

Equality, diversity and inclusion at universities: the power of a systemic approach

LERU position paper
September 2019

LE
RU

PUSHING
THE FRONTIERS
OF INNOVATIVE
RESEARCH

University of Amsterdam • Universitat de Barcelona • University of Cambridge • University of Copenhagen
Trinity College Dublin • University of Edinburgh • University of Freiburg • Université de Genève
Universität Heidelberg • University of Helsinki • Universiteit Leiden • KU Leuven
Imperial College London • University College London • Lund University • University of Milan
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München • University of Oxford • Sorbonne University
Université Paris-Sud • University of Strasbourg • Utrecht University • University of Zurich

Table of contents

Executive summary	3
Part I Manifesto for an inclusive university in a diverse world	7
1.1. The university as an institution can lead change: “Mind the gaps”	
1.2. Recognising potential bias in the system: “Use the evidence”	
1.3. The role of leadership: “Lay down stepping stones towards change”	
1.4. Scaling up change: “Lead by example and collaborate”	
1.5. Conclusions	
Part II Enabling change: five opportunities for universities	15
2.1. Better reflect and connect local and global challenges	
2.2. Discover and include the greatest talent, by reconsidering the definitions of excellence and success in the academic community	
2.3. Fully realise the potential in all staff and students	
2.4. Enhance wellbeing across the institution to the benefit of recruitment, retention and performance	
2.5. Increase the validity and quality of research results and knowledge production and transfer	
Part III Evidence-based contributions on specific and identifiable challenges	21
3.1. Acting against implicit bias and denial of discrimination	
3.2. Eliminating bias and blind spots in research and university assessment	
3.3. Embedding inclusive research and innovation across the university	
3.4. Recognising the less visible characteristics of diversity	
3.5. Intersectionality as a framework to understand the value and complexity of diversity	
Part IV Case studies and good practice from LERU universities	39
References	63

Acknowledgements

Lead authors: **Prof. Simone Buitendijk, Vice-Provost (Education), Imperial College London**
Prof. Stephen Curry, Assistant Provost EDI, Imperial College London
Dr. Katrien Maes, Deputy Secretary-General LERU

Contributing authors: Prof. David Bogle (University College London), Prof. Tomas Brage (Lund University), Prof. Frédéric Darbellay (Université de Genève), Prof. Athene Donald (University of Cambridge), Prof. Naomi Ellemers (Utrecht University), Prof. Jadranka Gvozdanovic (Universität Heidelberg), Dr. Matthew Harris (Imperial College London), Dr. Isabel Hoving (Universiteit Leiden), Prof. Jojanneke van der Toorn (Universiteit Leiden and Utrecht University), Prof. Anna Vignoles (University of Cambridge) and Dr. Didier Wernli (Université de Genève)

The paper benefited greatly from the help of the contributing authors, who generously gave their time discussing, writing for and commenting on the many drafts of this paper over the past two years. The members of the LERU Thematic Group Equality, Diversity & Inclusion were instrumental in reviewing the paper and in enriching it with examples of LERU universities' policies and practices. Sincere thanks go to them, as well as to the members of several other LERU groups that gave valuable feedback on the paper, and not least to the LERU rectors for their close involvement in the development of this paper. A special thanks goes to Ms Rachel Witton (Imperial College London) for her substantial contributions to the process, her editing efforts and her tireless work to keep this paper on track.

Executive summary

In the past few decades, many research and policy papers have been written documenting the widespread disadvantages faced by under-represented groups in academia and exploring the benefits to universities of work to promote equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI). However, despite numerous efforts, many research-intensive universities have yet to develop fully inclusive processes and cultures that provide true equality of opportunity to staff and students from all backgrounds.

Enhancing equality, diversity and inclusion brings many advantages. It provides a renewed focus on the wellbeing of scholars and students in universities and other academic institutions. Improved equality, diversity and inclusion will build community by improving the sense of belonging for *everyone* who comes to them for work or study, which in turn is likely to enhance their commitment and performance. Furthermore, by fully embracing and valuing diversity, universities can ensure their long-term relevance in a fast-changing world and increase their already considerable global impact.

In this paper we argue that EDI within universities can be more effectively promoted using a comprehensive approach:

- to address inclusion and enhanced representation of *all* under-represented groups,
- to aim at the entire academic community of staff and students *together*, and
- to make the *content of both* the research and the research-led curriculum more inclusive.

By making access to universities truly open to all staff and students who have the talent and capability to contribute, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, social class, sexual orientation, physical ability, identity and cultural background, universities will foster social cohesion and at the same time enhance their capacity for creative and original research and teaching. By creating inclusive research and innovation programmes and integrating them fully into the curriculum, universities will attract a broader range of students and scholars and will be better able to achieve globally relevant excellence in teaching, research and innovation. This synergistic approach to EDI will empower traditionally under-represented groups, will make the academic community more successful and will enhance the vigour of the academic enterprise.

We have set out four pivotal steps to build an equal, diverse and inclusive university:

1) Become familiar with the key lessons emerging from the large body of research related to privilege and the effects of bias, which reveals the extent of the issues facing under-represented staff and students. University leaders who take the time to engage with this evidence will be better equipped to identify interventions that work. In doing so they will send a powerful message to the entire university community that they are empathic to underprivileged groups, aware of the issues facing those groups and willing to prioritise solutions. This will build trust in their leadership and augment the credibility of their EDI programmes for change.

2) Monitor and measure the present situation and the impact of programmes introduced to bring about change. The case for change built on the existing literature is compelling, but it is crucial to understand the particularity of the issues at each institution, using both quantitative data and qualitative information from surveys and individual testimonials. The power of empathy, being open and listening to experiences shared in a safe and respectful environment, provides the crucial human dimension to complement the monitoring data and enriches the narrative drive towards the desired institutional culture.

3) Develop a formal strategy that can ensure both bespoke solutions for the many different issues and groups, as well as a holistic, synergistic and sustainable approach to inequality and lack of inclusion in university culture.

4) Communicate from the highest levels of leadership the need for change and the potential benefits to the entire university of increased equality, diversity and inclusion. Build a narrative that fits the institutional goals in terms of organisational culture and academic outcomes, one that is compelling and enthusing for all. Lead by example.

This paper aims to be comprehensive, but also inspirational. We hope it will convince academic leaders to become more involved with the EDI agenda and to implement institution-wide change that builds on existing strengths in their own university

and is focused on the specific needs of their community. It also aims to be practical. Rather than attempting to synthesise a vast body of literature, it draws upon and aims to transmit the core messages from the latest research on the challenges and opportunities for universities wishing to enhance equality, diversity and inclusion.

We also wish to highlight (see part III for more detailed discussion) a number of more recent research areas in EDI in academia that are worthy of ongoing reflection:

- **The importance of acknowledging bias:** in spite of endorsement of equal opportunities, and ambitions to select and reward merit, evidence of implicitly biased treatment at universities has become abundant during the past decades. Subtle and implicit discrimination can be equally or even more harmful for wellbeing and performance motivation than overt discriminatory treatment, while symbolic endorsements of equal treatment only make it more difficult to identify instances of bias. Evidence shows that perpetrators, targets and bystanders may avoid acknowledging or reporting discrimination when it occurs because this undermines wellbeing and just-world beliefs. The simple act of acknowledging that discrimination may persist despite people's best intentions is a key step. Change can happen when advantaged group members express their readiness to call out unequal treatment, and when the organisation is open to suggestions to improve its procedures.
- **The importance of eliminating bias and blind spots in research and university assessment:** biases due to various forms of stereotyping appear to have taken root in many areas of research assessment. These include scholarly publication, hiring and promotion, grant funding, and university league tables, all of which can impact the experiences and career opportunities of researchers. The impacts of assessment bias on diversity among researchers interact in complex ways that need to be better understood. However, emerging evidence suggests that concrete measures and targeted interventions can be taken by various stakeholders, including universities, funding organisations and journal publishers to counter the effects of bias in research assessment.
- **Embedding inclusive research and innovation across the university:** inclusivity and diversity in the content of the research ensures that university research and innovation, as well as its research-led teaching, are geared towards equitably benefiting all members of the population at large. Present inequalities risk narrowing the focus of research design. For example, the research questions asked or the outcomes to be implemented may primarily apply to men, overlook cultural and ethnic minority groups, or be less relevant to the Global South. Application of more diverse and inclusive research design holds the promise of generating greater value and impact.
- **Recognising the less visible characteristics of EDI:** gender and ethnicity are (mostly) visible, making people with those characteristics readily susceptible to stereotyping and bias. Sexual orientation, social class or invisible handicaps or disability may not be so easily noticed, but can still lead to exclusion through behaviour driven by implicit norms. University-wide efforts to create a fully inclusive culture can improve the sense of belonging and of being respected. This in turn fosters agency, creativity and success in all staff and students, including those from less visible under-represented groups.
- **The importance of intersectionality:** as an analytical framework intersectionality generates an understanding that individuals can be members of multiple underprivileged groups at the same time and may therefore face more barriers to success in the academic system. It validates the interconnected and system-wide approach to EDI. Single, short-term interventions are unlikely to be effective without this framework.

Although this paper has been written for the whole academy, it aims particularly to mobilise individuals in positions of leadership, since insight and visible support from people with decision-making power are absolutely critical to bring about real cultural change. LERU universities have a leading role to play in this endeavour. They are uniquely placed to work not just with their own academic community, but with other universities and stakeholders to drive the large-scale measures needed to make a step change in equality of opportunity in academia.

This paper cannot provide a precise EDI roadmap for university leaders to implement in their institutions. In spite of many of the underlying problems being widespread, it is impossible to devise a universally applicable blueprint for action. Each university is unique in the extent and nature of the specific EDI issues that it faces. The local and national context, as well as their strategic choices in research, education and societal impact, will influence the institutional change programme and the issues that need

to be prioritised. We are confident, however, that the principles of strategic thinking and visible leadership to enhance EDI apply to all universities. We are also confident that taking a holistic approach will greatly enhance the chances of large-scale success. What we are therefore offering in this paper is:

- **an overview of the benefits that a strategic approach to EDI can bring to universities;**
- **an introduction to the most recent and relevant research evidence on EDI issues in academia;**
- **an invitation for university leaders to fully equip themselves to recognise and address the particular challenges of EDI at research-intensive institutions;**
- **an overview of inspiring and practical examples of actions that can be taken.**

We hope this paper can be the start of a high-level and involved conversation that will lead to a collaborative process of implementing much needed, sustainable change, both institutionally and across universities and the wider higher education community.

Part I Manifesto for an inclusive university in a diverse world

1.1. The university as an institution can lead change: “Mind the gaps”

The history of the university in Europe is long and complex. Institutions initially conceived as communities of scholars and students have evolved over the centuries, especially in the last sixty to seventy years when they have grown rapidly in size and number as a result of increased public funding of research and tertiary education. Although these changes have sustained an ongoing debate about the proper balance between the autonomy and the wider responsibilities of universities, in which academics have often asserted the benefits of being to some degree *apart* from society, they retain a strong sense of their importance to society. In their modern incarnation as very much publicly funded and publicly oriented institutions, all universities have obligations to the societies they serve. This means that as well as promoting and preserving cultural, scientific and technological advances, they have a unique – but not exclusive – role to play as agents of social harmony and progression.

Among universities, research-intensive institutions can be particularly influential agents of societal enrichment and change. Their impact is due not only to the discoveries, innovations and critical analyses they produce in many different disciplines, but also to the research-focused education they provide to a growing population of skilled undergraduate and post-graduate students. Increasingly it has been recognised that their success, and the elitism that rightly accompanies it, can exacerbate the barriers to entry due to the structural inequalities embedded in the societies they serve.

The leadership of LERU universities and other top research-intensive universities around the world are increasingly aware of their responsibility to promote equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI), so as to become institutions where anyone with potential can thrive.

Most of them have made an explicit commitment to this cause, but in spite of good will – and the evidence of the very real benefits of diversity – progress has been slow. We therefore need to ask ourselves if we are doing the right things.

Many research papers have already been written describing the lack of diversity among staff and students at research-intensive universities and documenting the consequences for the individual members of the community, for the universities themselves and for society. Although this substantial body of literature points to the relevant causes and outlines potential solutions, it has not always been made easily accessible or communicated in compelling terms.

One of the impediments to sustainable change is that many of the initiatives to promote equality, diversity and inclusion at universities have not been joined-up. We identify three gaps in these approaches that need to be closed:

- 1) Efforts have not been sufficiently synergistic in tackling the common barriers faced by all under-represented groups¹, including women, ethnic or cultural minorities, LGBT+², disabled or first-generation members of the university community.
- 2) The focus of many efforts has been either on staff issues, or on student issues, rather than on addressing the needs of the university community as a whole.
- 3) The value of building inclusivity into the teaching curriculum or the design of research and innovation programmes (e.g. taking account of how considerations of sex/gender and/or minority perspectives could impact the research questions, methods and processes³) have often not been sufficiently central to efforts to address institutional issues of diversity and inclusion.

Not only do disjointed approaches tend to waste precious resources and goodwill, they risk marginalising the impact and credibility of universities in an increasingly diverse world.

1 The case study in part III.5. by Isabel Hoving explains intersectionality, i.e. how individuals may simultaneously identify with multiple underprivileged groups and may therefore face more barriers to success in the academic system. Intersectionality as a framework validates the interconnected and system-wide approach to EDI in this paper.

2 We use LGBT+ in this paper to denote Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and other spectrums of sexuality and gender. Other abbreviations such as LGBTQ(+) and LGBTIQ(+) are sometimes used in the contributions by LERU universities in Part IV.

3 The case study in part III.3. by Simone Buitendijk analyses this issue in-depth.

They also constitute missed opportunities for important and sustainable positive change. If universities themselves realise that catering to a diverse population of staff and students and to changing local and global communities requires innovating research and teaching and adapting the institutional culture, they will maintain their relevance.

In this paper we argue that universities willing to undertake a rigorous analysis of themselves as an academic body, to honestly identify the gaps, to promote empathic listening to marginalised groups, and to implement interconnected, university-wide systemic changes, will be much better placed to achieve sustainable equality, diversity and inclusion. As a result, they will create a better, more caring academic community for all, not only for under-represented groups. They will become even more valuable to the world.

To do justice to the ambition of our equality, diversity and inclusion agenda, we should reflect on the extent to which the broader university system is in good health. Research-intensive universities are focused on the pursuit of excellence in knowledge advancement, research and innovation, which is fuelled by competition for the best people and the best resources as well as by external drivers such as government accountability demands and the growing influence of university rankers. The competition to be the best, individually and as an institution, coupled with a sometimes unquestioned belief in the meritocracy of academia, are deeply engrained in research-intensive universities. While that is understandable and to some extent justifiable - healthy competition can stimulate creativity and productivity - at the extreme it can be at odds with a broader, more multidimensional and more collaborative conception of excellence. It would be wise to recognise the potential pitfalls if universities were to develop their EDI agenda from overly narrow definitions of excellence or inadequate considerations of the barriers that impair supposedly meritocratic systems of student and staff evaluation. While we cannot do full justice to the broader topic of the impact of the prestige economy on EDI in academia, we will touch on some of these issues at various points as part of our considerations of how to bring about change at the institutional level.

1.2. Recognising potential bias in the system: “Use the evidence”

A large and growing body of literature points to widespread disadvantage in academia for groups that are not ‘the norm’. Most well researched are the inequalities faced by women, which are most acute in male-dominated fields, such as STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics), or in academic positions of power and visibility. Another notable field of research is disadvantage for academics and students of colour, which tends to be more conspicuous in predominantly white academic environments. Experiences of discrimination and exclusion are often related to stereotypical views of under-represented groups and are prevalent in society at large. Staff and students who are LGBT+, disabled, or first in their family to go to university (‘first generation’) also often face such obstacles to participation in academia.

Overt discrimination is no longer legal, but less clear forms of disadvantage still happen. They are often difficult to prove for individuals who experience it. Individual staff and students may not even be aware of all instances of being held back because of, for example, their gender, the colour of their skin, their sexual orientation, socio-economic background, disability, age or any other characteristic or a combination of them.

In most of the literature on discrimination, the term ‘bias’ or ‘implicit bias’ is now used to indicate patterns of behaviour faced by underprivileged groups that are more subtle and covert than direct discrimination⁴. In some of the literature the term ‘privilege’, for instance male privilege or white privilege, has recently been introduced to indicate specific opportunities for the norm group of which it is often unaware. Less open, but still noticeable forms of discrimination have been described, such as micro-aggressions⁵, sex-role spillovers, intellectual intimidation, and “non-events”⁶ (Husu, 2001). Implicit bias, group privilege and micro-aggressions are often difficult to ‘prove’ on an individual basis. They can be more easily evidenced by quantitative and qualitative group data, and evaluation at the level of the institution.

4 The case studies in Part III.1. (by Naomi Ellemers) and Part III.2. (by Stephen Curry) explore further issues around bias and denial of discrimination and around bias and blind spots in research and university assessment, respectively. The case study in Part III.4. (by Jojanneke van der Toorn) focuses on the less visible characteristics of diversity.

5 For example, asking people from ethnic minorities where they are “really” from.

6 Examples of “non-events” are ignoring, not being invited, not being listened to, lack of validation, lack of visibility, etc.

Universities are part of society, and much of the implicit bias against particular groups starts long before they attempt to enter academia. Universities are well placed to decrease existing inequalities by developing measures to counterbalance existing societal bias and stereotypical views. By becoming aware of the issues faced by under-represented groups in society at large and in academia, universities can help to reduce the already existing inequalities and close any achievement gaps between groups. At present, however, many procedures at universities are still biased against underprivileged groups. Even though the difference in treatment in each instance is often small enough to go unnoticed if not monitored or researched, many molehills eventually add up to a mountain. Only with targeted counterbalancing activities can university populations truly represent the societies they serve so that talent is not wasted.

One of the most pernicious issues is not the existence of implicit bias, unequal distribution of privilege, or micro-aggressions, but rather the lack of awareness at the level of the institution and the community at large.

If at the heart of the narrative around excellence in academia is a belief that the university is truly meritocratic and at the same time there is evidence of women or academics of colour not climbing to the top in similar numbers to white men, the inevitable conclusion would have to be that female academics or academics of colour are not talented or hard working enough. Moreover, if for example the university community appears unable to recognise, acknowledge, challenge and counter bullying and harassment, or sexual misconduct, women and minority groups will be disproportionately negatively affected. As a result, they will not experience their work and study environment as welcoming, safe and inclusive, which may make it harder for them to succeed even if they are not always aware of the effects⁷.

Lack of insight into the existence of bias at an institutional level and lack of empathic listening to groups and individuals encountering bias may be the single most important obstacle in the way of sustainable change. Within the norm group it may lead to a lack of understanding concerning the issues that underprivileged groups face. In the groups that suffer from bias it may lead to an internalisation of a sense of shortcoming, a lack of agency and eventually to underperformance. Admitting there is bias and discrimination, acknowledging

that students and academics outside the norm group face extra hurdles, acknowledging that academic culture needs to change and that underprivileged individuals themselves should not feel ownership of that task, can be hugely important and positive. Without that acknowledgement, change will be much harder, if not impossible, to implement.

1.3. The role of leadership: “Lay down stepping stones towards change”

One of the most powerful ways to achieve sustainable and institution-wide change is clear and visible leadership from the very top. The university senior management team should take the lead in openly recognising the issues associated with bias, acknowledging the negative consequences for the entire community and pushing for a comprehensive and strategic change programme for EDI.

A first and pivotal step towards change, as described above, is for university leaders to familiarise themselves with the research evidence that reveals the structural inequalities in the higher education (HE) sector and to clearly acknowledge the existence of structural biases in many elements of university culture.

All groups and individuals, even under-represented people themselves, are biased at times and it may be impossible to prevent unfair judgements and processes totally. However, acknowledging that bias and discrimination may exist despite people's best intentions is necessary if our institutions are to create lasting change. It sends a message to minority groups that the organisation values their contributions and is ready to support them. An organisation's readiness to call out unequal treatment and to take necessary actions will enhance the sense of belonging of under-represented groups, their confidence in their abilities, and the level and quality of their performance.

The senior leadership can set an example for other leaders, such as deans, heads of institutions and departments, and academic group leaders. An inclusive leadership style that is self-reflective, demonstrates a willingness to listen, is open to change where needed and focused on the entire community's expectations and needs, makes a vital contribution to an inclusive academic culture.

⁷ Part IV of this paper provides a good practice example from the University of Cambridge, outlining how the University is developing a community approach to taking action against sexual misconduct.

A second step is for the university to monitor its situation and to measure the impact of the change programme qualitatively and quantitatively.

This is a crucial tool for the university leadership to decide on actions and to determine which projects are successful and which are not. Statistics specific to the institution itself are crucial for illustrating the extent of the issues, to get buy-in from key decision makers and to decide which areas to prioritise. Even though bias in academia is a widespread phenomenon, the local and national context as well as the success of previous institutional change programmes will determine specific needs for each university. For some universities access and participation of ethnic minority students may be the most important goal, for others gender equality or inclusion of LGBT+ staff and students may be more pressing, while yet others may want to take action across several areas at the same time. Regardless of the institutional situation, specific data on the particular issues are crucial for making them visible, persuading the organisation that action is needed, and for measuring progress.

Qualitative data from group surveys or discussions or from individual testimonials are valuable complements to statistics and institutional-level metrics. The university 'story' can best be told by its individual members, whether they are in leadership positions or less visible in the organisation. They can provide inspiration and can give depth and a human dimension to the facts and figures. If such qualitative data are seen to inspire the leadership to appropriate actions by giving a voice to under-represented groups within the university, this should demonstrate institutional empathy and help to build trust in the commitment of the leadership. An example of staff and student stories being a source of inspiration to the university leadership can be found in the UCL case study by Professor Michael Arthur in Part IV of this paper.

Developing a formal strategy, putting in place institutional measures and seeing them through is a third crucial step. Cultural change is a long-term endeavour and to be sustainable, the EDI programme needs to be comprehensive and will need to have enough long-term and visible support from the top to show results and gain momentum.

Each university will have its own approach and goals; nonetheless, evidence-based common principles can be used by all. Examples from LERU universities can be found

in parts III and IV of this paper.

Changing both the processes for defining who is best and changing the culture for staff and students to make it more inclusive will not just benefit the groups that encounter bias, but also make the entire institution more effective and robust. It will therefore enhance the quality of academic outputs in education, research and societal impact. A large body of research has revealed bias in almost all university systems: admission of students and measurement of study results, graduate prospects, hiring, reward and recognition, participation at the highest levels, availability of mentoring and sponsoring, success in grants, student evaluations of teachers, the content of research projects and the researched curriculum, external visibility and status of the academic institutions. To counterbalance, we need an institutional strategy and a broad set of measures that focus on changing the academic culture as a whole, without losing sight of the need for bespoke approaches for certain groups of underprivileged staff and students. The strategy needs to build EDI considerations into all university processes to ensure that inclusive research and innovation become integral to the research portfolio and the educational curriculum.

A final, pivotal step is communicating the commitment to the strategy and to the programme of culture change from the very top of the organisation.

The positive narrative that derives from an ambitious and demonstrably effective programme will create trust within the entire community that the change will eventually benefit everyone.

To sum up, commitment at the highest level of leadership, the institutional ability to listen to and to show empathy for the groups that face extra hurdles, and the strategic decision to act, will in combination be a very powerful instrument of change. With a formal strategy and clear goals that build on the myriad successes that have already been achieved in the recent past, sustainable, meaningful change is within reach of all research-intensive universities. It will make universities even more successful and more societally relevant than they are today.

1.4. Scaling up change: “Lead by example and collaborate”

University leaders often ponder the question 'what are universities for' (LERU, 2008). The leaders of top research-intensive universities are in their jobs because they want to change society and make a difference through research

and teaching. They know their institutions can have world-changing impact. The best among them care deeply about the wellbeing of their academic communities. At the same time, they wrestle with many different problems that can get in the way of these objectives.

There is ample evidence that increased equality, diversity and inclusion within organisations makes them happier and more productive. These benefits extend to all member of the organisation, not just to under-represented groups⁸. In this paper we present a framework to help universities to tackle the range of EDI issues that university staff and students face. We argue that a candid assessment of the status quo that feeds into a strategic programme addressing the needs of staff and students, of research and teaching is needed to sustain change at a level that has not been achieved before.

The scale of change needed demands a collaborative approach. No single university can challenge the existing academic system and culture in isolation. But there is power and opportunity in numbers. LERU, as a network of trusted friends, can collectively take EDI and research-intensive universities to the next level. It can move beyond Europe to add an important voice to the debate about the global state of play.

LERU and its member universities are committed to achieving change, institutionally and collectively by doing the following:

- **The leadership of the LERU universities will continue to develop and refine a framework for comprehensive, long-term strategic change in their own institutions.** Many of the tools to increase EDI are already available, but most universities have not yet implemented a holistic programme of change. LERU universities should endeavour to take a visible lead, showing knowledge of the issues facing under-represented staff and students, and helping to illuminate a clear path forward that can benefit and inspire all. They should develop a long-term plan that allows for synergy between different measures and hence for sustainability, but which also prioritises challenges for action in the short term to help communicate that a systemic programme of genuine change is under way. A synergistic plan that is likely to succeed is one that views bias as an institutional phenomenon which can hold back women, ethnic minorities, LGBT+ and other under-represented groups in similar ways, that looks at the entire academic community of staff and students, and that encompasses the content of the research and the taught curriculum from an EDI perspective.

- **LERU will develop an action plan that encompasses collaboration with each other as well as with other networks of research-intensive universities, networks of research funders, national and EU governments and policy makers, and journals,** to reach the EDI goals as well as the higher-level goals of academic culture change.

1.5. Conclusions

Enhanced equality, diversity and inclusion, both within universities as well as in academia at large, will improve the wellbeing and performance of entire academic communities, not only those who are impacted by structural biases. Furthermore, it will help secure the long-term relevance and viability of research-intensive universities and will increase their already considerable global impact. EDI within universities can be more effectively enhanced using a comprehensive approach to address inclusion and enhanced representation of all under-represented groups, to aim at staff and students together and to make the content of the research and the research-led curriculum more inclusive. To achieve EDI, it is crucial that university leaders and managers at all levels, familiarise themselves with the large body of literature on how the disadvantages faced by underprivileged groups affect those groups – and the wider academic community. Unfair systems can stress people not directly affected by the unfairness. The denial of bias and unequal opportunity can also provide serious barriers to institution-wide change of culture. Empathic listening, coupled with strategic, evidence-based approaches that aim at the entire university community, can be very powerful.

By truly opening universities to anyone who has the talent and capability to contribute, irrespective of identity, social class, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, cultural background, age or disability, universities will foster social cohesion and at the same time enhance their capacity for creative and original research and teaching. By creating inclusive research and innovation programmes and integrating them fully into the curriculum, universities will attract a broader range of students and scholars, they will engineer meaningful and sustainable change for everyone who works or studies at the university, and they will achieve greater excellence and global relevance in their teaching, research and innovation.

⁸ The case study by Jojanneke van der Toorn in part III.4. of this paper provides research evidence on the benefits of inclusion on wellbeing.

Part II Enabling change: five opportunities for universities

To highlight the potential benefits of investment in change, we examine the opportunities for universities that decide to travel the road towards making their organisation more equal, diverse and inclusive. Research has clearly documented there are positive opportunities for universities if they address the multiple challenges in an integrated and interconnected way – see, for example, the research-based case studies in Part III of this paper. Below we outline five opportunities for universities that have the potential to bring long-term benefits.

2.1. To better reflect society and connect local and global challenges

Universities are naturally shaped and influenced by the societies in which they were founded. But they are also places where people come together to offer scholarly critique of society, and to challenge the status quo. This can be more effectively achieved if universities are seen to actively represent the range of perspectives held by the national and international communities they serve.

Universities, research-intensive ones in particular, are seen as elite institutions that embody some of the highest cultural and intellectual endeavours of our civilisations. In the modern world governments increasingly look to them as founts of the discoveries, innovations and analyses needed to help society face major challenges. These include not just technical innovations in healthcare, energy generation and food supply, but social and cultural insights to inform decision making on complex and contentious issues such as social mobility, the balance between freedom and security, and environmental protection. They are also expected to introduce cutting-edge research into the teaching curriculum.

In Europe, despite many legislative advances designed to enhance equality of opportunity irrespective of gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability and other protected characteristics, many key decision-making positions in universities remain dominated by white, heterosexual, norm-bodied men. Similarly, the student community at research-intensive top universities often does not reflect the full diversity of society. It is increasingly evident that this level of homogenisation, which is in many ways self-reinforcing, is no longer fit for purpose. A growing body of evidence points not only to the mechanisms that inadvertently but systematically exclude many different groups of people, but also reveals

myriad potential benefits to the quality and societal relevance of university research and education of diversifying the talent pools from which staff and students are drawn.

Although the relative lack of diversity in LERU and other universities is often viewed as an inevitable outcome of insistence on excellence, this is a problematic misapprehension for several reasons. It undermines the confidence in the declared commitment of many universities to take a full part in society, isolating the academy from the concerns of the general public. It also undermines the claims of universities to be agents of social mobility.

To be sure, whereas many societal inequalities do not start at the university level- often becoming apparent in childhood, primary and secondary education- traditional systems of selection will exacerbate the problem by disproportionately offering the advantages of a degree or an academic career to more privileged groups.

Moreover, excellence and diversity are in no way juxtaposed. On the contrary, an increase in numbers of underprivileged staff and students achieved through evidence-based policy and targeted measures will likely result in better outcomes for the institution.

For example, a diverse pool of talented students provides an enriched learning environment for everyone. And as our students subsequently become agents of change within our societies, they will be better equipped to serve the diversity of those communities. Similarly, if staff from different backgrounds feel included and respected because the university sees their diversity of experience as an asset rather than something that sets them apart, they will be happier and more productive. Ultimately, attention to EDI benefits all staff and students since inclusion of different perspectives not only enriches the creative vigour of the institution but also signals a commitment to fairness. Moreover, if teachers and researchers come from diverse backgrounds and if those backgrounds are celebrated, they can serve as role models for students from under-represented groups.

2.2. To discover and include the greatest talent, by reconsidering the definitions of excellence and success in the academic community

Although competition is healthy in many ways and can bring out the best in talented people, academia's concepts of excellence and success are constrained to a certain extent by the highly competitive culture of research-intensive universities.

The practice of managing and assessing research and teaching through metrics and rankings tends to homogenise universities by narrowing the scope of what constitutes success, which is usually weighted towards research funding and publications⁹. These systems of evaluation tend to exclude the less tangible but no less important ways in which universities positively impact the world, such as in the transfer of knowledge and skills through research-led teaching.

That is not to say that the leading universities in Europe and North America, which tend to dominate rankings and the pages of prestigious journals, do not offer hugely enriching experiences to their staff and students or do not conduct impactful and ground-breaking research.

Rather, it is a declaration that universities can do even better by taking a broader, richer view of excellence to deconstruct the barriers for under-represented groups that have arisen from traditional measures of success which lack a sufficient focus on the diversity of contributions responsible for that success.

More diverse definitions of research and educational outcomes could include not only how well we connect with and meet the needs of society, or how we address historical and geographical inequalities, but also how effectively we nurture and support all our staff and students so as to provide them with a healthier working and studying experience.

2.3. To fully realise the potential in all staff and students

Current recruitment and selection procedures are not optimally suited to realise the full range of talent in our diverse populations.

Lack of diversity deprives talented staff from under-represented backgrounds of an opportunity to contribute academically and represents a missed opportunity to stimulate the creativity of research teams. This problem is compounded because promotion of relatively low numbers of talented staff from under-represented groups by a system that is supposedly based on merit sends an implicit message that these staff are less deserving.

Such messages are often internalised, thereby reducing the self-confidence of those directly affected, while potentially reinforcing the prejudices among the dominant group. Even for those in under-represented groups who succeed in gaining entry despite the structural barriers, the university can become a place that treats certain talented people unfairly and perpetuates inequality. Such sentiments lower morale as well as productivity, and reduce the university's chances of reaching true excellence.

Similar concerns apply to students. While branded as meritocratic, student admissions procedures rely heavily on exam results and/or interviews that favour people who have the economic, social and cultural capital to anticipate what the university expects of them. Admissions systems need to recognise and address the academically irrelevant barriers to entry faced by talented people from traditionally under-represented groups. The same is true of selection procedures that do not correct for the possible influence of bias. The argument is sometimes made that attention paid to equality and diversity is at the expense of quality and excellence, but this is a false dichotomy. Such views are grounded in the conviction that current selection procedures are fair and unbiased and that adapting them will make them less effective rather than enhancing the quality of the selection. The challenge and opportunity of our increasingly

⁹ The case study by Stephen Curry in Part III.2. of this paper looks at issues around bias and blind spots in university and research assessment.

diverse societies is to ensure that our systems and processes eliminate bias and unwarranted barriers to access across all of the universities' missions and to enable all members of society to achieve their full potential.

This is crucial because universities also have a responsibility to employers who want to recruit and retain the best from all sectors of society. Employers, too, understand the need for a diverse staff to serve their ever more diverse customers and clients. They also need employees with diversity competences, and ample experience with diverse work and learning communities.

If our graduates are to flourish in the workplace, we need to foster the diversity of our intake, teach all our students how awareness of diversity affects the way they work, and acknowledge the full range of talents they develop in their academic training.

2.4. To enhance wellbeing across the institution, to the benefit of recruitment, retention and performance

When people who study or work at universities perceive their talent or their line of academic work not to be recognised, negative outcomes for them as well as for the university as a whole can be the result. For example, if academics from under-represented groups are treated unfairly in the allocation of teaching and administrative tasks, they may feel less valued than their peers with more time for research. Even their peers may be negatively affected since observation of such organisational inequality and exclusion can lower morale and productivity by undermining trust in the good intentions of the institution. For example, the negative consequences of the "leaky pipeline" and the "glass ceiling" for women have been amply documented (LERU, 2012, 2018; European Commission's She Figures, 2019)¹⁰.

By paying greater attention to equality, diversity and inclusion, universities can create a more engaging environment for work and study, one where all individuals feel valued. In turn this should increase their sense of belonging, their day-to-day satisfaction, their performance and their capacity for innovation.

Effective procedures to promote inclusion will not only instil a greater sense of fairness within the university, benefiting under-represented groups as well as majority-group staff and students. The benefits to the institutional culture extend beyond equality and diversity. For example, a culture that is actively inclusive has been shown to empower more people to challenge flawed work practices, or instances of bullying and harassment, even when this is not related to their minority or majority status (such as coercive authorship, reporting and correcting errors at work).

Moreover, it is important to recognise that while many of the stresses of academic life may be experienced more acutely by under-represented groups, their impacts are widespread. Problems combining family duties with academic performance may be felt more by young academic women than men, for example, but they also make academia an unattractive workplace for young men who want to be involved fathers. Extreme stress and anxiety, particularly at more precarious early-career stages, may be more common in minority staff and students (e.g. as a result of the self-confidence issues mentioned above) and therefore more of an impediment to career progression. Such effects may be exacerbated in highly competitive and uncollaborative environments.

University leaders can address these issues strategically and accelerate the pace of change by integrating efforts to create a better environment for under-represented groups with work to tackle some of the more generic problems of academic wellbeing.

2.5. To increase the validity and quality of our research results and knowledge production and transfer

Universities operate in a world that is diverse. The continued relevance of our research and our curriculum can be enhanced and secured by a diversity of perspectives, which generates more ideas and a greater range of approaches to problem-solving in research, in teaching, in management and in reaching out to society. This will be most effective if we foster a culture that is willing to listen to all voices, even if they are dissenting. Creativity and scientific innovations come from engaging in frank dialogue between different perspectives, where ideas and critique can flow freely¹¹.

¹⁰ The leaky pipeline is a commonly used, albeit incomplete metaphor. In fact, one may speak of multiple leaky pipelines (Ong et al., 2016; Gibbs, 2014) or of a "vanish box" (Etzkowitz & Ranga, 2011).

¹¹ <https://www.nature.com/scientificamerican/journal/v311/n4/full/scientificamerican1014-42.html>; <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-05316-5>

In particular, emphasis can be placed on considering how diversity affects the framing and the breadth of research questions and how this can influence the taught curriculum and foster inclusion of students and staff. Knowledge production and research at universities and research-performing institutions are not as inclusive as they could be.

This is now generally recognised and addressed for gender issues. LERU (2015) has argued that sex and gender¹² issues should be examined in all methods and steps of the research process, from fundamental research design to innovation applications. This is crucial if we are to avoid painful and costly mistakes (e.g. medicines or treatments that are ineffective or even harmful for women, or algorithms in cardiology, or university admissions that are biased against women). Attending to sex and gender issues in all steps of the research process is thus indispensable for making sure research is valid, trustworthy and of high quality. The case study by Simone Buitendijk in Part III of this paper explores in-depth the dimension inclusive research and innovation, and its relevance to education.

Likewise, global challenges such as climate change adaptation, poverty reduction or sustainable food production will be more effectively addressed with an inclusive agenda in mind, since this expands the range of perspectives brought to bear on these problems. The same thinking can and should be applied to the teaching curriculum at research-intensive universities by making the reading materials and the research being used more inclusive.

This creates an opportunity not only to better engage minority students through having a curriculum that more closely matches their lived experiences, but also to enhance the quality of classroom discussions by including a richer set of perspectives¹³. Students from under-represented groups have the chance to see their contributions valued, while majority-group students have enhanced opportunities to learn from perspectives that are different to their own.

A final element to mention is the increasing recognition that diversity is key to the production of scientific knowledge. With science evolving toward team work and interdisciplinary research, and with the increasing importance of societal challenge-oriented research, a diversity of approaches, methods, mindset and perspectives can increase research capacities as well as problem-solving potential (Fortunato et al., 2018). Since performing complex tasks is better addressed by a diverse¹⁴ team of people (Page, 2017), harnessing complexity requires collective intelligence. The challenge lies in fostering not only diversity but also fruitful interactions between people in diverse groups.

12 Sex is defined as a biological factor related to genetic and reproductive characteristics, while gender is defined as a behavioural factor related to societal and cultural roles.
13 In Part IV of this paper Matt Harris and Mark Skopec describe efforts at Imperial College London to eliminate geographical bias in reading lists for students, thus working towards a curriculum that incorporates high-quality research regardless of its country of origin.
14 Page (2017, pp. 14-15) defines cognitive diversity as “differences in information, knowledge, representations, mental models, and heuristic, to better outcomes on specific tasks such as problem solving, predicting, and innovating”.

Part III Evidence-based contributions on specific and identifiable challenges

In this part we highlight certain issues, which we believe form important further reading to understand and recognise the ramifications of a comprehensive and joined-up approach to EDI at research universities, and to translate awareness into action. Some of the contributing authors of this paper have written the research-based contributions below on specific and identifiable EDI challenges. It is neither possible nor the purpose in this paper to give a definitive overview of the existing research literature, which is also confined in time since new, and much needed, further research insights will continue to refine our understanding and influence our actions. Nor is it possible to address all the different dimensions and specificities of EDI. Still, we do hope that the contributions below will increase understanding and provide inspiration for possible action. The five contributions, each of which includes a separate research reference list at the end of the paper, explore the following EDI issues:

1. Acting against implicit bias and denial of discrimination
2. Eliminating bias and blindspots in research and university assessment
3. Embedding inclusive research and innovation across the university
4. Recognising the less visible characteristics of diversity
5. Intersectionality as a framework to understand the value and complexity of diversity

3.1. Acting against implicit bias and denial of discrimination

Naomi Ellemers, Utrecht University

We think we know what discrimination looks like

Research in psychology reveals that we not only hold implicit stereotypes about individuals and groups, we also have stereotypical views about the way bias and discrimination *typically emerge*. **We assume that bias is visible from specific cues**, for instance when someone explicitly voices negative opinions about certain social groups, and/or withholds desired resources or important opportunities from individuals motivated by their group membership. Common examples of such statements are men saying: “women are not fit for leadership”, local citizens saying “migrants are not qualified for these jobs”, or heterosexuals saying “we don’t want our teachers to be gay”. Existing legal guidelines tend to rely on these stereotypical views of what discrimination looks like. They make it possible to sanction

those who explicitly refer to group-based features to motivate individual employment decisions (such as “we didn’t offer you promotion because you are a woman”, “we didn’t offer you the job because you are a foreigner”).

Modern forms of discrimination are not easily recognised

Due to anti-discrimination laws and social desirability concerns, many people no longer express such blatantly biased views. This makes it more difficult to ‘prove’ unfair treatment, or to file a discrimination complaint that will hold up in the courtroom. This doesn’t mean biased judgements have disappeared, or that they no longer influence the decisions we make or the outcomes people achieve. Modern discrimination simply tends to emerge in more subtle and implicit ways (“this candidate just does not seem to have what it takes”), couched in positive terms (“women deserve to be protected by men”), or motivated by referring to seemingly essential features (“it is not in their culture”, “they are biologically predisposed”).

At the same time, empirical studies consistently reveal that perpetrators as well as targets of biased treatment have difficulty *recognising* discriminatory views that are expressed in subtle, implicit, or seemingly positive ways – because this does not match the stereotype we have about what discrimination looks like.

Furthermore, many such views are so ingrained from childhood and socially reinforced, that they tend to be widely shared. When women agree that women are vulnerable, or when ethnic minorities acknowledge they are culturally different from the majority, we find it even more difficult to realise these also exemplify stereotypical judgements that contribute to unequal treatment of individuals based on their group membership – and can be a root of discrimination.

Implicit bias persists

The fact that we tend not to see discrimination when it occurs, does not mean it no longer *exists*. Despite endorsement of equal opportunities, and ambitions to select and reward people based on individual merit alone, **evidence of implicitly biased treatment has piled up during the past**

decades. This has been empirically established in many ways – in academic contexts mostly by comparing achievements and career paths of men and women. For instance, studies show that perceived math abilities of female students are underestimated and of male students overestimated in relation to their grades, that female teachers receive less favourable evaluations than male teachers in all disciplines, that female scholars are less likely than men to achieve tenure or be honoured with an endowed chair - even if they have equal records of scholarly achievement. Moreover, studies have shown that male scholars have a greater likelihood of being awarded research grants, receive more grant money, and are more likely to receive research awards, while female scholars on average spend more time on teaching and committee work, and are more likely to receive service awards. Experimental designs that allow researchers to keep constant information provided about actual behaviours (e.g. student interactions in an online course) and achievements (e.g. grades, publication records, products delivered), and only change the alleged sex of the target that is evaluated, replicate these findings. In these situations the differential ratings can only be attributed to gender-based interpretations of objective information provided, as these do not reflect actual differences in displays of ability, performance, or motivation.

The meritocracy illusion

Notwithstanding this evidence to the contrary, the common belief is that the academic community evaluates and awards individual merit alone. Yet, individuals present in these situations can easily observe that members of some groups are less likely to be successful than others. Everyone can see that fewer women achieve tenure and advancement opportunities and that more male than female scholars receive research grants, or other honours. In combination with the emphasis on individual merit as the main criterion determining these outcomes, this makes it easy to think that there is something about women that makes them less likely to be successful in an academic career. Maintaining the conviction that the university system rewards academic achievement alone only makes this worse: If the system is just, and all individuals receive equal opportunities to excel, then the observation that women are less successful than men can only imply that women are somehow less talented and motivated than male scholars.

Denying unequal treatment while it is clear members of different groups receive unequal outcomes also is a form of discrimination, as it implicitly conveys that members of some groups are essentially less deserving than others.

What's the harm?

It is tempting to think that people cannot suffer from discriminatory treatment as long as they do not realise they are being discriminated. Research convincingly shows this is not the case. Meta-analyses capturing results from many studies have revealed that **subtle and implicit discrimination often is equally or even more harmful for wellbeing and performance motivation than more blatant displays of discriminatory treatment.** How can this be? Denial of group-based discrimination while unequal treatment persists, reinforces the view that members of some groups are inherently less competent, motivated, or deserving than others. This causes individuals representing these groups to be afforded less confidence in their abilities, less credit for their achievements, and less opportunities for growth. For instance, research reveals that senior female academics experience less support from the organisation and its leadership than senior male academics. They also indicate having had to make more difficult life choices and personal sacrifices for their career than their male colleagues. Junior women see this, and do not consider senior women as attractive role models, despite their career success. More generally, observing that other members of their group have to overcome additional hurdles in order to be successful easily causes people to become discouraged from trying the same.

While the decision to 'opt out' may seem to confirm the view that these individuals just are less motivated, it is just as much the result of anticipating less return on investment, due to the way other members of their group are treated by the organisation.

Common pitfalls

As long as equal outcomes are not in sight, **symbolic endorsements of equal treatment only make it more difficult to identify instances of bias.** Research shows this makes people less vigilant for implicit bias, less tolerant of complaints about unequal treatment, and less critical of current procedures. Relying on those who are disadvantaged to call out incidences of unequal treatment, and assuming all is well as long as this does not happen, neglects research evidence showing that perpetrators as well as targets avoid acknowledging and reporting discrimination when it occurs because this undermines wellbeing and just-world beliefs. Even those reporting legitimate concerns tend to be seen as complainers.

What can be done?

Experimental evidence also reveals how these pitfalls can be avoided. **The simple act of acknowledging that discrimination may persist despite people's best intentions is a key step in this process.** Explicitly reassuring people that their individual and group features are valued – despite implicit indications that suggest otherwise, having men communicate that women might be disadvantaged instead of relying on women to complain about their treatment, and expressing the desire to learn from the identification of faulty procedures and to adapt inappropriate criteria, can all contribute to this.

Even if it is difficult, if not impossible, to prevent the emergence of biased judgements, research shows that individuals are more motivated to persist in their efforts and ambitions, more ready to communicate about problems they perceive, and actually perform better (e.g. on intelligence tests) when they are made aware that others in the organisation have confidence in their abilities, when advantaged group members express their readiness to call out unequal treatment, and when the organisation is open to suggestions to improve its procedures.

3.2. Eliminating bias and blind spots in research and university assessment

Stephen Curry, Imperial College London

*"Reputation is what men and women think of us; character is what God and the angels know of us."
Thomas Paine*

For any student looking to lay the foundations of a successful career, for any academic aiming to thrive as a researcher and teacher, or for any university seeking to prosper in a world that only seems to get more and more competitive, a good reputation is vital. The universities that belong to LERU are rightly proud of the reputations that they have built over many years for world-class research and teaching, and for their influence as important cultural institutions. But as Paine observes, reputations are based on the judgement of *others* and we know from the accumulating insights of psychology that our human capacity for evaluation is prey to perturbations of many kinds. We are hard-wired to make snap judgements based on limited information (Kahneman's 'system 1') (Kahneman, 2012); we suffer from confirmation biases that filter information to reinforce our preconceptions; and we are

buffeted by social pressures to conform with ingroups and to discount the opinions of outsiders (Schulz, 2010).

Within the university sector the challenge of making good judgements is perennial. Student assessments, hiring and promoting staff, and peer review of papers, books and grant applications are constant preoccupations for academics already busy with research, teaching and other university and scholarly duties. At the same time, the grip of university league tables on the minds of students means that university leaders can ill afford to ignore them, a pressure that is often transmitted to all staff. While the use of aggregated or averaged indicators such as journal impact factors, h-indices and university rankings may offer the prospect of simplifying some of these judgements, their broad strokes of information risk obscuring the particular qualities of an individual scholar, project or university.

When used in context and at the appropriate level of granularity, quantitative data have many valid uses in managing different processes within large organisations such as modern universities. They can provide a useful buttress against some of the biases that may creep into more subjective forms of assessment. But numbers can also assume degrees of objectivity that are not always warranted and may sometimes create scope for the operation of hidden biases.

In themselves, aggregating indicators are a form of *stereotyping*: papers are judged important because they are in a particular journal; researchers are judged worthy because of the reputation of their university. But they are also prey to the effects of stereotyping based on characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, age, disability or sexual orientation, that have long been known to perturb the judgement of individuals in ways that exacerbate inequality of opportunity.

As pointed out by Naomi Ellemers in the previous case study, reliance on stereotypes, which is often unconscious, leads us "to overemphasise differences between groups and underestimate variations within groups" (Ellemers, 2018). This is an insight of fundamental importance. The key to unlocking the full potential of diversity within our universities is to ensure that our culture and processes are focused on the individual, and capable of recognising the range, variation and particular qualities of the contributions that different people bring to the organisation.

To do that successfully, we need to identify the nodes of

evaluation that punctuate academic life, understand how they may be affected by bias, and take remedial action. In this section we focus on interlinked aspects of research assessment where the biases due to various forms of stereotyping have taken root: scholarly publication, hiring and promotion, grant funding, and university league tables, all of which can impact the experiences and career opportunities of researchers.

The impacts of publication bias on diversity among researchers have primarily been investigated with regard to gender. Much of the analysis is focused on STEM subjects where research papers, rather than books, are the primary output, and where coverage in citation databases is most comprehensive (Sugimoto & Larivière, 2018). The effects appear to be complex – reflecting the interactions between biases that operate throughout women’s research careers – and are subject to disciplinary variation. This makes it difficult to isolate cause and effect, though it is necessary to do so given the weight assigned to publication track records in decisions about hiring, promotion and funding, all of which are critical to career advancement.

It is important to benchmark comparative success in publication relative to the underlying demographics.

Figures for the U.S. for the first decade of the 21st century indicate that in science and engineering subjects women comprise around 39% of PhD graduates, 26% of tenure-track positions and 18% of full professors (West et al., 2013). These proportions are lower in the EU where (in 2012) women made up 35% of science and engineering PhD graduates, 23% of mid-career researchers and just 11% of professors (European Commission, 2012)¹⁵. These aggregate figures mask significant variations between fields; for example, in the EU there are more women professors in the humanities (28%) and social sciences (19%), than in medical subjects (18%) or engineering and technology (8%) – giving an overall figure of 20%.

The increases over the past several decades in the proportion of women researchers have been partly reflected in trends in academic publishing. As a recent study of about 1.8 million papers across many disciplines in JSTOR has shown the percentages of women as first authors (31%, up from 9% in the 1960s) to be comparable to the levels that one might expect from the numbers of women in early and

mid-career positions (West et al., 2013; Eigenfactor.org). Progress has been slower in the more senior, last-author positions where the proportion has risen from 15% to 23% since the 1960s. This remains lower than the total proportion of female authorships (27%) – possibly as a result of the reduced numbers of women attaining the status of principal investigator. However, again the gross figures disguise large differences between disciplines. The figures given above are broadly representative of trends in ecology and evolution and in molecular and cellular biology, two of the largest fields of scientific research. But in history and law, women occupy first- and last-author positions at levels corresponding to the proportion of total authorships that they have in these fields. Drawing lessons from these data therefore needs to be done at a disciplinary level. With that in mind it is worth noting that the portion of the JSTOR collection used for this analysis does not have significant numbers of papers in physics, chemistry or engineering.

That said, a global, cross-disciplinary analysis of over five million papers indexed in the Web of Science database and published between 2008 and 2012, reached broadly similar conclusions about authorship patterns (Larivière et al., 2013). It found that women have about a 30% share of authorships of research papers, though again this proportion exhibits significant regional and disciplinary differences. The study also showed that papers where women were the sole, first or last authors were cited less often (with relative citation rates about 5-10% lower than for papers where men held these authorship positions). In part, these differences appear to arise because women researchers are less likely to be involved in international collaborations, which generally attract higher citation counts (Adams & Gurney, 2018), than their male counterparts from the same country. The tendency of men to self-cite more – by about 50% (a pattern that has held steady for the last 50 years despite a significant increase in the numbers of women researchers) may also be a contributing factor (King et al., 2017).

With regard to acceptance rates, the picture is also complex. Localised studies found that women are not disadvantaged in submissions to the journal *Biological Conservation* (Primack et al., 2009) and actually have slightly higher acceptance rates than men as first authors in the twenty journals published by the American Geophysical Union (AGU) (61% compared to 57%) (Lerback & Hanson, 2017). While these findings are encouraging and counter some of the headline-grabbing instances of outright sexism in peer review (Bernstein, 2015), an intriguing recent analysis

15 The 2012 *She Figures* are used for contemporaneous comparability with the U.S. The most recent EU data, reported in the *She Figures* 2018 (European Commission, 2019), give somewhat improved figures, i.e. 39% of science and engineering PhD graduates, 28% of mid-career researchers and 15% of professors.

of the collaborative decision-making between reviewers and editors at eLife found that these gatekeepers favoured authors of the same gender (Murray et al., 2018). This effect was greatest when the team of reviewers was all male. By contrast, mixed-gender teams gave rise to more equitable outcomes.

Potential problems of reviewer bias may be exacerbated because women are consistently under-represented as reviewers of manuscripts submitted for publication compared to the demographics of the research community.

The AGU study mentioned above found that only 20% of their journals' reviewers were women, compared to a membership that is 28% female. Investigation of the possible causes suggested that this was primarily due to the fact that women received fewer invitations, in part because both male and female authors suggested disproportionately low numbers of women reviewers. Under-representation was exacerbated because women declined invitations to review at a slightly higher rate than men.

A similar pattern of under-representation of women reviewers has been reported by Nature. Just 16% of their reviewers were women in 2017 (up from 12% in 2011) (Nature Editorial, 2018). Nature has also acknowledged that women are still losing out in opportunities to write review and commentary (News and Views) articles, where female authorships stand at 19% and 26% respectively. Since such articles tend to be written by established researchers, these numbers in part reflect the reduced proportion of women at senior levels. But at the same time they may also be a contributing factor. The lack of opportunities to participate in activities that are often regarded as measures of esteem, such as writing commentary pieces, may be impeding the career progression of women academics.

The question of publication biases affecting ethnic minority scholars has been less well studied. In part this is because of the lack of data held by publishers with which to reliably identify author, reviewer or editor ethnicity.

One American study found that while black philosophy scholars wrote about 1.3% of articles in the top general philosophical journals, they only had 0.3% of authorships in the 15 highest-prestige titles (de Cruz, 2018). In contrast, an

intriguing bibliometrics analysis found that scientific research papers from more ethnically mixed groups of authors were more likely to be in higher-impact journal and gained 5-10% more citations (Freeman & Huang, 2014).

Although the latter finding represents evidence of the strength that may come from diversity, ethnic minority researchers remain significantly under-represented in the sciences (Oh et al., 2015) and across academia (AdvanceHE, 2018). This under-representation results from the cumulative effects of barriers such as socio-economic disadvantages and biases in student admissions to universities and the recruitment and promotion of staff. Some of these biases are rooted in the currency of reputation among elite institutions. A recent study found that elite institutions predominantly recruit academic staff from their own or other elite universities (Clauzet et al., 2015) – a further instance of the reliance on an aggregated stereotype that means that individual qualities can be overlooked and that serves to perpetuate under-representation of ethnic minorities in academia.

Ethnic minority scholars who overcome the barriers to entry face further potential discrimination at the level of funding.

A 2011 study by Ginther and colleagues found that Asian and African-American researchers were 4% and 13% less likely to be awarded NIH investigator-initiated research grants compared with white applicants (Ginther et al., 2011). More recent work has shown that the gap persists and has in fact endured for nearly 30 years (Oh et al., 2015). It has been suggested that this may be due to “an ‘inverse Matthew’ effect that is, residual cultural biases may have disproportionately adverse consequences on minority subgroups of our scientific community” (Tabak & Collins, 2011). Similar biases persist in the evaluation of funding applications by female researchers, though the effects appear to be mitigated if the evaluation processes are more focused on the research proposal than on the identity (and gender) of the researcher (Witteman et al., 2019). A similar rationale may underlie the recent finding of no gender or ethnic bias in the *initial* review of NIH grants, where reviewers are more preoccupied with digesting the huge amounts of information present in each application and preparing a justification of their scoring for subsequent panel discussions.

Publication bias is also impacted by nationality and prestige. As with gender bias and other types of bias, nationality and prestige bias undermine the “universalism” norm of science (Merton, 1973), which postulates that the

merit of research should be independent of the characteristics of the researcher and their institutional or national affiliation. However, the prevalence of international university rankings dominated by western and northern hemisphere institutions, and the persistent – albeit often unspoken – legacy of European colonialism and narratives development assistance for the global south, serve to perpetuate the negative effects of country-level stereotypes. For example, research is rated worse if from a low- and middle-income country (LMIC) than from a high-income country (HIC) (Harris et al., 2017), and only a small proportion of frontline health workers from HICs look to LMICs for research innovation (Harris et al., 2015). Compounding this issue is the fact that LMIC researchers tend to be given lower authorship positions and are under-represented on editorial boards (Cash-Gibson et al., 2018).

Tackling these challenges needs to be incorporated into ongoing efforts to reform research evaluation which are aiming to focus attention on the content of research rather than relying on heuristic indicators for quality such as journal or institutional names, or country of origin.

It is also important to recognise and exploit the synergism between education and research in search of mitigation. Actions can be taken around course admissions, such as advocating for the use of implicit association tests and other measures to reduce geographical bias. Some HIC institutions are exploring how to 'decolonise' their undergraduate and postgraduate curricula as a way of challenging preconceptions and broadening perspectives on research. This can be done by showcasing LMIC research and innovation, and by incorporating teaching of equality and diversity into the curriculum. Such moves may well serve to boost the inclusivity of the institution, increasing its appeal to under-represented groups. They can be enhanced further by encouraging fair collaboration and inclusion in research projects, publications and conferences, irrespective of geographic location or ethnicity.

Efforts to enlarge the scope of research assessment and to value the qualities that diversity – difference and individuality – brings to our universities have to contend with the homogenising power of university rankings (Hazelkorn, 2007).

This relatively new industry has grown enormously in influence over the past decade and poses a difficult dilemma

for all universities. Elite international institutions such as the members of LERU are under intense pressure to maintain their rankings, while universities that primarily serve regional interests nevertheless often come under pressure from national governments to break into the international rankings.

Universities are complex and diverse organisations. The attempt to capture their performance with a single or a few numbers risks diverting attention from important aspects of their mission to serve the needs of society (LERU, 2008; LERU, 2010), including their efforts to promote social mobility and justice. As currently configured, most university rankings rely heavily on reputational surveys and narrow measures of research prowess (e.g. citation impact) in their scoring mechanisms. This practice favours established, research-intensive institutions and reinforces some of the national and prestige biases noted above. Indeed, these effects are likely exacerbated by the very practice of *ranking*, which is driven by the reluctance of rankers to properly acknowledge both the significant uncertainties in their data and its incompleteness. Aggregate performance scores are commonly published to three significant figures but lack the accuracy to justify this. The error in this approach is compounded by the arbitrary weightings given to the different categories of performance and the absence of good quantitative indicators for important features of universities such as educational quality, staff diversity and wellbeing, pay equality or societal impact (Woolston, 2015). While we are beginning to see some changes in the ranking systems, such as the incorporation of university contributions to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (Bothwell, 2018), this practice has yet to become widespread and does not address the fundamental problems mentioned above.

University leaders are well aware of the limitations of league tables but find it all but impossible to ignore the influence of rankings in the marketplace for students and staff. Their power may also tempt university leaders to fall back on stereotypical markers of achievement which, as we have seen, stymie efforts to embrace the vigour of diversity. This is a systemic issue that ultimately requires systemic action. An individual institution might summon the courage to plot its own course by withdrawing from university rankings and setting out a mission statement that embraces a more holistic vision of university purpose and performance. But it will take an enormous risk in doing so. **A bolder, yet more pragmatic way forward would be for the leaders of LERU universities to engage with other elite universities around the world and, through a united front, seek to drive overdue reform of university performance measurement.** Some ranking organisations take a disaggregated, multidimensional approach, which does not impose an aggregate measure of performance and

focuses instead on the different aspects of university activities. Such an approach may offer a way forward since it allows institutions to focus on the activities that matter most to them, although other issues remain¹⁶.

Recommended actions

Biases and blind spots in research and university assessment evidently interact in complex ways that need to be understood if effective action is to be taken. Causes and effects have to be disentangled with care.

While it is encouraging that the numbers of first authorships have risen to broadly reflect the population of women at early- and mid-career stages, the effects of the leaky pipeline are still apparent in the lack of last-author positions and in the low level of participation in both peer review and in the broader evaluation of research through commentary and review articles. These deficits reduce the visibility of women in the research community, likely feed into funding and hiring decisions, and may well send discouraging signals about the possibility of career advancement to younger women researchers. Similar concerns impact researchers from other under-represented groups.

Nevertheless, emerging evidence suggests that measures can be taken by various stakeholders to counter the effects of bias in various forms of research assessment.

These stakeholders include journal publishers, funding organisations and universities. Although universities have little or no control of the activities of publishers or funders, their staff often have influential positions as editors, members of editorial boards and reviewers, through which pressure for reform can be brought to bear.

- Given the fragmentary nature of the current data on key activities in scholarly publishing (authorship, reviewing activities, citation rates, invitations to write reviews or commentary) and the importance of analysing these data at appropriately granular levels (job level, gender, ethnicity (where possible), discipline, country of origin of the work), **we would recommend that publishers gather and publish these data for authors, reviewers**

and editors, and formulate an action plan to address any imbalances that are revealed.

- **We recommend that funders gather and publish similar data on applicants and reviewers** to check for biases and to guide remedial action.
- Similarly, **conference organisers should be more proactive in identifying qualified speakers and panellists from under-represented groups.** Participation in conferences should also be supported by enhanced support for child-care which still falls disproportionately to women. These opportunities should interact synergistically by enabling under-represented researchers to become better known within their fields, leading to invitations to speak, to review and to participate in more international collaborations. **Universities should develop policies to set out what constitutes best practice in this regard** for conferences hosted on their campuses and/or organised by members of their staff.
- Within universities, **all staff involved in evaluation (e.g. hiring, promotion, funding decisions) should receive training to make them fully conversant with the effects of bias in publishing and funding decisions (LERU, 2018), in citation and self-citation patterns and the reduced capacity of those with caring responsibilities to forge high-value international collaborations.** Targeted interventions should also be considered since these have been shown to have a positive effect on hiring decisions (Carnes et al., 2015).

3.3. Embedding inclusive research and innovation across the university

Simone Buitendijk, Imperial College London

LERU universities strive to create new knowledge which will serve to address the grand challenges facing our world, such as climate change, poverty and threats to public health. They train students through their research-led curricula in becoming the leaders and global citizens of tomorrow, who can change the world through evidence-based knowledge and skills they have gained while at university. Yet, the global challenges and many other societally relevant issues cannot be optimally addressed unless our research, innovations and research-led curricula are fully inclusive. Until we have reached that point, any research endeavour will only serve a portion of society.

16 See for example <http://occamstypewriter.org/scurry/2019/05/20/unsustainable-goal-university-ranking/>, as well as LERU (2010).

Inclusion and diversity in research and innovation ensure that the research itself and the research-led teaching that is being delivered, are geared towards equitably benefiting all members of the population at large.

Through a narrowly focused or limited research design, the research questions asked or the outcomes to be implemented may primarily apply to men, ignore cultural minority groups, or bear less relevance to the majority of the populations in the Global South. Such research may inadvertently benefit far fewer people than possible.

Carrying out inclusive research involves consciously contemplating whether aspects such as race, sex, gender, sexual orientation, age, ability, social and cultural background may be relevant. If these elements are important, they should be considered at every stage of the research process: setting research priorities, making funding decisions, establishing project objectives, developing methodologies, gathering and analysing data, evaluating and implementing results, developing patents, transferring ideas to market and drafting policies. Clearly, there are some research questions which do not have such a dimension, for example in the fields of theoretical mathematics or astrophysics. However, in many disciplines, especially those that have a more applied dimension, there is a need to think about inclusion and to ensure the research benefits apply to as large a group as possible.

The majority of the work in inclusive research and innovation has been focused on sex and gender as important variables to take into account.

Sex is defined as a biological factor related to genetic and reproductive characteristics, while gender is defined as a behavioural factor related to societal and cultural roles. Sex and gender may be completely separate factors or may overlap in their effect on outcomes of research. For instance, women have genetically and hormonally different risks compared to men with respect to cardiovascular disease. However, their mortality from heart disease is also influenced by their own health-care seeking behaviours, by different access to care and by the clinical behaviours of health care providers that are influenced by patients' gender. Those sex and gender differences can- separately and especially when they play out in combination- result in worse health

outcomes for women than for men (see example 2 below for more detail). Another example of the importance of studying sex and gender is the risk of heart failure from diabetes type 1, which is 47% larger in women than in men as shown in a recent multi-country meta-analysis (Ohkuma, 2019). The authors speculate that one of the culprits is the increased duration of pre-diabetes in women resulting from gender roles, power imbalances and limited access to health care. This disproportionately amplifies the impact of diabetes on heart failure in women (George Institute for Global Health, 2019).

Many examples of the need for taking sex and/or gender into account in research can be drawn from the field of medicine.

A recent bibliometric study of more than 11.5 million papers showed that sex- and gender-related reporting in clinical medicine and in public health research is still not standard, although it increased from 59% to 67% and from 36% to 69% in the last 30 years, respectively. However, in spite of the fact that sex-based differences at the genetic, cellular, biochemical and physiological levels influence many human diseases, only 31% of biomedical papers report sex-related outcomes (Sugimoto, 2019).

The EC-funded 'Gendered Innovations' project carried out by Stanford University has led to the designation in the Horizon 2020 EU research funding project of over 130 subfields which can potentially benefit from including sex and gender in analysis. These fields range from computer hardware and architecture to nanotechnology, oceanography, geosciences, organic chemistry, aeronautics, space medicine, biodiversity, ecology, and biophysics, among others. Thus, it is crucially important to ensure that these aspects are included at all stages of the research process, before they can be ruled out as insignificant; failure to do so risks excluding significant subsections of society, and most commonly these are non-male, non-white groups.

Recent literature has pointed to multiple examples in which the systematic failure to include sex, gender, ethnicity and other characteristics in research and innovation has been to the detriment of female or non-dominant groups. Examples, as highlighted in LERU (2015), include:

Example 1:**Female and pregnant crash test dummies lead to better vehicle safety standards (Gendered Innovations Project)**

Although crash test dummies were developed as early as 1949, female crash test dummies only appeared in the late 1960s and pregnant test dummies did not become a research priority until the 1990s.

Conventional seatbelts do not fit pregnant women properly, and motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of foetal death related to maternal trauma. Today, state-of-the-art virtual pregnant crash test dummies, including a 36-week foetus (developed by Volvo, for example), allow researchers to model the effects of high-speed impact on the womb, placenta, and foetus.

Analysing sex has led to the development of pregnant crash dummies and computer simulations. Ultimately, it has given rise to more inclusive standards for crash test dummies and greater vehicle safety overall. However, safer seatbelts for pregnant women are still not legally mandated anywhere. Importantly, it should be remembered that from the start, devices should be engineered for safety in broad populations. Taking both women and men as the norm may expand the quality and creativity of scientific and technological innovation.

To read the full case study and for research references, go to: <https://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/case-studies/crash.html#tabs-2>

Example 2:**Heart disease in women**

Heart diseases, such as coronary artery disease, myocardial infarction and heart failure, often have different pathophysiologies and different manifestations in men and women. The differences depend on the differential effects of sex hormones and sex chromosomes as well as on gender differences in patients' life-style and health-seeking behaviours and differences in the management of the disease for female and male patients on the doctors' side.

Myocardial infarction (MI) has long been believed to be primarily a disease of men, to a large degree because research was primarily carried out in men. It has a slightly lower prevalence in women than men, but because women on average live longer than men, the numbers of men and women suffering from MI are roughly the same (Anand et al.,

2008). A large number of recent studies found that men and women present with different symptoms, which can influence diagnosis and treatment. Men are more likely to exhibit symptoms of chest pain, while women more frequently exhibit nausea, general weakness, sweating and a larger variety of symptoms (Regitz-Zagrosek, 2012). Men and their doctors are more likely to attribute chest pain to heart disease than women and their doctors are to make this diagnosis from the same symptoms. As a result, the so-called door-to-needle time in women who are admitted and subsequently diagnosed is significantly longer than for men (Dey et al., 2009).

An additional complicating factor is that MI is traditionally often diagnosed by angiogramme, showing obstructed arteries. Studies have found that women with an MI, even when they exhibit chest pain, more often than men do not have closed-off arteries and do not show abnormalities on the scan. In women, ischaemic heart disease rather than obstructive disease may better describe the underlying issue (Shaw et al., 2009). As a result, many women with MI have been and still are being under- or mis-diagnosed and under- or mis-treated.

Research in the last decade has shown that women suffer from MI on average ten years later than men, are more likely than men to report emotional rather than physical stress as the trigger and more often than men have a single affected artery instead of multiple affected arteries (Regitz-Zagrosek, 2012). Women are less likely to receive thrombolytic therapy, aspirin and beta-blockers when suffering from an acute MI. Mortality after MI is higher for women than for men, especially in younger age (Rosengren et al., 2001; Vaccarino et al., 2002; Vaccarino et al., 1999). The recent significant decrease in mortality due to better recognition and treatment has occurred primarily in men, not women (Lundblad et al., 2008; Vaccarino, 2005).

A recent publication argues that sex disaggregation should be the norm in cardiovascular disease research, for both humanitarian and clinical reasons. It describes how to design and analyse sex comparisons, including ways of reducing bias and increasing efficiency. It presents methodologies both in the context of analysing individual participant data from a single study and in a meta-analysis of sex-specific summary data (Woodward, 2019).

To read the full case study and for research references, go to: <https://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/case-studies/heart.html>

Example 3:

Artificial intelligence and data science

A growing body of evidence demonstrates the need to pay due attention in artificial intelligence (AI) knowledge production to a range of characteristics such as sex and gender, skin colour, ethnicity and geodiversity. Schiebinger and Zou (2018) highlight for instance the problematic effects of biased AI systems, noting that “when Google Translate converts news articles written in Spanish into English, phrases referring to women often become ‘he said’ or ‘he wrote’”. In addition, they mention that software designed to warn people using certain cameras when the person they are photographing seems to be blinking, tends to interpret Asians as always blinking. Word embedding, a popular algorithm used to process and analyse large amounts of natural-language data, characterises European American names as pleasant and African American ones as unpleasant. They argue AI algorithms researchers must ensure datasets are bias-free and inclusive. The growing influence and use of AI means that existing biases built into the data risk yielding ever-increasing negative and discriminatory effects.

Other examples

A recent article (Ni Loideain & Adams, 2019) points out **the problematic nature of the almost exclusively female-gendered Virtual Personal Assistants (VPAs)** such as Alexa, Siri and Cortana, which may inadvertently reproduce normative assumptions about the role of women as subservient and secondary to men. The authors explore the potential and scope of the EU Data Protection Law to consider and address the adverse societal impact of products such as exclusively female VPAs.

Research in the area of Automatic Gender Recognition (AGR) in Human Computer Interaction (HCI) shows that **design processes often use strict binary definitions of gender that yield outcomes limiting the usefulness of the products for gender-nonconforming people.** A recent study (Keyes, 2018) demonstrates that AGR frequently excludes and misgenders transgender people.

Bias against research from low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) and the Global South can lead to limited impact of highly relevant research (Harris, 2017) on globally important topics. It is a pervasive issue which may further result in the research-led curriculum being less inclusive and diverse (for more detail see the example from Imperial College London in part IV of this paper). Students at research-intensive universities in the U.K., the U.S. and

on the African continent have begun to demand a change in narratives, reading lists and course content, to avoid inherently favouring certain perspectives over others. The issue is relevant in social sciences and humanities, but equally so in STEM fields, particularly in the more applied STEM sciences. There is growing evidence to suggest that building more diverse and inclusive research groups may support an inclusive approach to research and innovation and to more diversity in the research-led curriculum.

Research groups with a diverse membership may bring different perspectives and experience to the research design. Research programmes that cover a range of perspectives will likely be more attractive to a diverse body of researchers.

The large bibliometric biomedical study mentioned above (Sugimoto, 2019) showed that papers with female-first and -last authorship were more likely to report sex in their study results. Nielsen and Bloch (Nature Human Behaviour, 2018) showed similar results in an analysis of medical studies which reported sex and gender separately, namely that papers with female-first authors were more likely to show research findings that took sex and/or gender into account. This is an area which requires further analysis and study, to look at other factors than the gender diversity of the research group and to understand the policy implications of the relationship between group composition and knowledge production.

Inclusive research and innovation in the curriculum

Inclusive research and innovation can and should lead to inclusive teaching and learning. At research-intensive universities, the teaching is research-led and the content of the curriculum will be determined by the research that is being carried out at the university. If inclusive research and innovation become a natural part of the taught curriculum and of student projects, students will learn from and contribute to research that is relevant to a wider population. They will, in turn, become more sensitive to the need for design and implementation of research for non-norm groups.

Students from under-represented or non-traditional backgrounds will be more in tune with and interested in the taught materials if these are inclusive and diverse and reflect author diversity in, for instance, gender, race and geographical affiliation. They will feel more connected to what they learn and will be able to contribute more effectively to their own learning and to the group process. Students from majority backgrounds will learn to think beyond more narrowly

defined definitions of relevance when their reading materials reflect a wider range of perspectives and populations.

Research-intensive universities should, as part of a broader agenda that includes actions to improve access for students of all backgrounds, make their curriculum inclusive through incorporating inclusive research and innovation wherever possible and appropriate.

Call to action

LERU universities have an opportunity to lead by example in making inclusive research and innovation the standard for all disciplines where human characteristics are relevant. In the LERU (2015) advice paper *Gendered research and innovation: integrating sex and gender analysis into the research process*, the discussion about the need for inclusive research was focused on sex and gender. Extrapolating from the conclusions and recommendations in that paper to other characteristics such as race, cultural background and LGBT+, we propose that **universities should in their EDI efforts not just focus on addressing the numbers of under-represented groups and changing the university culture, but also on taking actions to produce a different type of knowledge. They should take the lead in stimulating the integration of inclusive and diverse research production in their own research strategy and subsequently in government policies and strategies, funding programmes and journal policies.** Making the results of research equally applicable to under-represented groups will result in more responsible research and innovation to the benefit of society at large and will result in better inclusion of minority students and minority perspectives in the classroom.

3.4. Recognising the less visible characteristics of EDI

*Jojanneke van der Toorn,
Universiteit Leiden and Utrecht University*

Gender and ethnicity bias in academia are well documented. The fact that both identities are (mostly) readily visible enables easy stereotyping and implicit or explicit discrimination. Other minority characteristics such as sexual orientation, social class or invisible disabilities may not be so easily noticed. They could still, however, constitute a problem for the minority group involved if the implicit norm behaviour can work as a mechanism for exclusion. LGBT+ people may find it difficult to 'come out' and explain their personal and

living circumstances if colleagues implicitly assume they are adhering to the heterosexual norm. Likewise, students who are the first in their family to go to university may find the unwritten rules and the social conventions alienating. Students and staff with an invisible disability may also face challenges in feeling included in the group. A sense of inclusion (i.e. feeling that one belongs and can be oneself) influences agency and performance. In this section, we discuss how 'invisible' characteristics that are outside the norm may get in the way of students' and staff's success in highly competitive university environments, and how a climate for inclusion is key to buffering these effects.

How do invisible characteristics that are outside of the norm get in the way of students' and staff's success in universities?

Invisible social identities are common in organisations but are often overlooked in diversity management practices (Clair, Beatty, & MacLean, 2005). Diversity and inclusion initiatives tend to focus on relatively visible social identities such as age, gender and ethnicity; less attention is paid to relatively invisible social identities such as based on religion, illness, and sexual orientation or gender identity.

Research on particular types of invisible social identities within the literature on race, on sexual orientation, on chronic illness, and on disabilities has shown that individuals with stigmatising invisible social identities experience their workplace interactions differently than individuals with visible differences (Clair et al., 2005).

For example, individuals with invisible social identities are constantly faced with a choice between revealing versus concealing their social identity. Concealing devalued personal information may help in avoiding potential negative treatment and discrimination (e.g., Croteau, 1996) but has also been shown to have important emotional costs, such as anxiety and depression, and to undermine wellbeing (Barreto, Ellemers, & Banal, 2006; Newheiser, Barreto, & Tiemersma, 2017). Concealing may interfere with one's need to be one's authentic self (Creed & Scully, 2000; Moorhead, 1999; Reimann, 2001), which is an important dimension of a sense of social inclusion (the other dimension being a sense of belonging; Jansen, Otten, van der Zee, & Jans, 2014). People need to feel that they belong *and* that they can be themselves at school and work.

In recent research, Şahin and colleagues (2019) found that

employees' perceived invisible (but not visible) dissimilarity to others at work negatively predicted their sense of inclusion and, consequently, their wellbeing and work-related motivation. When employees indicated feeling invisibly dissimilar to most of their colleagues (e.g. in terms of their preferences and beliefs), they were significantly less likely to feel that they belonged and that they could be themselves at work.

Inclusion, in turn, predicted higher job satisfaction, lower work-related stress, and lower turnover intentions. This research suggests that in developing and implementing diversity policies, organisations should shift from a one-sided focus on surface-level differences between employees to also integrating deep-level differences in their diversity management strategies.

The importance of a sense of social inclusion for performance is demonstrated by the research of Jansen and colleagues (2014). In a sample of first-year psychology students they found that feeling included positively affected students' subjective sense of creativity and group performance.

The benefits of a climate for inclusion

The research by Şahin and colleagues showed, furthermore, that the negative effects of feeling invisibly dissimilar were offset if employees perceived a positive climate for inclusion in their organisation. A climate of inclusion means that in a team or organisation, employees are treated fairly, that differences are valued, and that everyone is involved in decision making (Nishi, 2013). Such a climate has positive consequences for the organisation, both in terms of the effectiveness of teams (Nishii, 2013; Hofhuis, Van der Zee, & Otten, 2012) and for the wellbeing and engagement among individual employees (e.g. Şahin et al., 2019). Interestingly, in the research by Şahin et al. (2019), even employees without an invisible dissimilarity benefited from such a climate in the sense that they felt more included in the organisation.

Thus, a climate for inclusion is beneficial to both majority and minority members. In addition, research has shown that work teams with an inclusive work climate experience fewer conflicts and lower attrition (Hofhuis et al, 2012; Nishii, 2013).

How can an inclusive climate be achieved?

Universities should create a climate for inclusion in which those who are visibly and invisibly different from others can belong and be themselves. They can do so by ensuring that different groups in the organisation are treated fairly, by creating opportunities for students and employees to share their whole selves, and by implementing mechanisms for increasing inclusion in decision making (Nishii, 2013; Nishii & Rich, 2014). **Ensuring fair treatment requires an assessment of equal access and of the evaluation and reward structures present in the university.** For example, universities may monitor whether different groups of employees enjoy the same benefits and chances for promotion, and determine whether assessment techniques are culturally unbiased.

Networks

An example of concrete promising initiatives aimed at improving the academic context for LGBT+ students are the so-called "Gay Straight Alliances" (GSA; sometimes also referred to as "Gender Sexuality Alliance"; see e.g., www.gsanetwork.org). These student-run clubs are aimed at creating a safe space where majority and minority students can meet each other, socialise, and work together in reducing sexual orientation and gender identity prejudice in the school. Several studies indicate positive effects for LGBT+ youth of having a GSA at their school (Heck, Fientje, & Cochran, 2011; Toomey, McGuire, & Russell, 2012; Walls, Kane, & Wisneki, 2010). For example, the presence of GSAs has been shown to correlate with more positive school experiences among sexual minority youth (Walls et al., 2010), and it didn't matter if they were active members or not. In addition, being involved as allies was experienced as rewarding by heterosexual students (Rostosky, Black, Riggle, & Rosenkrantz, 2015), suggesting that GSAs not only have benefits for minority but also for majority members. Though not directly examined, these benefits may extend to the pride networks for students and employees that can be found in universities. According to a review by Cramwinckel, Scheepers and Van der Toorn (2018), **particularly promising interventions to reduce sexual orientation and gender identity prejudice are those aimed at evoking empathy and perspective taking and those aimed at developing alliances between minority and majority members.**

Leadership

Much research stresses the importance of supervisors in enhancing inclusion. A transformational leadership style that balances attending to individual growth with inspiring the collective endeavours of the group has been shown to contribute to an inclusive organisational culture (Ashikali & Groeneveld, 2015).

Brimhall and colleagues (2017) demonstrated the importance of improving leadership interactions with employees to increase workplace inclusion. In addition, inclusive leadership which emphasises employees' needs and expectations, has been shown to relate to greater creative task involvement, greater work engagement, and more innovative work performance (Carmeli, Reiter-Palmon, & Ziv, 2010; Choi, Tran, & Park, 2015; Javed, Naqvi, Khan, Arjoon, & Tayyeb, 2017).

Diversity training

The evidence as to the effectiveness of diversity training is mixed. In some instances, diversity training has backfired by reinforcing stereotypes and prejudice among students (e.g. Legault et al., 2011; Robb & Doverspike, 2001). But there is also evidence that diversity training can be effective, for example in reducing gender and racial bias among students and educators, by enhancing multicultural skills among students, and by increasing the hiring of female faculty in STEM departments (Rudman, Ashmore, & Gary, 2001; Carnes, et al., 2015; Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, & Montoya, 2006; Moss-Racusin, Van der Toorn, Dovidio, Brescoll, Graham, & Handelsman, 2016; Devine, Forscher, Austin, & Cox, 2012). A meta-analysis of 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation indicated that **the positive effects of diversity training were greater when training was complemented by other diversity initiatives, when it was targeted to both awareness and skills development, and when it was conducted over a significant period of time** (Bezrukova, Spell, Perry & Jehn, 2016). Moss-Racusin and colleagues provide a scientific approach to the design, assessment and implementation of diversity interventions (Moss-Racusin, Van der Toorn, Dovidio, Brescoll, Graham, & Handelsman, 2014).

Policy support among minorities and majorities

For universities to be successful in implementing and executing diversity management practices so that a climate for inclusion can be created, support among students and staff is crucial. Because majority members tend to be more resistant to diversity policy than minority members (Wolsko, Park, &

Judd, 2006), it is especially important to secure their support. This can be done by **explicitly including the majority group in the organisation's diversity approach** (Jansen, Otten, & van der Zee, 2015), for example by addressing the benefits of diversity management for all employees through the university's communications regarding its motivations and vision for diversity and inclusion (e.g. in their mission statement).

3.5. Intersectionality as a framework to understand the value and complexity of diversity

Isabel Hoving, Universiteit Leiden

Intersectionality is an analytical framework that explains how different aspects of bias and discrimination may overlap and further disadvantage marginalised groups.

It may help universities to better understand the structures that raise multiple barriers to access and to success for minority and under-represented groups. Specifically, **intersectionality considers as intertwined the various characteristics of minority groups, rather than looking at them in isolation**, for instance when considering the disadvantages that women of colour have compared to white men. This framing can be useful in different ways, for example, by showing that an individual who belongs to more than one minority group will simultaneously be subject to multiple oppressive mechanisms and therefore faces multiple barriers. Intersectionality also helps us to recognise the value and the complexity of diversity; that an individual does not simply represent one social stratification but brings a unique perspective, as a result of the interplay of their identity, personality and the social conditions of their life experience.

By highlighting the multi-faceted nature of diversity, the intersectionality framework helps to explain why singly-targeted interventions for narrowly defined groups are unlikely to be effective and why the interconnected, system-wide approach suggested in this paper is the best way forward.

Intersectionality concerns all dimensions of identity and exclusion, even as it acknowledges the specificity of all the different forms of exclusion. The concept was coined three decades ago, by scholar Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw in 1989. In the 1990s, Crenshaw, alongside African American, Asian, Caribbean and other black or postcolonial women scholars, presented her pioneering research on the ways in which race is defined differently for women than for men. Black female identities are understood as very different from

black male identities, and gender means something different for white and black women. Identities are always specific, situated, and intersectional (Crenshaw). This approach produced important insights in the multiple forms of exclusion experienced by women of colour that are of course relevant to their experiences in higher education. The intersectional approach also explores the link between exclusion based on gender and sexual diversity, between exclusion based on sexual diversity and health (physical and mental), between age and health, socio-economic background and race, etc.

How can we use intersectionality to create an inclusive community? An example

More and more examples of how to adopt an intersectional approach in practice are becoming available. One good example of an intersectional approach is the “core value” discussion at Lund University (Brage & Lövkrona, 2016). The project includes, among others, an anti-discrimination workshop using inclusive educational methods and a norm-critical approach. The workshop (“See the Human Beyond”) is intersectional, and discusses the intertwining of different forms of discrimination¹⁷. The workshop resulted in the design and implementation of an effective and context-specific intervention.

This intervention works because it relates inclusion and non-discrimination to the university’s core values, which enlarges internal discussions about fundamental principles and values. Thus, it addresses both the individual and the institutional level, thereby facilitating real cultural change, not just individual awareness raising.

An intersectional approach can be useful on an institutional level in other ways. It may, for example, help to explore the extent to which the concept of academic merit disadvantages not only women in general, but also women – and men – from minority ethnic groups and disadvantaged socio-economic groups. While merit is often seen as a criterion that can be objectively assessed, it reflects the values of a certain (predominantly white, male, upper middle-class) dominant group, which also impact race-, gender- and culture-specific notions of worth (Krefting, 2003). This might explain why the academic system of meritocracy may actually exacerbate inequality between people from many different groups (Brage & Lövkrona, 2016; Gillborn & Youdell, 2019).

Is an intersectional approach an effective way to address ethnic and racial inequality?

University leaders and policymakers are likely well aware that race is a sensitive issue, but may at the same time feel ill-equipped to develop initiatives to effectively also address ethnic minority experiences of inequality. They may prefer instead to focus on interventions relating to socio-economic differences. However, this risks missing the target. For example, white students from lower socio-economic class perform better than students of colour from the same class (Carnevale & Strohl, 2010, 2013, quoted in Bensimon, 2017: 6; Ching, 2013). Recent research on the U.S. context offers a convincing argument why a focus on socio-economic equity will not be helpful to bring racial equity any closer (Ching, 2013). All forms of inequality demand their own specific, well-informed approach.

A general policy to counter all forms of discrimination will therefore not lead to the desired results, as it leaves out groups that are often the most vulnerable. While racial bias and gender bias overlap, they also have their own history and context, which need to be addressed separately *and* together. Bias against people from African descent, for example, has a very specific history rooted in colonisation and slavery, and in the scientific racism of the 19th and 20th centuries, including the enduring myth of racial differences in intelligence. Through the years, this has materialised in various forms of racial inequality and segregation that are still observable today. The history of oppression, exploitation and exclusion has for example led to the “education debt,” the tenacious racial gap in study success (Ladson Billings, 2006), which appears to be highly resistant to interventions. The need for specific attention to be paid to racist bias also becomes apparent in the pay gap between Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) and white staff members in Great Britain. The pay gap between female and male academics was 10.5% in 2015-2016. Thanks to increasing attention to the topic, the gap is diminishing, though very slowly. The pay gap between academic staff with a BME background and white academic staff, however, is at least as worrying. The gap was 12.6% (black staff) and 10.4% (Asian staff) in 2015-2016.

But while the gender pay gap has been on the agenda for some time now, attention to the “racialised pay structure” in academia is only now emerging¹⁸.

17 See also the section on Lund University in Part IV of this paper.

18 Times Higher Education Pay Survey 2017 (4 May). Data taken from <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/>.

Institutional racial bias may play a role here. There has been ample research on the question whether school tests are racially or culturally biased (Banks & McGee Banks, 2010, 381-82), or on the bias in the curricula (Apple, 2001), for example, but the issue goes deeper¹⁹. Definitions of worth are not only gendered, but also shaped by specific cultural repertoires, tied to national and, ethnic contexts, and to social position. The criteria of evaluation applied in higher education reflect the specific norms of dominant groups. During the last few decades, these norms and criteria have been increasingly informed by neoliberal discourse. Competitiveness, individualism and economic success are valued; but at the same time, the stigmatisation of lower income groups has grown. This has led to the widening of ethno-racial boundaries (Lamont, 2017, 14-21). In this context, implicit racist bias (e.g. concerning the presumed lack of ambition of certain ethnic groups) can easily affect the evaluation of the worth of BME students and staff.

An additional problem in dealing with racial inequality is the lack of data, as is also observed by Stephen Curry in the case study above. While data on black and minority ethnic *students'* study success and the tenacious gap with that of white students is widely available, **many European nations lack adequate data on the numbers and careers of BME staff. Often, the law does not allow for registration.** The data that is available points at a structural scarcity of BME staff; the gap is especially visible in Europe's present-day superdiverse urban environments (Vertovec, 2007; Crul, Schneider & Lelie, 2013). Stephen Curry (cf. above) refers to data that suggests ethnic and racial bias in the assessment of publications, and persistent bias in funding.

For all these reasons, racial inequality is often seen to be one of the most difficult forms of academic inequality to address and to remedy. An intersectional approach is necessary to address these complex and sensitive issues, but it can only succeed when it has acquired a profound insight in the body of research on race inequality.

Two intersectional approaches to racial inequality

Research on equity and inclusion shares a broad consensus

that 'colour-blindness' does not help increase racial equality (Roosevelt Thomas, 1991; Ely & Thomas, 1996). Nor does a policy that merely focuses on addressing cultural differences, or the deficit model²⁰. Moreover, if policymakers assume racial inequalities result from individual bias only, their interventions will be less effective. Institutional and structural racism should be addressed too.

Presently, **we can discern two different intersectional approaches to racial and ethnic inequality in higher education.** The first builds on the discourses of diversity and inclusion, and engages institutions and their leadership by relating diversity to quality and excellence, through recognising the creative vigour that comes from enabling people with different perspectives and capabilities to work together. Its aim is **"inclusive excellence"** (Williams, 2013). The second approach, inspired by **critical race theory**, departs from the argument that the association of diversity with excellence may well obscure racial inequality and keep power relations intact. It argues that diversity and inclusion policies are often merely used as a measure of institutional success, a front for policies that ultimately do little to challenge existing hierarchies (Ahmed, 2012).

What these intersectional approaches have in common is the insight that policies are dependent on the support of the leadership, and have to address the institution as a whole (i.e. comprehensive institutional interventions are essential). Both see cultural, ethnic and racial differences as positive assets²¹ and emphasise the need for collaboration and community. Both also acknowledge the need for better understanding of (racial) inequality. While the inclusive excellence approach has proven to be effective in Europe and the U.S., it has yet to bring full equity and inclusion, as critics of diversity policies have stated. In practice, diversity policies are prone to stagnation; and it appears to be very hard to close existing gaps. The critical race approach has the advantage of offering a deeper analysis of the causes of racial and ethnic inequality, as well as valuable tools to move forward.

How can an inclusive academic community, including racial and ethnic equity, be realised?

Research and practice suggest the following guidelines which might inform an intersectional approach that includes a specific focus on race and ethnicity:

¹⁹ The presence of racial bias within the academy has been amply documented, especially by black and minority ethnic staff and students (for example, see work listed in the reference section by Ahmed, Banks, Bensimon, Essed, Ouali, Puwar, Wekker, White, Wilder). Much research in this area stems from the US, and while much data is still missing for the European situation, the fact that racial bias is equally active in European institutions is well established (https://data.europa.eu/euodp/data/dataset/S1043_77_4_EBS393).

²⁰ A good example can be found in a review of the Spanish diversity policies in education (Odina, 2009).

²¹ This is not always the case in Europe; France's assimilationist stance, and its strict *laïcité*, is an example of the opposite position.

- Specific data on racial and ethnic inequality among faculty and staff is necessary (number of BME staff members, pay gap, career options, facilities, etc.), analysed by gender, etc.
- To be effective, it is not enough to observe there is an achievement gap between BME students and white students; one needs to know the disaggregated data about specific groups of students (in terms of gender, nationality, ethnic identity, sexual orientation, etc.), at departmental and institutional level.
- Diversity policies will benefit from an in-depth knowledge of the history of different forms of racism (antisemitism, islamophobia, anti-black racism, anti-Roma discrimination, etc.) and of their intersection with discrimination on the basis of gender, sexuality, disability etc.; this will explain how they have shaped the nature and context of contemporary racism (including the scholarship on white privilege, white fragility, disavowal, etc.).
- Diversity policies will benefit from insights into their specific national contexts, e.g. legislation, national history of policies towards ethnic minorities, and national history of racism.
- To analyse the exact causes of a specific inequality, it will help to have a good sense of the cultural context and specific ambitions and needs of the group in question. Too often, the minority groups are not engaged as partners in discussions about how to address inequality and promote inclusion.
- **An intersectional approach will be helpful to understand the causes of inequality: race and ethnic relations are specific to each social and cultural context, and are always intertwined with nationality, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic situation, health, religion, etc.**

Part IV Case studies and good practice from LERU universities

This last part of the paper provides case studies and good practice from LERU universities, including some exemplary successful campaigns and strategic measures that can inspire other actions. They were collected in 2018 and 2019, and are organised per university in order to give a cohesive picture of individual universities' actions on EDI.

University of Amsterdam (UvA)

Responsibilities and engagement of the university leadership

The UvA has appointed a Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) and all Faculties have a Faculty Diversity Officer. The role of the CDO is to stimulate the necessary cultural change and to function as a critical sparring partner for the Executive Board and the Deans of the Faculties.

<https://www.uva.nl/en/shared-content/studentensites/uva-studentensite/en/az/diversity/diversity.html>

Academic Diversity Programme (ADP) – Student-to-student mentoring

ADP is a mentoring programme centred around diversity. During the academic year, first-year students are supported by senior students. The programme strives to create a space in which students can develop their capacities to the fullest. Students are paired up with senior students who support them in the first phase of their academic studies.

ADP acknowledges the intersections between gender, culture, ethnicity, mental and physical health, socio-economic background and more. Thanks to this approach, a dialogue is stimulated which brings more depth and understanding to the conversation about diversity. ADP tries to challenge students to develop their full capacities and acknowledge their own diversities. This results in each student developing their own strength and succeeding in their study programme.

<https://student.uva.nl/en/content/az/diversity/initiatives-and-events/initiatives/academic-diversity-programme.html>

EduHub – Reaching out to pre-university pupils

The Faculty of Science, located in the eastern part of Amsterdam, is a very active Faculty regarding outreach to secondary and primary schools. The Faculty has the ambition to create a more equal gender balance in the student population of the bachelor and master programmes. Also, the Faculty strives to have a student body that reflects the national population. The education directors are painfully aware of the fact that success in the Dutch educational system is becoming more and more dependent on the socio-economic status of the parents.

To realise the ambitions for a more balanced and inclusive student population, the Faculty has submitted a plan, together with a private organisation for diversity (*Stichting Diversity*, originating from the Amsterdam University College (AUC), which has already built up experience in this respect). Central in the approach is to set up a programme for and by students that reaches out to the relevant groups, inspired by, amongst others, the UCLA AAP programme. The initiative is ambitious, with activities tailored to primary and secondary education, but is also aimed at improving inclusiveness at the university level.

<http://stichtingdiversity.nl/eduhub/>

Recruitment and selection of female scientist in the Faculty of Science

Wanting to increase the number of female scientists, the Faculty of Science started a third round of six specific fellowships for talented women, named after the ground-breaking crystallographer professor Carolina MacGillavry (1904-1993), an alumna of the University of Amsterdam. In the first two rounds a total of nine fellows were appointed.

<https://www.uva.nl/en/faculty/faculty-of-science/macgillavry-fellowship/macgillavry-fellowship.html>

University of Cambridge

“Breaking the Silence” - a case study on sexual misconduct, written by Miriam Lynn and Sarah d’Ambrumenil, University of Cambridge

This Collegiate University-wide initiative was instigated by students; in 2010 NUS had conducted research into the prevalence of sexual misconduct within universities and in 2014, the Cambridge University Students’ Union repeated that research at the University. Whilst this work and subsequent research has confirmed that sexual misconduct is more prevalent within the student population (students spend more time together and often live in close proximity to each other), when it came to taking action, the University took a community approach – a gender-neutral campaign, implementing clear and transparent policies and procedures targeting both students and staff.

The University had been researching and planning a response to this matter since 2014, in doing so it had engaged a number of external organisations including Cambridge Rape Crisis, Women’s Aid and the police. The issues that were identified included limited reporting of incidents by students and staff (informally and formally), low confidence in the existing reporting structures and a belief that any reporting process was opaque and would protect those in positions of power.

The initiative was split into three aspects:

Prevention

- *Consent and active bystander workshops for students*: a variety of workshops, which separately targeted new students (Students’ Union sessions), sports clubs (Good Lad) and student representatives/those with responsibility for student welfare (Intervention Initiative)
- *‘Where to Draw the Line’ workshop for staff (WDYDTL)*: workshop focussing on culture change, primarily delivered in departments and developed collaboratively by UCL, University of Manchester and Oxford University
- *Student-staff relationship policy*: a policy discouraging relationships between students and staff and requiring any relationships to be reported by the staff member to the Head of Department or HR
- *Training for staff on handling disclosures of sexual misconduct*: a two-hour session providing all College and University staff with knowledge and tools to be able to respond appropriately to a disclosure of sexual misconduct

Support

- *Appointment of a University Sexual Assault and Harassment Advisor*: full-time, permanent staff member who provides emotional and practical support to students who have experienced any form of sexual misconduct (or harassment)
- *Dignity at work contacts*: trained volunteers who provide confidential advice to those experiencing difficult working relationships, including discrimination, bullying or harassment, have witnessed discrimination, bullying or harassment or who have been accused of it
- *Wellbeing advocates*: a departmental contact who provides signposting and support for staff members
- *University Counselling Services*: university counselling for staff and students

Reporting

- *Anonymous reporting tool*: a mechanism for students, staff and visitors to report incidences of harassment and misconduct
- *Procedure for Student Harassment and Sexual Misconduct*: a process enabling students who have experienced any type of harassment by another student to reach an agreement with that student regarding limiting their interaction
- *Dignity at Work Policy*: sets out the University’s commitment to creating and maintaining a safe, welcoming, inclusive and diverse community which nurtures a healthy environment and culture of mutual respect and consideration, and explains what actions can be taken if its principles are not observed. Details reporting and investigation procedures
- *Student and staff disciplinary procedures*: formal procedures, potentially resulting in findings and disciplinary sanctions

A successful, multi-channel communications plan was key in effectively communicating all of these initiatives to internal and external stakeholders. Different communications were targeted at senior leaders within Colleges and Departments; internal audiences of students and staff; and external audiences, which were accessed more by students than the student-specific

communications. These initiatives were supported by the University's senior leadership team; the Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellors, as well as the Colleges. The Vice-Chancellor was clear in explaining that an increase in reporting was a measure of success and that every report would be taken seriously.

The University engaged student activists and staff in pastoral roles throughout the University and Colleges and provided a 'media kit' of images and narratives that could be adapted and shared to social media. Some student groups and Colleges ran their own 'breaking the silence' events and campaigns alongside the University. There were a number of high-profile external speakers, events involving specialist organisations and senior leaders.

The campaign was overseen by a number of senior committees but two groups, including student and staff representatives, undertook the majority of the preparatory work.

The Harassment Avoidance Working Group made recommendations in the following three areas relating to the avoidance of sexual misconduct between students and employees:

- a) fostering a zero-tolerance culture free from coercive behaviour, harassment and sexual misconduct;
- b) providing support and guidance to members of the University;
- c) handling allegations of harassment and sexual misconduct between students and employees.

The Student HEFCE Catalyst Group coordinated the projects partly funded by the HEFCE Catalyst Fund following calls for student projects relating to harassment and sexual misconduct. This Group was responsible for:

- a) planning and overseeing each of the student-focused initiatives;
- b) overseeing the evaluation of these initiatives and making recommendations regarding the continuation of these initiatives;
- c) reporting to HEFCE regarding the outcomes of the initiatives.

Outputs and lessons learned from the project

The Breaking the Silence initiative has been viewed internally and externally as a positive campaign that has brought attention to this area and has provided improvements in the prevention, support and reporting mechanisms²². The communications campaign generated more than 500 media articles, tweets reached five million accounts and the accompanying film series had 90,000 views on Facebook. The student cases reported to the University rose by 1000% in 18 months and in the same time period, the University received 350 anonymous reports of harassment and misconduct. Thousands of students received some sort of information on consent, with over 200 receiving training about how to safely intervene in situations involving harassment. Over 250 staff received training on responding appropriately to disclosures of sexual misconduct and 677 staff have received WDYDTL training. However, the purpose of this campaign is culture change – something which requires a continued effort over a long period of time and which requires constant reinforcement with the high turnover of students.

The Universities UK Task Force Report, published in 2016, provides a number of essential recommendations that led to the success of this campaign including senior leadership buy-in, creating an institution-wide approach, engaging with specialist organisations, and ensuring that both appropriate support and reporting mechanisms are in place before encouraging increases in reporting.

In addition to this information, the Collegiate University has taken forward the following lessons, many of which are well-known but not to be underestimated:

- involve all students and staff who wish to be involved – reach out to academics, student activists and representatives;
- ensure that policies are clear, consistent, transparent and understood by those with signposting responsibilities (for example, the Dignity at Work Contacts and Wellbeing Advocates have received disclosure training and Where to Draw the Line training);
- eye-catching posters remain a good way of catching people's attention;
- specialist organisations are generous with their time and knowledge (the University pays them for this);
- investigate ways of educating students and staff – identify local organisations that can provide specialist support to young

²² All relevant materials and information are collated at www.breakingthesilence.cam.ac.uk.

adults who display sexually harmful behaviour;

- encourage all students and staff to access support, inform them about reporting options and let them choose the right decision for them and try to give them as much control about what happens next;
- remove timeframes from reporting procedures, but acknowledge that the time taken to report may have an impact on the investigation and potential outcomes;
- anonymous reporting is very helpful for measuring institutional impact – prior to the Breaking the Silence campaign, 52% of anonymous reporters believed the University or College would not take action if they formally reported their experience; this has moved to 11% of anonymous reporters;
- keep improving communications and processes – the University has stopped offering an online student consent course (evaluation showed it was ineffective), but introduced a College Discrimination and Harassment Contact (CDHC) in each of the 31 Colleges, as students gave feedback that Colleges were providing inconsistent information about University policy and procedure – all CDHCs receive up-to-date information and briefings on University and sector policy.

There is still a long way to go before every student and every staff member will feel comfortable speaking out about sexual misconduct and harassment, whether witnessed or experienced by them. However, it is now clear what is expected of staff and students in terms of behaviour, the routes for seeking support, reporting behaviour and the potential outcomes.

By challenging pervasive myths and stereotypes and by providing briefings and information in safe and supportive environments by facilitators who are suitably trained and resourced, the community can develop a better understanding of sexual misconduct and harassment.

Trinity College Dublin

Responsibilities and engagement of the university leadership

The President & Provost of Trinity College Dublin takes an active role in the promotion and advancement of matters of equality, diversity and inclusion. He has personally commissioned or initiated several activities in this area.

In the context of recruitment and promotion, the President & Provost has commenced a pilot programme of implicit bias observers in Chair Professor appointments, to reduce the possible impact of bias on the appointment process. Alongside this, he has halted Chair processes because of insufficient women on the shortlist.

The President & Provost has personally undertaken implicit bias training twice during his tenure, and has commissioned training for the most frequent members of recruitment panels, including members of the senior management team such as the Vice-Provost / Chief Academic Officer and Faculty Deans, to ensure fair assessment of candidates in the recruitment process.

The President & Provost has commissioned reports and reviews to investigate key equality questions, including:

- a [2016 report](#) which considered the relative chance of male and female academics reaching the highest academic grade;
- a review of gender structures in the university to ensure the best possible position to drive strategic goals in this area; this is ongoing. Both an academic expert and a change management consultant have been engaged to lead the review.

Trinity College Dublin's institutional applications to the [Athena SWAN](#) programme are supported by the President & Provost, who drafts a personal letter of endorsement to open the application.

The Board of the University, chaired by the President & Provost, reviews [Annual Equality Monitoring Reports](#) which present a wide range of data on the full range of diversity grounds covered in Irish equality law, and which are then made publicly available.

Trinity has an [Equality Policy](#) setting out the University's commitment to non-discrimination for staff, students and visitors (last revised in 2016), as well as a [Diversity and Inclusion Strategy](#) (first published in 2017) which contains concrete actions to implement the College's goals for [Equality, Diversity and Inclusion](#) as set out in [Trinity's Strategic Plan 2014-2019](#).

University of Edinburgh

Responsibilities and engagement of the university leadership

Equality and inclusion has been the specific remit of a member of the University Senior Management Team since 2007 and the Principal himself is a visible champion for gender equality. He is only one of ten Vice-Chancellors to champion 'HeforShe', has written widely on gender equality, and since coming to Edinburgh has already chaired our International Women's Day lecture in March 2018.

Gender equality issues are regularly discussed at the University Court and Senate. Under the Principal's leadership, in November 2018, the University was successful in retaining its University's Athena SWAN Silver award, which recognises achievements in progressing gender equality in higher education. Edinburgh is the only institution in Scotland to hold this level of award.

Monitoring and communicating

In accordance with U.K. equality legislation the University publishes ambitious 'Equality Outcomes' every four years; these also serve as the University's overarching EDI Strategy. The University publishes a biennial progress report on these outcomes along with a further report on its approach to mainstreaming EDI across the institution. There is also a specific action plan for gender equality.

The University has shared its experiences and good practice in gender equality through the publication of a book 'EqualBITE: Gender equality in higher education'. The book collates academic research alongside gender equality 'recipes' gathered from our staff and students. These recipes share real-life experiences of gender challenges and opportunities, and their constructive responses.

"Don't Cross the Line" campaign on bullying and harassment

In January 2019 the University launched the 'Don't Cross the Line' campaign to call on staff and students to help the University tackle bullying and harassment, and raise awareness of the Dignity & Respect policy and the support available. The campaign uses posters and digital images, social media and online content to raise awareness of what bullying and harassment looks like, how the University views this behaviour, and how to seek help.

Alongside this, a web hub has created called 'Respect at Edinburgh' which collates all related information, policies, support and guidance, and the University has developed a training workshop to support staff to address bullying and harassment. This workshop has already been delivered to about 250 staff with extremely positive feedback. The campaign also provides a 'how to' guide for staff to champion Respect in their departments.

University of Freiburg

Responsibilities and engagement of the university leadership

The University of Freiburg established a top-down structure for gender and diversity already in 2008 (Gender and Diversity Office), complementing the bottom-up structures, which date back to the 1980s (Equal Opportunities Officer). Freiburg was thus one of the first German universities to broaden its understanding of equality, diversity and inclusion and to take on responsibility for these issues in a top-down way. In 2010, the Rector signed the German Diversity Charter to emphasise the University's commitment. In 2014, the rectorate installed a vice-rectorate for research integrity, gender and diversity.

A cultural change towards more diversity, internationalisation, interdisciplinarity and creativity is the key element of the University of Freiburg's excellence strategy, which was the foundation of the University's proposal in the Germany-wide university competition of the same name. Irrespective of the outcome of that competition, the university has taken first steps towards change and has created a spirit of enthusiasm and commitment which can and will be built on. Equality, diversity and inclusion are seen as transversal issues which are of relevance in every area of academic life and concern each and every member of the university. The University of Freiburg has integrated its diversity strategy in its strategic development planning. Every five years, the plan is being renewed and further developed with regard to all areas of academic life, including governance, personnel policy, research, teaching and learning, and infrastructure. In the course of the preparations of this plan, the rectorate visits every faculty and discusses, among others, equality, diversity and inclusion issues as part of individual strategy agreements between the rectorate and the single faculties. The strategic development plan for the 2019–2023 period is currently in the making.

In 2018, a new university-wide agreement on inclusion of people with disabilities and chronic diseases was made, promoting a paradigm shift from 'integration' to 'inclusion'.

The importance of speaking up

In 2015, the Rector spoke up against nationalism, discrimination and hate, and for open-mindedness, equality, diversity and inclusion in front of 20,000 participants in an anti-Pegida²³ demonstration in the city of Freiburg.

In 2016, the University Senate issued a public statement and press release for plurality and against xenophobia.

In 2017, the Rector and many other university members joined the Freiburg March for Science, the largest March for Science of any German city (with the exception of Berlin), where 2,500 people demonstrated for the freedom of teaching and research and emphasised the importance of science for democracy, plurality and open-mindedness.

Since 2013, the University has flown a rainbow flag on the rectorate building for one week every year, to demonstrate support for and solidarity with people of all gender identities and sexual orientations.

In 2015, the Vice-Rector for teaching and learning spoke words of welcome at the Christopher Street Day of the city of Freiburg.

Changing structures, processes and culture: raising awareness and organising trainings

The numerous diversity measures which the University has taken for three decades have contributed a great deal to becoming a more inclusive organisation. The University constantly develops and strives to implement equality, diversity and inclusion measures in all structures and processes. One exemplary step is the development of a toolkit on diversity in teaching and learning (see <http://www.diversity.uni-freiburg.de/Lehre>).

²³ Pegida is a German nationalist anti-Islam movement. The abbreviation stands for "Patriotische Europäer gegen die Islamisierung des Abendlandes", Engl. "Patriotic Europeans against the islamisation of the occident".

EDI trainings and workshops are offered on a regular basis by the Gender and Diversity Office and take place in different formats (e.g. in the continuing education programme, in academic teaching, in work outings etc.).

In 2014, the university leadership took part in an LGBTIQ workshop which aimed at raising awareness for LGBTIQ issues at the University. The workshop was designed exclusively for the rectorate and was part of a series of events on LGBTIQ targeting different groups at the University.

Since 2012, the University of Freiburg celebrates an annual diversity day. Drawing on the German General Act on Equal Treatment, there is one specific diversity issue every year. The diversity day aims at all members of the University, takes place in different locations and in different formats and is always inaugurated by dedicated words of welcome from the Rector and Vice-Rector for research integrity, gender and diversity. Products and results of the diversity days are distributed throughout and beyond the University, e.g. several videos (see especially <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VB1I5rK7Nw8&feature=youtu.be&list=PL0KNNSWJHMYQrZqaLpjHfIMAc23GgHs1w>).

In 2016, the Rector joined the inaugural panel of the annual convention of the German Federal Conference of Equal Opportunities Officers in Freiburg on "Sustainable equality politics".

University of Geneva

Equal opportunities matter

Equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) has been a priority for the rectorate of the University of Geneva since the establishment of the [Equal Opportunities Office](#) (EOO). Moreover, the Office reports directly to the Rector since 2017. The head of the EOO attends the weekly rectorate meetings and also has regular meetings with the Rector.

Every 8th of March, the EOO organises "The female professors' breakfast" with the Rector attending (discussion and network), conferences, artistic performances, collaboration with the [Geneva International Film Festival and Forum on Human Rights \(FIFDH\)](#), exhibition stands from students associations, activists and university libraries.

There is an Equal Opportunities commission in each of the nine faculties, composed of approximately six members representing academic staff and students. Their chairs attend the university Equality Commission meeting, which is held four times a year.

The EOO has implemented a mentoring programme, which aims to encourage young female researchers. There are currently four female professors in the programme that act as mentors.

Equal recruitment matters

The Equality Delegation, led by a Vice-Rector, consists of five full professors affiliated with different faculties (three men and two women). For the last 18 years, these equality experts have been part of all appointment committees at professor level. Their role is to guarantee that women and men's applications are equally treated and without gender bias. The booklet "[Extra-ordinaires](#)" collecting guidelines and observations of the different members was published in 2015.

The EOO translated and made available the video "[Recruiting without gender biases](#)". This video has been shown in different events organised with HR experts from universities and companies based in Geneva.

Gender matters

The Institute for Gender Studies (Faculty of Society Sciences) is active in delivering courses, as well as in creating the MOOC "[Genre : quels enjeux ? Violences, globalisation, biomédecine, sexualités](#)".

In 2016, the EOO together with the Institute for Gender Studies established the annual [Gender Award](#) to encourage student research on topics related to gender issues. Every year, the Gender Award is granted to six students (three at Bachelor and three at Master level) from all faculties. The members of the selection committee are junior and senior researchers representing almost all faculties.

Diversity matters

Since 2016, the EOO has been celebrating the [International Day against homophobia](#) (17 May) with a flashmob, artists, exhibition stands from students associations, activists and university libraries.

In line with this strong commitment, the Rector signed a [Diversity Charter](#) on 17 May 2018. The charter has triggered different actions such as a meeting on disability policies; a roundtable on the integration of people coming from different cultural backgrounds; the summer school "[Prejudice, discrimination and the diversity challenge](#)" (2018, 2019); the course "[Understanding and combatting the prejudice](#)"; the project [Sciences, sex, identity](#) (project promoting scientific and health literacy in adolescents and adults, including parents, teachers and health professionals); [continuum exhibition](#) from October 2018 to January 2019 (about LGBTIQ+ knowledge and narrative).

Inclusive language matters

The EOO encourages the UNIGE community to write in an inclusive way by providing writing support for official documents, delivering workshops and guidelines.

Sexism and harassment matter

In November 2016, [the study](#) "Academic Careers and Sexism at UNIGE" (Faniko, 2016) was published. The campaign against sexism and sexual harassment at the University ([UNIUNIE](#)) was launched in November 2017. Teasers and posters (500 copies) in 14 buildings, a guide "[Don't turn a blind eye](#)" in French and English, postcards, faculty pins and coffee cups were distributed. As part of this campaign, the "[Groupe de confiance](#)" was created, with two specialists in the field of personal protection. In the framework of this campaign, a series of workshops, conferences, and roundtables have taken place. The UNIUNIE, a pioneering campaign, inspired other universities and institutions all over Europe.

University of Heidelberg

Online tutorial "Against Gender Bias"

Beyond the legal and procedural provisions regarding equal opportunity at universities, careers of women and men are affected by gender stereotypes that are activated instinctively or deliberately. An online tutorial developed in 2017 by the Equal Opportunities Office of Heidelberg University identifies three areas in which gender bias oftentimes plays an important role. While providing information on each of these topics, the tutorial also offers recommendations on how to deal with and avoid gender bias in appointment procedures. The information given is based on current research findings in the fields of psychology and business, as well as on relevant legal bases.

The tutorial consists of three modules, which cover important topics related to appointment procedures:

- individual career paths - raises awareness of the individual career trajectories of applicants;
- the assessment of academic achievement - addresses the assessment of applicants' past performance and potential;
- academic as well as professional skills - draws attention to applicants' sets scientific and generic of skills.

All three modules are structured in the same way: first, a short introduction to the topic is provided, followed by a description of the underlying problem, highlighting individual features - such as excellence, independence, mobility - and discussing the

effects of gender bias in context. In a final step four recommendations are offered on how to avoid gender bias. The tutorial aims (a) at creating awareness to resist gender stereotypes, and (b) to de-bias hiring procedures by making suggestions to identify issues that may be affected by bias. Implemented in 2018, the tutorial has become a constant item on the agenda of each appointment committee. A formative evaluation is yet to be carried out to learn about the impact of the tool, the extent to which the tutorial was helpful and whether committee members felt it had influenced their individual decision-making.

www.uni-heidelberg.de/tutorial-gender-bias

Diversity policy

The University of Heidelberg's diversity policy is guided by the different dimensions of diversity. Individual measures either work towards improving parameters in general, or they are part of diversity management, which is meant to avert discrimination and advance equal opportunity. In general, all measures are put to the test in a pilot phase before being implemented on a larger scale. In combination, these measures constitute a portfolio with four fields of action:

- organisational culture and organisational development,
- human resources development,
- individual support,
- quality management and communication.

There are 11 goals to implement the policy through various measures:

- GOAL 1: Create organisational conditions to implement the diversity programme
- GOAL 2: University-wide coordination of diversity management activities
- GOAL 3: Development of advanced training measures and events
- GOAL 4: Development of an interactive communication concept
- GOAL 5: Employment of quality assurance instruments
- GOAL 6: Development of measures for implementing the General Act on Equal Treatment with regard to "age"
- GOAL 7: Further development of access and participation opportunities for university members from different backgrounds and in difficult personal circumstances
- GOAL 8: Establishment of university offerings, projects and initiatives for refugees
- GOAL 9: Qualification for situations with intercultural requirements - development of training concepts for dealing with internationally diverse groups in study and research
- GOAL 10: Establishment of mentoring programmes for international students
- GOAL 11: Offers for a socially diverse student body

The implementation of these goals can be illustrated by the tools designed to meet goal 6: development of measures for implementing the General Act on Equal Treatment with regard to "age".

One of the central tasks of the university is to generate, promote and contribute knowledge to society. Besides the academic knowledge, a university works as an institution through the formal and informal knowledge and expertise of its employees.

Knowledge management in transitional stages is a relevant topic in all areas of the university - research, teaching and administration. What happens to the know-how and expertise of university members, when they leave the university, may it either be because older members enter retirement or because young professionals start a new job? What happens in phases of personal mobility with knowledge that is essential for the action of the institution - in scientific working groups, the institutes, the faculties or the university as a whole? How could those transitions be organising in a productive and appreciative way for all parties? And how should an open-minded university facilitate access to knowledge as a resource?

The project group "Knowledge Management and Intergenerational Transfer of Knowledge in Transitional Periods" (*Wissensmanagement und transgenerationale Weitergabe von Wissen in Übergangssituationen*) began its work in 2019. The project develops and tests specific hand-over processes for the transfer of professional knowledge. It is part of a cooperation between the Equal Opportunities Office and two research groups. This cooperation works towards the development of an institutional form for the transfer of professional knowledge for members and staff of Heidelberg University in order to comply with the University's Diversity Strategy to guarantee equal treatment with regard to age. In the framework of this initiative, work has

already been done on the topic of “Preserving Knowledge – Managing Transitions” (*Wissen bewahren – Übergänge gestalten*). To start the cooperation between the researchers and the project group, which aims at putting findings into practice, a workshop has already taken place, at which representatives from the private sector introduced the knowledge transfer strategies of their respective companies. In addition, an age structure analysis of the employees at Heidelberg University has been conducted to evaluate future challenges regarding age and the transfer of professional knowledge.

www.uni-heidelberg.de/diversity/

University of Helsinki

Responsibilities and engagement of the university leadership

The Rector decides on the acceptance of “The University of Helsinki Equality and Diversity Plan”. The Rector also decides on the members of the University’s Equality Committee, whose members are appointed from across the University to include representatives of different genders, all staff groups, students, and different age groups, as well as groups with particular insight or experience regarding equality issues.

Equality and diversity is within the specific remit of one of the Vice-Rectors. The Vice-Rector chairs the Equality Committee, which has existed since 1990, and often hosts events organised by the Equality Committee.

The first Equality Plan was published for the period 1995–1999. Nowadays the plan is called “University of Helsinki Equality and Diversity Plan”²⁴. The goal of the plan is to support the creation of a healthy studying and working environment. The focus areas are “promotion of leadership work”, “promotion of wellbeing” and “promotion of multiculturalism”. All members of the University community, including teachers, researchers and other staff, as well as students, are invited to comment on the University’s Equality and Diversity Plan.

Changing structures, processes and culture: raising awareness and organising trainings

The University of Helsinki has planned that the HR specialists in the recruitment committees’ meetings and especially in the induction session share information on equality and diversity issues including on implicit bias. One of the members of the committee has a responsibility to be an observer. If none of the members of the committee can work as an observer, then the HR specialist takes the role. Materials concerning equality and diversity are shared to the members of the committees and a video on the topic is in the making. Training will be especially targeted to the HR specialists but general training for supervisors, all personnel and students is also envisaged.

The Equality Committee of the University of Helsinki organised a “Do we hear the (critical) voice?” event in 2018 as part of the Helsinki Pride Week. The aim of the event was to promote equality issues from the point of view of diversity in the university world and to highlight the issues that often remain in the margins. The event was aimed not only for all university people but also for the wider audience. The programme included topics such as sexual and gender diversity at work and gender equality and diversity in the university education. This event was part of the University’s theme “Community Spirit, Diversity and Equality”. The University also arranged “The flags for the equality on the campuses” as part of the Helsinki Pride Week and The Helsinki University Library organised a “Rainbow curved study” event.

²⁴ The current plan (2019–2020) can be accessed at <https://www.helsinki.fi/en/university/strategy-and-management/equality-and-diversity-at-the-university>.

The Equality Committee organised implicit bias training in the fall of 2018. The objective of the training was to make the participants conscious of their implicit biases. In the year 2019 the university aims to organise four bias trainings at each of the campuses. The “Simply Trilingual” campaign launched at the University of Helsinki encouraged the academic community to boldly use different languages in communication. The campaign aimed to make the community aware of well-trying policies for everyday language use as well as share tips on how trilingualism (Finnish, Swedish, English) can work in practice. The University is officially a bilingual (Finnish and Swedish) university. The campaign continues in 2019.

Leiden University

Policy and engagement of the university leadership

Leiden University's [EDI policy](#), established in 2014, takes an integral and comprehensive approach. A gender balance in hiring and promotion policy, student performance and study success for all students, specifically black and minority ethnic students and first-generation students, and an increased awareness and expertise in the area of diversity and inclusion have been central goals of Leiden University's policy since its inception. EDI policy and its implementation are facilitated by the Diversity Officer who works in close collaboration with, and is supported by the Vice-Rector Magnificus of Leiden University.

Since the establishment of Leiden's EDI policy, important advances have been made in increasing awareness by offering a range of training programmes to staff members of all ranks, establishing staff and student networks committed to the promotion of an inclusive work and learning environment, and integrating EDI policy within the organisation with the appointment of diversity coordinators. A gender-conscious approach in hiring and appointments has led to a significant increase of female full professors (27% of full professors in 2018, compared to 21% in 2013, and almost 21% in the Netherlands in 2018).

The POPcorner: student support and community building

One initiative in the area of student performance and study success, which has been particularly successful, has been the POPcorner, an office and meeting point for students, whose services are specifically aimed to support first-generation students, and students from under-represented groups. The reason for establishing the service is the tenacious gap between the study success of the latter and Dutch majority ethnic students.

Situated in a central location within the faculty, the POPcorner offers easy access to various forms of support in managing student life, including individual consultation and mentoring by a study advisor, as well as a range of courses on academic skills, study skills (time management, effective planning, avoiding procrastination, exam study skills), Dutch language and university etiquette. The POPcorner has recently expanded its activities to talent development, focused on personal development and peer support, and community building, by organising events, lectures, and social gatherings, aimed at supporting the development of a diverse and inclusive community, and expanding students' social circle. Students' evaluation of the service is very favourable, especially as it contributes significantly to creating an inclusive learning environment. First established in the [Faculty of Social Sciences](#), the model has recently been replicated in the [Faculty of Humanities](#) and is actively expanding its scope.

Toward an inclusive working and learning environment

A review conducted in 2018 has positively evaluated Leiden's EDI policy, and the efforts and commitment of the Diversity Officer and her team in laying the foundations for a diverse and inclusive community. Building on these efforts, in the next phase, a key goal will be to further implement on a faculty and university level, to promote ethnic and cultural diversity among staff, and to provide training and tools to support the development of an inclusive learning environment.

KU Leuven

For many years diversity issues have been on the agenda of KU Leuven policy. Since 2009 a Vice-Rector for diversity is responsible for the development and follow-up of a diversity policy plan, herein supported by a diversity policy council. The current plan contains two main foci. On the one hand, KU Leuven aims to promote an inclusive culture so that both student and staff members, people with different backgrounds and beliefs have opportunities to fully develop their talents. On the other hand, we want to stimulate the in-, out- and through-flow of a diverse student and staff population.

Examples of ongoing actions to realise the objectives of the policy plan:

- **Harassment help desk**

To facilitate early detection of interpersonal problems a harassment help desk has been set up. The intention of this action is to ensure necessary interventions and to provide referrals to specialised care and support. The help desk is open to students, staff and external parties with questions or reports of difficult conflict situations, abuse of power, verbal or physical aggression, discrimination, bullying, sexual harassment, etc. Prevention workshops are organised to stimulate respectful behaviour and solution-focused approaches.

- **Gender vanguards**

Full professors who participate in assessment committees develop a special sensitivity to counteract implicit biases and other gender-related mechanisms in KU Leuven procedures and customs. The so-called gender vanguards are supported and trained via a programme developed by the Diversity Policy Office.

- **Talent for inclusion (TINC)**

To stimulate sensitivity, to strengthen the talents to cope with diversity are objectives of the TINC workforce. The workforce exchanges good practices in teaching and research focusing on student integration and involvement, dealing with polarisation, cultural barriers, stigmatisation, implicit bias and other sensitive topics.

- **UNDIVIDED**

As an independent bottom-up initiative facilitated by KU Leuven, the main goal of UNDIVIDED is to make the University more inclusive in education, research and public service. UNDIVIDED brings students and staff together to make diversity more visible, to influence policy and to learn from each other. Within the diversity policy of KU Leuven, the diversity platform takes an important role in being a bottom-up voice that challenges existing policies and gives advice from a student perspective.

- **Monitoring**

KU Leuven assesses its EDI policy by means of data and an annual monitoring of the inflow and through-flow of staff and students with diversity characteristics. The policy is founded on data to detect and follow-up on bottlenecks; it is evaluated annually. In terms of staff diversity, the Diversity Policy Office is conducting systematic assessment of the outcomes of different stages of the recruitment, selection process and promotion of M/F ratios and M/F disparities among Senior Academic Staff (ZAP), Administrative and Technical Staff (ATP) and Special Academic Staff (BAP).

Imperial College London

“Examining geographic bias in teaching and learning” - a case study, written by Matthew Harris and Mark Skopec, Imperial College

Following the [#RhodesMustFall](#) movement at the University of Cape Town in South Africa, initiatives to “decolonise curricula” have emerged at [University College London](#), the [School of Oriental and African Studies \(SOAS\)](#), [Oxford University](#) and [Cambridge University](#), becoming a high-profile and very public debate in the U.K.²⁵. Bias against research from institutions in the Global South is a pervasive issue²⁶ and many argue that academic curricula at institutions in the Global North are predominantly Eurocentric, with a potentially significant amount of research and contributions from non-Western countries being overlooked²⁷. In response, students at various academic institutions have begun to challenge narratives, and course content, that inherently privilege certain perspectives over others. A major challenge with these efforts is identifying, in the first instance, the extent to which curricula are distorted in particular directions. Institutions engaged in this debate rarely measure or quantify the sources of their curricula content, asking what sources are being drawn upon and from which countries. Similar to the institutions in our vicinity, we seek to identify and redress any potential inequalities in the way that literature is represented in the curriculum, to ultimately avoid perpetuating the imbalance in research seen in the biomedical field. So, as part of a broader diversity and inclusivity agenda that includes actions to improve access to students of all backgrounds through pedagogical and technological reform we:

- 1) conducted a detailed descriptive analysis of all the material we provide to our students on the Masters in Public Health (MPH): a one-year intensive, on-campus course that includes modules such as Global Health Challenges, Global Health Innovations, Foundations of Public Health Practice, Population Health Improvement, Disease Masterclasses, Health Economics, Epidemiology and Statistics;
- 2) developed an implicit association test (IAT) that measures the extent to which faculty implicitly associate good research with high-income countries rather than low-income countries, a potentially important issue in terms of the choices lecturers make in developing reading lists and curricula;
- 3) held workshops with faculty to discuss and debate the issues related to geographical bias.

We analysed the reading lists of all 16 modules on the MPH course, extracting data such as first- and last-author names of each citation, their institutional affiliations, as well as the rank of their institutions (according to Times Higher Education data) and the income status of the country in which the institution is based (according to World Bank data). Overall, 1039 citations from 34 countries are represented in the readings assigned to the MPH course. The U.K. was the most represented (45.1%) followed by the U.S.A (31.3%), Switzerland (4.8%) and Canada (3.8%). 25.4% of first and last authors were affiliated with institutions ranked among the top 10 of the world and over 67% were affiliated with institutions in the top 80 in the world. 97.8% of first and last author institutions were based in high-income countries. This has demonstrated that our MPH course is heavily skewed towards research from the Global North. Descriptive analyses such as these paint a picture, but the reading lists might also simply represent broader patterns of knowledge production, which are heavily skewed toward the Global North²⁸.

We cannot rule in or out the possibility that implicit bias plays a part in selecting articles from certain sources. A preliminary analysis of the IAT has shown that over 70% of our respondents demonstrate a moderate to very strong implicit bias that good research is associated with high-income countries, not low-income countries. Only 10% of respondents did not demonstrate

25 <https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2018/10/18/diversifying-and-decolonising-the-medical-curriculum/>, <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/soas-university-of-london-students-union-white-philosophers-curriculum-syllabus-a7515716.html>, <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2017/feb/19/soas-philosophy-decolonise-our-minds-enlightenment-white-european-kenan-malik>, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/2017/10/24/cambridge-decolonise-english-literature/>

26 [https://academic.oup.com/circvascres/article-lookup/doi/10.1016/S0008-6363\(02\)00712-5](https://academic.oup.com/circvascres/article-lookup/doi/10.1016/S0008-6363(02)00712-5), <http://www.nature.com/articles/srep00902>, <http://jama.ama-assn.org/cgi/reprint/295/14/1675>, <http://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hlthaff.2017.0773>

27 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27858122>, <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1751157714000479>, <http://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.38069.518137.F6>

28 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13676261.2018.1471199>

any implicit bias in either direction, comparable to previous research²⁹. Again, although implicit bias against low-income country research is prevalent we cannot conclude that this is explanatory with respect to reading list choices. Implicit bias tests are useful as a point of departure to explore potentially undesirable inequities; however, they do not, on their own, predict explicit bias nor are they effective, on their own, at changing institutionalising practices.

Notwithstanding this, the distribution of readings is concerning, considering the global emphasis of the course and that public health is such a broad topic. There is a case to be made that the vast material inequalities, in terms of representation of knowledge from diverse sources, should be addressed. An MPH with a “Global Health” stream must be more representative of the global research landscape, and not just rely on the outputs of a few, elite institutions. We provided bespoke, individual reports to each module lead on the course and included some suggested approaches to address this imbalance if, as the content experts, they conclude that there is scope to improve the range of sources in their reading lists without jeopardising the quality and content of the material. Over half of module leads have indicated interest and enthusiasm to explore this issue more closely and make amendments to their reading lists. The question remains around what does success look like and when is a reading list sufficiently representative. We invite them to consider this challenge without mandate or punitive consequence, and we have been encouraged at the very engaged response by most module leads that are proposing revised reading lists which include additional, not replacement, readings. We acknowledge that there are many risks in this work, in particular that additional readings from the Global South might be selected in a tokenistic manner. The answer is not in simply picking some new readings. Geographical bias must be embedded further within the teaching by drawing purposefully on research or case studies from any source, not just prestigious universities.

The faculty workshops have reached nearly one hundred participants and have allowed us to share our preliminary findings to other members of the College community, appraise the current landscape and discuss strategies surrounding geographical bias in curricula they have been involved in. We find that there is broad engagement with this agenda at an institutional level and strong leadership is critical to pursue this further. However, there needs to be continued dialogue as well as student involvement to ultimately arrive at a curriculum that incorporates high-quality research regardless of its country of origin. As well as gathering ideas on how to sustainably embed our research and findings into institutional practices several important themes have emerged from these discussions including that:

- 1) these workshops must become a regular feature of the professional development of educators within Imperial College London;
- 2) the issue of geographical bias should be explored within the Information Literacy Strategy currently being developed by the Libraries, given their central role in ensuring articles are available and accessible to students;
- 3) the descriptive analysis of reading lists is expanded across other undergraduate and postgraduate courses within Imperial College London as a useful strategy to stimulate debate;
- 4) the issue of geographical bias is embedded within the social accountability agenda in the Medical School, which seeks to ensure that medical students are equipped to work within a diverse community, sensitive to diverse realities and experiences;
- 5) a Student Academic Choice Award should be established for educators that demonstrate excellence regarding use of diverse knowledge sources in their teaching;
- 6) opportunities to draw more on our diverse student body are needed to bring their own examples from their own country contexts into the learning environment.

29 <http://globalisationandhealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12992-017-0304-y>

University College London

“We can shift the dial” - Testimonial by Professor Michael Arthur, President & Provost of UCL

At a recent ‘Provost’s Welcome’ to all new staff, I was asked in the Q&A session what achievement I was most proud of at UCL. I did not hesitate to say that is was our commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI). I explained that we may not always get it right, and we certainly have a long way to go, but our hard work is having an impact.

I believe fervently that EDI should not be about ‘window-dressing’. It is not a theoretical or abstract, academic exercise. It is about improving the real lives of our university community, by recognising that there is an uneven distribution of social and cultural capital, that some of our students and staff have faced significantly more hurdles than others to earn their place at UCL, and that it is unacceptable that barriers still remain based on unjust, biased and outdated social hierarchies.

The seminal moment on my personal journey to understanding why this matters so much was in 2014. I chaired an event called ‘Why isn’t my professor black?’. It was attended by 350 staff and students, the majority of whom were from racially minoritised backgrounds. To be candid, I was apprehensive about the event as I suspected that our staff and students would feel that UCL was not doing enough to progress race equality. Instead, it was a remarkable evening with a real outpouring of honesty, critical but entirely constructive challenge and a sense of optimism that by working together, we could do better.

Since then, I have played a very active role in our EDI endeavours. I have attended many events, wrote articles, spear-headed significant initiatives like the Race Equality Charter, worked closely with my Senior Management Team Equality Champions and expanded the EDI team and moved them under my office to signify the strategic importance of this work.

We have made gains, particularly in relation to gender equality. We can demonstrate some real success stories on the recruitment and promotion of women academics, heads of departments and senior professional services staff. The percentage of minority ethnic professors has been slowly creeping up. It is not always easy to evidence how much the culture of an institution has changed, but I believe it has. A combination of grass-roots engagement across UCL and senior level commitment is key. I’m determined to show that we can shift the dial.

Lund University

Responsibilities and engagement of the university leadership

Lund University’s policy for gender equality, equal opportunities and diversity has existed since 2011³⁰. Lund University, along with every other employee and education provider in Sweden, must by law work pro-actively with anti-discrimination measures³¹. Information material and templates are available for the faculties to use, as well as support from central administration³².

The Vice-Chancellor of the University makes sure that it is well known that he considers equality issues to be a top priority. He has taken the role as chairperson of the Council for gender equality and equal opportunities.

A very concrete example is the introduction of a new routine in the recruitment process of full professors. When the deadline for application has passed, the faculties are mandated to bring to the Vice-Chancellor’s attention if the applicants are all of the same

30 <https://www.staff.lu.se/sites/staff.lu.se/files/lund-university-policy-for-gender-equality-equal-opportunities-and-diversity.pdf>

31 the Discrimination Act – see <http://www.do.se/other-languages/english/>

32 <https://www.hr-webben.lu.se/arbetsmiljo/diskriminering> ,
<https://www.hr-webben.lu.se/arbetsmiljo/diskriminering/systematiskt-forebyggande-arbete-mot-diskriminering>,
https://www.hr-webben.lu.se/sites/hr-webben.lu.se/files/systematic_preventive_work_against_discrimination.pptx

gender. The V-C demands that the faculties can explain how this has happened and what they have done to promote applications from excellent persons of the under-represented gender. If the discussions are not constructive, the V-C has the opportunity to stop the recruitment until the faculty has put in the right measures for promoting gender equality.

In 2016 the V-C started an investigation into how the academic appointments boards at each faculty works with EDI, with a special focus on gender equality. That resulted in a seminar on recruitment and EDI with target group academic appointments boards that is held once a year with a different focus. This has been very well received, with every board almost represented in full. In 2019 the focus is on the possibilities and restrictions of meritocracy.

The V-C has also prompted an investigation into the academic career paths from an EDI perspective, which has resulted in an ongoing renewal of Lund University Appointment Rules, to make them even sharper regarding EDI than today³³.

Another initiative from the V-C is the Tellus-project³⁴, a research-based project that aims at gathering knowledge about sexual harassment at Lund University. The project will produce a number of ways to work pro-actively against discrimination, and especially the kind of discrimination that is sexual harassment.

The V-C has spoken up publicly about EDI in many different ways and settings, since this is one of his prioritised areas. For example, he often makes statements in his V-C blog, or in debate articles in the newspapers.

Each year the V-C reserves support for projects on the faculty level to work against vertical segregation. Even if the main focus is on gender, other dimensions are also welcomed and encouraged.

Examples of projects to promote equality and diversity at Lund University

1. Core values work in academia

Working on equality and for diversity is strongly linked to the core values of academic organisations. In 2016 Lund University finished a project on core values to prepare the development of a new strategic plan. The work has resulted in a book, in which descriptions of some other projects can be found, too³⁵.

2. Gender-integrated leadership and mentor programmes

Gender-integrated implies in this context that a gender perspective is applied throughout a programme, in all aspects and topics. About two decades ago Lund University initiated the AKKA programme (*Akademiska Kollegors Ansvar*, "the accountability of academic colleagues"), which is a gender-integrated leadership programme offered to senior researchers and teaching staff at Lund University³⁶. Five training programmes (which include aspects other than gender as well) have been conducted between 2004 and 2014 with 150 participating staff members. The first two programmes were offered to women only; the following programmes have included male participants as well. All five programmes have been presented in various reports. In the so-called AKKA white paper (*AKKA Vitbok*, 2012) the programme coordinators summarise their experiences and analyse the results and effects of the programme.

More recently a gender-integrated mentors programme has been initiated by the Faculty of Sciences, inspired by the bifocal approach by Jennifer de Vries³⁷. It is based on the ideas of a transformative and relational mentors programme, where mentors and mentees become partners for change. It involves group mentoring and focuses on both individual and institutional change. The programme as developed in Lund focuses on gender and ethnicity, and targets young researchers in the beginning of their careers.

33 <https://www.staff.lu.se/sites/staff.lu.se/files/lund-university-appointment-rules-2018.pdf>

34 <https://tellus-eng.blogg.lu.se/about-tellus/>

35 Brage, T., & Lövkrona, I. 2016, *Core values work in academia – with experiences from Lund University*, [https://portal.research.lu.se/portal/sv/publications/core-values-work-in-academia\(ceadd0f3-dc37-4007-a93b-c31adadc0e4d\).html](https://portal.research.lu.se/portal/sv/publications/core-values-work-in-academia(ceadd0f3-dc37-4007-a93b-c31adadc0e4d).html)

36 The programme is described in chapter 3.1 of the reference in footnote 14.

37 See <http://www.jendevries.com/>

3. Anti-discrimination workshops

Prevention of discrimination and harassment is probably one of the most important parts of an active strategy for diversity. For over a decade the workshop “See the human beyond” has been offered to departments, student groups, divisions at Lund University and beyond. The workshop consists of two three-hour long sessions. The first starts with a discussion of the discrimination act – the law – with a clear norm-critical perspective. It continues with a discussion of suppression techniques, from a research perspective, and results from surveys of the academia considering all discrimination grounds. It ends with value exercises, case discussions in groups and a survey of the status of the participants’ own workplace. The second session brings up the diversity perspective of research and a deeper discussion on what discrimination is. In the end the participants formulate suggestions for actions relevant to changing cultures in their workplace. The project discusses all grounds of discrimination and is offered to all departments, divisions, research groups and students associations in the University.

LMU Munich

In Germany, equality, diversity and inclusion are fundamental rights guaranteed by article 3 of the German Constitution. The state is obliged to promote EDI. Therefore, all universities are obliged by law to promote EDI.

LMU places great importance on equality, diversity and inclusion, based on six dimensions: gender; inclusion and participation; cultural diversity; family friendliness; healthy environment within the university, and anti-discrimination. EDI is seen as cross-cutting issue concerning all activities of the university, for which a member of the University Governing Board holds a dedicated responsibility. The LMU Office for Equality and Inclusion set up in 2014 reports directly to this Vice-President in charge. LMU is determined to create an environment in which its members achieve, maintain and profit from all aspects of diversity. For this reason, students, faculty and staff are strongly encouraged to make use of the office’s services.

The Office for Equality bundles the various activities concerning EDI on a website that gives an overview and guides towards tailored offers to fit various aspects and specific life situations. LMU’s comprehensive guide on diversity: http://www.en.uni-muenchen.de/about_lmum/introducing-lmu/diversity/index.html

LMU signed the “German Diversity Charter”, a certificate issued by the *Charta der Vielfalt* Association, a non-profit organisation that began operating in 2011 under the aegis of the German Chancellor Dr. Angela Merkel. LMU has received the “Total E-Quality Award” presented by the TOTAL E-QUALITY Deutschland Association, as proof that a culture of equality and diversity is lived throughout the institution.

LMU has organised a number of activities aimed at promoting EDI. Examples include:

- Round Table Diversity: Established by the Vice-President for Research and Diversity in 2015 and convening twice a year, the Round Table Diversity offers an institutionalising, cross-thematic exchange between all colleagues responsible for and committed to diversity in research, education and administration at LMU. Objectives of the Round Table are:
 - university-wide networking of actors who deal with the issue of diversity;
 - interdisciplinary exchange among diversity stakeholders;
 - development of measures and projects;
 - promoting the equal participation of all university members in university life.
- Diversity Day and Diversity Dinner: Since 2016, LMU hosts one of the yearly Diversity Days (an initiative by the Charta of Diversity Association). In 2018, LMU held an additional event called “Diversity Dinner” with an international keynote speaker where senior academics, mainly professors of all faculties, had an intensive exchange of experiences and ideas on EDI at LMU.

LMU aims to provide structures and framework conditions that promote the different potentials of all university members in the sense of a comprehensive diversity management at all qualification levels and management positions in science, research,

and the central administration. This is also rooted within the target agreement between LMU and the Bavarian State Ministry of Education and Culture, Science and the Arts.

In the overall strategy of LMU, equal opportunities are a cross-cutting issue pursued with great commitment on all institutional levels: the University Executive Board, all faculties as well as all administrative units. LMU aims at enabling equal opportunities, optimally promoting the potential of its members and achieving the best possible performance in research and teaching.

Equality is anchored as a guiding principle in the first paragraph of LMU's university constitution: "Equality of men and women is an integrated guiding principle, also for all institutions and boards of the university, and shall be promoted in all university policy, standardising and administrative measures by respecting gender mainstreaming."

For LMU's non-academic staff, the "[Equality Concept](#)" constitutes a fundamental instrument for personnel planning, especially for human resources development and the equality of men and women.

In LMU's Institutional Strategy "LMUexcellent", funded by the German Excellence Initiative, concrete measures to achieve the equality goals are implemented and funded to a considerable extent. The same applies to LMU's *Lehre@LMU* programme, which funds teaching measures within the *Qualitätspakt Lehre* – Quality Pact for Teaching by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research.

University of Oxford

There is significant consensus amongst leadership at the University of Oxford about the importance of the role that institution heads play in encouraging and prioritising equality, diversity and inclusion.

In January 2015, the University created the post of University Advocate for Equality & Diversity. The role is aligned to a Pro Vice-Chancellor position, demonstrating its importance and that this is an institutional priority and has support right at the top of senior governance and leadership. The role acts as a visible conduit to bring together all the various strands of this work across the institution and it informs senior management decisions about EDI implications.

Together with the Vice-Chancellor, the University Advocate for Equality and Diversity participates in various activities across the collegiate university – from high-profile lectures and seminars to cultural events and celebrations of under-represented groups. The principles and objectives are also embedded into overall strategic plans and commitments, such as outlined in the University's [5-year Strategic Plan](#). The overall approach to EDI is laid out in the University's [Equality Policy](#).

The University of Oxford also participates in national and international accreditation programmes and uses these, together with other external regulatory frameworks, as mechanisms to coordinate work in this area. For example, the University has developed detailed action plans to address specific issues as part of its participation in [Athena Swan](#), the [Race Equality Charter](#), the [Stonewall Workplace Equality Index](#) and the [Mindful Employer Charter](#).

The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford personally participates in a number of activities related to EDI. These key activities include:

- introducing the annual BME, Disability, Women of Achievement and LGBT lectures;
- hosting the biennial [VC's Diversity Awards](#);
- attending, along with the University Advocate for Equality & Diversity, race awareness training and other EDI-related training.

Sorbonne University

Ensuring equality, diversity and inclusion is a top political priority for Sorbonne University, directly managed by the presidency and the Vice-President for personnel, professional equality and diversity. Sorbonne University aims to sustain a diverse community and positive cultural climate, where students and staff can thrive regardless of gender, cultural background, sexual orientation or disability. While the recruitment of students without selection naturally favours diversity, gender biases and social representations have yet to be identified and corrected. Recruitment committees are parity-based, but diploma juries less so. EDI steering committees have been set up in each faculty and at the level of the whole university to promote equality, fight against discrimination and to redress the balance. EDI committees also aim to precisely monitor EDI indicators in order to refine and develop our strategy. The university-wide commitment to EDI is mostly implemented through three synergistic initiatives: the gender equality initiative, the diversity initiative, and the disability initiative. A contact person has been named for each initiative.

The gender equality initiative

Gender equality is taken very seriously at Sorbonne University, up to the highest level and to the most visible positions. Fifty percent of the Vice-Presidents are women, whose functions extend to fields that are most often those of men: the Vice-President Research is a woman. The team is very mobilised on these subjects, as evidenced by the President's personal commitment to women in science through the L'Oréal UNESCO programme. The Sorbonne University foundation, in the framework of its "Welcome to the Future" fundraising campaign, offers outstanding women students four-year scholarships to participate in demanding curricula (double-degrees/multidisciplinary programmes).

The gender equality initiative is structured by a clear action plan. Information is the starting point. Sorbonne University trains the selection and evaluation committees for researchers on gender bias. Students from the Sorbonne School of Communication will direct a movie on gender bias. The visibility of women in science roles is also a key objective of our policies, to act as role models and to open doors for the future generations. Hence, Sorbonne University frequently organises events to promote outstanding women within the university's community. Naming currently unnamed buildings and places within the university after women is another example of a simple step to improve the visibility of women in science.

Secondly, accounting for gender differences in HR policies is also important. Balancing parenthood and career can be an arduous task, especially for women. Parenthood support is thus at the heart of the University's actions, e.g. maternity and parental leave policy, Return-to-Work support policy upon return from leave).

Thirdly, fighting sexual and sexist violence is of utmost importance. Sorbonne University will create specialised units to support victims, prevent and react quickly to sexual and sexist violence.

The diversity and inclusion initiative

Sorbonne University strives to educate as many people as possible about preconceived ideas, prejudices, stereotypes, racism, anti-Semitism and xenophobia. It will set up a system to combat hatred spreading over the internet and social networks. Freedom of expression is subject to limitation, and should not be invoked to justify racist, anti-Semitic or anti-LGBT words or acts. No racist or anti-Semitic comments or acts will be left unanswered. A generic messaging system will be available to receive complaints. The contact person for diversity will also be the main contact point for any topic related to anti-Semitic, racist or anti-LGBT behavior. Sorbonne University policies for diversity are built within the framework of the national policies for diversity in higher learning, in line with the higher education and research ministry directives.

Inclusion also means giving migrants the tools necessary to start or complete their university-level studies. The University's RESPE programme welcomes all migrants who couldn't pursue their studies and wish to go back to school, but do not have the required level for a bachelor degree, especially in French. The one-year curriculum includes a core of courses in French and the sciences, to be taken in the evening. Participants are then considered ready to undertake a normal curriculum at Sorbonne University.

The disability initiative

Sorbonne University has taken concrete steps to improve the quality of life of students and staff with disabilities, in order to minimise the impact on their career or curriculum. Teachers and staff at Sorbonne University have access to educational resources for dealing with disabled students and colleagues, and some of the staff underwent obligatory training. A strong work-from-home policy is also being developed, alongside multiple sorts of accommodations for disabled personnel (reduction in working hours, financial benefits, housekeeping benefits, ...).

Synergies and intersectionality

Gender equality, inclusion and diversity are inextricably linked. All types of discrimination share some essential characteristics, and should be dealt with concurrently. Furthermore, the relationships between different sorts of discrimination are complex and not entirely understood, which is yet another reason to avoid silos and build a coherent, exhaustive EDI strategy. In Sorbonne University, the three initiatives mentioned above are all coordinated at the presidency level, by the Vice-President for personnel, professional equality and diversity. It is however necessary to ensure seamless communication at the administrative level, between contact persons: making use of synergies between EDI initiatives to the fullest extent is currently one of Sorbonne's priorities.

Utrecht University

Utrecht University (UU)'s [Strategic Plan 2016-2020](#) includes a section specifically about stimulating EDI.

In 2016, a Diversity Task Force was set up following the request of UU's community to prioritise EDI. The Diversity Task Force is a university-wide committee established to drive the ambitions in the field of diversity and inclusion. Its members are selected on the basis of their academic and personal expertise regarding EDI. The Diversity Task Force focuses on four priority areas: 'Equal treatment and inclusion', 'Broadening participation and social commitment', 'Intake and selection' and 'Communication and representation'. Various projects have been issued along the lines of these priority areas.

For 2019 the UU focusses on three EDI topics:

- accessibility for students with a disability: for instance, by modifications to university buildings;
- inappropriate behavior: developing an on-line training for supervisors and teachers and a communication campaign to inform all students and staff about the subject;
- intake and selection of students: removing barriers in the intake and selection phase, to stimulate equal opportunities for future students.

An overview of ambitions and actions can be found on the [diversity website](#), alongside information regarding the Stimulation Fund, EDI initiatives at Utrecht University, Education and Research, News and calendar, and the Diversity Task Force.

Leadership

EDI is regularly a subject of conversation with deans and directors. Also by representing all faculties and seniority levels within the Diversity Task Force and related consultative bodies, EDI becomes a shared responsibility for the Utrecht University community as a whole. One of the goals is to improve the gender balance in faculty boards.

On 29 November 2018 a compulsory EDI training on implicit bias was organised for members of the Executive Board, directors and deans. UU is currently developing implicit bias training for its wider staff community. This training consists of a basic module on implicit bias, supplemented with a module for selection committees and a module for leadership. Training courses for academic and support staff on the topic of intercultural awareness started in 2018.

Utrecht University encourages students and staff to start initiatives on EDI and created a stimulation fund. In 2019 the first ever Utrecht University Diversity & Inclusion Award was awarded by the Vice-President of the Executive Board.

In collaboration with *Studium Generale*, the Diversity Task Force organised the Movies & Science ‘Hidden Stories’ triptych in early 2018. The triptych consists of three documentaries about the challenges of gender fluidity, deaf culture and the emancipation of migrant women. The documentaries were followed by a Q&A session with experts.

The Diversity Task Force is planning to organise a university- wide inclusion day in 2020. Its goal is to reflect on what has been realised and also what is needed in the future to ensure EDI.

University of Zurich

EDI issues present opportunities to develop and professionalise the University of Zurich (UZH) as an institution. The President and Executive Board of UZH work with the seven faculties on EDI issues to achieve ever better working and learning conditions. UZH has adopted a number of important, interlinked policies and related implementation plans, and UZH has funded and staffed institutional structures responsible for the day-to-day operations in this area since the mid-1990s. For example, UZH offers leadership training on diversity management on an annual basis³⁸. It has also funded a multi-centre study into the situation of researchers with disabilities (2017-2020). UZH is fostering the accessibility of online content by hiring an e-accessability officer in 2018 with the goal of “Access for All”.

In addition, in 2018 UZH established the new position of Deputy-President with responsibility for gender equality and diversity, sustainability, and evaluation.

University leadership is about creating the best possible learning and working conditions for the people within the university. This includes, among other things, being able to identify and address any problems and to lead change from within.

At the level of practice, change often comes through institutional learning: a change that had good results in one faculty is subsequently adopted by other faculties or introduced centrally for UZH as a whole. One example of this is the elimination of the mean time differential for women and men professors, respectively, for promotion from associate to full professor. This initiative started within one faculty and has since been introduced as a centrally operated control mechanism to ascertain equal treatment. Another faculty recognises the need to remove financial obstacles to professors working part-time. In fact, the UZH gender equality policy and the UZH budget processes operated at cross purposes. Once the problem had been highlighted, a new, university-wide policy on part-time professors that removed the financial disincentives to part-time was introduced.

The President and several other members of the Executive Board regularly participate in UZH events and panel discussions that address EDI issues. Recent examples include:

- Kick-off event for UZH’s Diversity Policy in November 2018 (Deputy-President UZH)
- Second LERU Gender Conference in June 2018 (President, Deputy-President, Vice-President Research UZH)
- “Gender – what works“, UBS Center Event 2018 (Deputy-President UZH)
- “Advance International Women’s day”: 2018 and 2019 event hosted by UZH
- Financial support for first-generation students was improved by better regulations and processes in 2018 (Vice-President Faculty Affairs and Scientific Information UZH)
- Parenthood Support is being pushed in 2019 (Executive Board)

UZH is currently developing a new set of Strategic Principles, and EDI matters will be addressed within them and within the UZH Executive Board’s new Priority Programme. There are a number of other interlinked policies which support and promote EDI:

38 For example, on working with diverse teams - see <https://www.weiterbildung.uzh.ch/de/mitarbeitende/hochschulmanagement/diversity.html>

- Diversity Policy – Promoting, Practicing, and Benefiting from Diversity
- Code of Conduct Gender Policy
- Protection against sexual harassment
- Leadership and Management Principles
- Internationalisation Strategy
- Disability Statement³⁹.

More specifically concerning UZH's Diversity Policy, the Executive Board has decided to adopt a policy as well as an implementation plan (currently under development). The implementation plan aims at addressing EDI issues in the following areas: teaching and learning, research, continuing education, facility management, administration, and governance. UZH is committed to allocating a commensurate amount of resources for the coordination, implementation and regular evaluation of these measures.

Generally speaking, at UZH EDI matters are being looked at as transversal issues. Therefore, a key part of rolling out and implementing EDI policy, strategy, and measures is to dovetail it with larger issues of strategic significance. If this can be achieved, EDI comes alive at the top, middle and bottom of the organisation. Two reasons for this are:

- Legal context: Swiss labour law is relatively soft in terms of affording employees protection against discrimination (moreover, Swiss law on discrimination is highly fragmented across protected characteristics). Beyond very clear breeches against EDI-related legal principles, the law rarely acts as a “push factor” for institutional change;
- Decentralisation: UZH is highly decentralising, which can and does limit the effectiveness of top-down initiatives.

The Deputy-President and Executive Board of UZH have recently taken important steps to ensure the effective use of opportunities to advance on EDI issues. One example of this is the 2018 revision of regulations governing professorial hiring. A concurrently running EDI project on open, transparent and merit-based recruitment had a major impact on the new regulations. Without this window of opportunity the impact of the EDI project is likely to have been marginal, despite the inherent quality of the project.

9 More information about these six policies may be found at:
<https://www.uzh.ch/cmsssl/en/about/basics/diversity.html>;
<https://www.uzh.ch/cmsssl/en/about/basics/genderpolicy.html>;
<https://www.uzh.ch/cmsssl/en/about/basics/genderpolicy/sexualharassment.html>;
<https://www.uzh.ch/cmsssl/en/about/basics/leadership-principles.html>;
<https://www.int.uzh.ch/en/international/strategy.html>;
http://www.disabilityoffice.uzh.ch/dam/jcr:00000000-2d90-0550-ffff-ffffd1009bf5/Disability_Statement_UZH_2016.pdf.

References

References in Parts I and II

- Etzkowitz, H. & Rangan, M. (2011). Gender dynamics in science and technology: From the “Leaky Pipeline” to the “Vanish Box”, *Brussels Economic Review* 54(2/3), 131-147.
- European Commission. (2019). *She Figures 2018*. Doi 10.2777/936. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/info/news/gender-balance-research-improving-pace-too-slow-eu-she-figures-2019-mar-08_en
- Fortunato, S., Bergstrom, C. T., Börner, K., Evans, J. A., Helbing, D., Milojević, S., ... Barabási, A.-L. (2018). Science of science. *Science*, 359, 6379.
- Gibbs, K. (2014). Beyond “the pipeline”: Reframing science’s diversity challenge. *Scientific American*. Retrieved from <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/voices/beyond-the-pipeline-reframing-science-s-diversity-challenge/>
- Husu, L. (2001). Sexism, support and survival in academia: Academic women and hidden discrimination in Finland. *Social Psychological Studies* 6. Department of Social Psychology, University of Helsinki.
- League of European Research Universities. (2018). *Implicit bias in academia: A challenge to the meritocratic principle and to women’s careers – And what to do about it*. Retrieved from <https://www.leru.org/files/Publications/Implicit-bias-in-academia-Full-Paper.pdf>
- League of European Research Universities. (2015). *Gendered research and innovation: Integrating sex and gender analysis into the research process*. Retrieved from <https://www.leru.org/files/Gendered-Research-and-Innovation-Full-paper.pdf>
- League of European Research Universities. (2012). *Women, research and universities: Excellence without gender bias*. Retrieved from <https://www.leru.org/files/Women-Research-and-Universities-Excellence-without-Gender-Bias-Full-paper.pdf>
- Ong, M., Ko, L., & Hodari, A. K. (2016). Agency of women of color in STEM. In E.H. Branch (Ed.) *Pathways, potholes, and the persistence of women in science: Reconsidering the pipeline*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Page, S. E. (2017). *The diversity bonus: How great teams pay off in the knowledge economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

References in Part III

3.1. Acting against implicit bias and denial of discrimination, Naomi Ellemers, Utrecht University

- *On the origins and consequences of gender stereotypes:*
Ellemers, N. (2018). Gender stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 69, 275-298.
- *On the recognition of implicit bias:*
Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2015). Modern discrimination: How perpetrators and targets interactively perpetuate social disadvantage. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 142-146.
- *On the impact of subtle discrimination:*

Jones, K. P., Peddie, C. I., Gilrane, V. L., King, E. B., & Gray, A. L. (2016). Not so subtle: A meta-analytic investigation of the correlates of subtle and overt discrimination. *Journal of Management*, *42*, 1588-1613.

See also: <https://hbr.org/2016/07/why-subtle-bias-is-so-often-worse-than-blatant-discrimination>

- *On the relation between implicit bias and career motivation:*

Ellemers, N. (2014). Women at work: How organisational features impact career development. *Policy Insights from Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *1*, 46-54.

- *On career experiences of women:*

Faniko, K., Ellemers, N., Derks, B., & Lorenzi-Cioldi, F. (2017). Nothing changes, really: Why women who break through the glass ceiling end up reinforcing it. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *43*, 638-651.

- *On the pitfalls of symbolic diversity statements:*

Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T. L., Brady, L. M., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013). Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organisational diversity structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *104*, 504-519.

See also: <https://hbr.org/2016/01/diversity-policies-dont-help-women-or-minorities-and-they-make-white-men-feel-threatened>

- *On practical interventions:*

Walton, G. M., Logel, C., Peach, J. M., Spencer, S. J., & Zanna, M. P. (2015). Two brief interventions to mitigate a "chilly climate" transform women's experience, relationships, and achievement in engineering. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *107*, 468-485.

See also: http://mindsetscholarsnetwork.org/research_library/reducing-inequality-academic-success-incoming-college-students-randomized-trial-growth-mindset-belonging-interventions/

3.2. Eliminating bias and blind spots in research and university assessment, Stephen Curry, Imperial College London

AdvanceHE. (2018). Equality in higher education: Statistical report 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.ecu.ac.uk/publications/equality-higher-education-statistical-report-2018/>

Adams, J. & Gurney, K. A. (2018). Bilateral and multilateral coauthorship and citation impact: Patterns in UK and US international collaboration. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, *3*, 12.

Bernstein, R. (2015). PLOS ONE ousts reviewer, editor after sexist peer-review storm. *Science*. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2015/05/plos-one-ousts-reviewer-editor-after-sexist-peer-review-storm>

Bothwell, E. (2018). THE developing ranking based on Sustainable Development Goals. *Times Higher Education (THE)*. Retrieved from <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/developing-ranking-based-sustainable-development-goals>

Carnes, M., Devine, P. G., Baier Manwell, L., Byars-Winston, A., Fine, E., Ford, C. E., Forscher, P., Isaac, C. Kaatz, A., Magua, W., Palta, M., and Sheridan, J. (2015). The effect of an intervention to break the gender bias habit for faculty at one institution: A cluster randomized, controlled trial. *Academic Medicine* *90*(2), 221-230.

Cash-Gibson L., Rojas-Gualdrón, D. F., Pericàs, J. M., & Benach, J. (2018). Inequalities in global health inequalities research: A 50-year bibliometric analysis (1966-2015). *PLoS ONE* *13*(1): e0191901.

Clauset, A., Arbesman, S., & Larremore, D. B. (2015). Systematic inequality and hierarchy in faculty hiring networks. *Science*

Advances 1(1): e1400005.

- de Cruz, H. (2018). Prestige bias: An obstacle to a just academic philosophy. *Ergo*, 5, 259-287.
- Eigenfactor.org - Gender composition of scholarly publications (1665 - 2011). Retrieved from <http://www.eigenfactor.org/gender/>
- Ellemers, N. (2018). Gender Stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 69, 275-298.
- European Commission. (2019). *She Figures 2018*. Doi 10.2777/936. Retrieved from <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/9540ffa1-4478-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>
- European Commission. (2012). She Figures 2012: Gender in research and innovation. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/she-figures-2012_en.pdf
- Freeman, R. B., & Huang, W. (2014). Collaboration: Strength in diversity. *Nature*, 513, 305.
- Ginther, D. K., Schaffer, W. T., Schnell, J., Masimore, B., Liu, F., Haak, L. L., & Kington, R. (2011). Race, ethnicity, and NIH research awards. *Science*, 333(6045), 1015-1019.
- Harris, M., Weisberger, E., Silver, D., & Macinko, J. (2015). 'They hear "Africa" and they think that there can't be any good services' – Perceived context in cross-national learning: A qualitative study of the barriers to Reverse Innovation. *Globalisation and Health*, 11, 45.
- Harris, M., Marti, J., Watt, H., Bhatti, Y., Macinko, J., & Darzi, A. W. (2017). Explicit bias toward high-income-country research: A randomized, blinded, crossover experiment of English clinicians. *Health Affairs*, 36(11), 1997-2004.
- Hazelkorn, E. (2007). The impact of league tables and ranking systems on higher education decision making. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 19(2). <https://doi.org/10.1787/hemp-v19-art12-en>
- Kahneman, D. (2012). *Thinking, fast and slow*. London: Penguin.
- King, M. M., Bergstrom, C. T., Correll, S. J., Jacquet, J., & West, J. D. (2017). Men set their own cites high: Gender and self-citation across fields and over time. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 3, 1-22.
- Larivière, V., Ni., Gingras, Y., Cronin, B., & Sugimoto, C. R. (2013). Bibliometrics: global gender disparities in science. *Nature*, 504, 211-213.
- Lerback, J., & Hanson, B. (2017). Journals invite too few women to referee. *Nature*, 541, 455-457.
- League of European Research Universities. (2018). Implicit bias in academia: A challenge to the meritocratic principle and to women's careers – And what to do about it. Retrieved from <https://www.leru.org/files/Publications/Implicit-bias-in-academia-Full-Paper.pdf>.
- League of European Research Universities. (2010). University rankings: Diversity, excellence and the European initiative. Retrieved from <https://www.leru.org/publications/university-rankings-diversity-excellence-and-the-european-initiative>.
- League of European Research Universities. (2008) What are universities for? Retrieved from <https://www.leru.org/publications/what-are-universities-for>.
- Merton, R. K. (1973). [1942] The Normative Structure of Science. In R. K. Merton (ed.), *The Sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Murray, D., Siler, K., Larivière, V., Chan, W. M., Collings, A. M., Raymond, J., & Sugimoto, C. R. (2018). Gender and international diversity improves equity in peer review. *bioRxiv*, 400515.
- Nature Editorial. (2018). Nature's under-representation of women. *Nature*, 558, 344.
- Oh, S. S., Galanter, J., Thakur, N., Pino-Yanes, M., Barcelo, N. E., White, M. J., de Bruin, D. M., Greenblatt, R. M., Bibbins-Domingo, K., Wu, A. H. B., Borrell, L. N., Gunter, C., Powe, N. R. & Burchard, E. G. (2015). Diversity in clinical and biomedical research: A promise yet to be fulfilled. *PLoS Medicine*, 12(12): e1001918.
- Primack, R. B., Ellwood, E., Miller-Rushing, A. J., Marrs, R., & Mulligan, A. (2009). Do gender, nationality, or academic age affect review decisions? An analysis of submissions to the journal *Biological Conservation*. *Biological Conservation*, 142(11), 2415–2418.
- Schulz, K. (2010). *Being wrong: Adventures in the margin of error*. New York: Ecco.
- Sugimoto, C., & Larivière, V. (2018). *Measuring research: what everyone needs to know*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Tabak, L. A., & Collins, F.S. (2011). Weaving a richer tapestry in biomedical science. *Science*, 333(6045), 940-941.
- West, J. D., Jacquet, J., King, M. M., Correll, S. J., & Bergstrom, C. T. (2013). The role of gender in scholarly authorship. *PLoS ONE*, 8(7): e66212.
- Witteman, H. O., Hendricks, M., Straus, S., & Tannenbaum, C. (2019). Are gender gaps due to evaluations of the applicant or the science? A natural experiment at a national funding agency. *Lancet*, 393, 531–40.
- Woolston, C. (2015). A case for a university happiness ranking. *Nature*, 517, 415. Retrieved from https://www.nature.com/news/polopoly_fs/1.16730!/menu/main/topColumns/topLeftColumn/pdf/517415f.pdf

3.3. Embedding inclusive research and innovation across the university, *Simone Buitendijk, Imperial College London*

- Heart disease in women: Formulating research questions. Retrieved from <https://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/case-studies/heart.html>
- George Institute. (2019). Diabetes increases the risk of heart failure; more so in women than men. Retrieved from <https://www.georgeinstitute.org/media-releases/diabetes-increases-the-risk-of-heart-failure-more-so-in-women-than-men>
- Harris, M., Macinko, J., Jimenez, G., & Mullachery, P. (2017). Measuring the bias against low-income country research: An Implicit Association Test. *Globalisation and Health*, 13, 80. Retrieved from: <http://globalisationandhealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12992-017-0304-y>
- Harris, M., Marti, J., Watt, H., Bhatti, Y., Macinko, J., & Darzi, A. W. (2017). Explicit bias toward high-income-country research: A randomized, blinded, crossover experiment of English clinicians. *Health Affairs*, 36(11), 1997–2004. Retrieved from: <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/full/10.1377/hlthaff.2017.0773>
- Keyes, O. (2018). The misgendering machines: Trans/HCI implications of automatic gender recognition. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, Vol. 2, No. CSCW, Article 88. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3274357>
- League of European Research Universities. (2015). *Gendered research and innovation: Integrating sex and gender analysis into the research process*. Retrieved from <https://www.leru.org/files/Gendered-Research-and-Innovation-Full-paper.pdf>
- Nielsen, M., & Bloch, C. (2018). Making gender diversity work for scientific discovery and innovation. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2, 726-34.

- Ni Loideain, N., & Adams, R. (2018). Gendered AI and the role of data protection law. Retrieved from <https://infolawcentre.blogs.sas.ac.uk/2018/10/26/gendered-ai-and-the-role-of-data-protection-law/>
- Ohkuma, T., Komorita, Y., Peters, S., & Woodward, M. (2019). Diabetes as a risk factor for heart failure in women and men: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 47 cohorts including 12 million individuals. *Diabetologia*, *62*(9), 1550-1560. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00125-019-4926-x>
- Schiebinger, L., & Zou, J. (2018). "AI can be sexist and racist – it's time to make it fair". *Nature*, *559*, 324-326. Retrieved from <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-05707-8>
- Sugimoto, C., Ahn, Y., Smith, E., Macaluso B., & Larivière, V. (2019). Factors affecting sex-related reporting in medical research: A cross-disciplinary bibliometric analysis. *Lancet*, *393*, 550-59.
- Woodward, M. (2019). Rationale and tutorial for analysing and reporting sex differences in cardiovascular associations. *Heart*. Epub ahead of print: 13 August 2019. doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2019-315299. Retrieved from <https://heart.bmj.com/content/heartjnl/early/2019/08/01/heartjnl-2019-315299.full.pdf>
- 3.4. Recognising the less visible characteristics of EDI, Jojanneke van der Toorn, Leiden University and Utrecht University**
- Ahikali, T., & Groeneveld, S. (2015). Diversity management in public organisations and its effect on employees' affective commitment. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *35*, 146-168.
- Barreto, M., Ellemers, N., & Banal, S. (2006). Working under cover: Performance-related self-confidence among members of contextually devalued groups who try to pass. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *36*, 337-352.
- Bezrukova, K., Spell, C. S., Perry, J., & Jehn, K. A. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of 40 years of research on diversity training. *Psychological Bulletin*, *142*, 1227-1274.
- Brimhall, K. C., Barak, M. E. M., Hurlburt, M., McArdle, J. J., Palinkas, L., & Henwood, B. (2017). Increasing workplace inclusion: The promise of leader-member exchange. *Human Service Organisations Management Leadership & Governance*, *41*(3), 222-239.
- Carmeli, A., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Ziv, E. (2010). Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety. *Creativity Research Journal*, *22*(3), 250-260.
- Carnes, M., Devine, P. G., Manwell, L. B., Byars-Winston, A., Fine, E., Ford, C. E., ... Sherridan, J. (2015). Effect of an intervention to break the gender bias habit: A cluster randomized, controlled trial. *Academic Medicine*, *90*, 221-230.
- Choi, S. B., Tran, T. B. H., & Park, B. I. (2015). Inclusive leadership and work engagement: Mediating roles of affective organisational commitment and creativity. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *43*(6), 931-943.
- Clair, J. A., Beatty, J. E., & MacLean, T. L. (2005). Out of sight but not out of mind: Managing invisible social identities in the workplace. *The Academy of Management Review*, *30*, 78-95.
- Cramwinckel, F. M., Scheepers, D. T., & Van der Toorn, J. (2018). Interventions to reduce blatant and subtle sexual orientation- and gender identity prejudice (SOGIP): Current knowledge and future directions. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *12*, 183-217.
- Creed, W. E. D., & Scully, M. A. (2000). Songs of ourselves: Employees' deployment of social identity in workplace encounters. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *9*(4), 391-412.

- Croteau, J. M. (1996). Research on the work experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people: An integrative review of methodology and findings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 48*, 195-209.
- Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. L. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 1267-1278.
- Heck, N. C., Fientje, A., & Cochran, B. N. (2011). Offsetting risks: High School gay-straight alliances and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) youth. *School Psychology Quarterly, 26*, 161-174.
- Hofhuis, J., Van der Zee, K. I., & Otten, S. (2012). Social identity patterns in culturally diverse organisations: The role of diversity climate. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(4), 964-989.
- Jansen, W. S., Otten, S., & Van der Zee, K. I. (2015). Being part of diversity - The effects of an all-inclusive multicultural diversity approach on majority members' perceived inclusion and support for organisational diversity efforts. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 18*, 817-832.
- Jansen, W. S., Otten, S., Van der Zee, K. I., & Jans, L. (2014). Inclusion: Conceptualisation and measurement. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 44*, 370-385.
- Javed, B., Naqvi, S. M. M. R., Khan, A. K., Arjoon, S., & Tayyeb, H. H. (2017). Impact of inclusive leadership on innovative work behavior: The role of psychological safety. *Journal of Management & Organisation, 23*, 1-20.
- Legault, L., Gutsell, J. N., & Inzlicht, M. (2011). Ironic effects of antiprejudice messages how motivational interventions can reduce (but also increase) prejudice. *Psychological Science, 22*, 1472-1477.
- Moorhead, C. (1999). Queering identities: The roles of integrity and belonging in becoming ourselves. *Journal of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Identity, 4*, 327-343.
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Van der Toorn, J., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M.J., & Handelsman, J. (2016). A "scientific diversity" intervention to reduce gender bias in a sample of life scientists. *CBE—Life Sciences Education, 15*, ar29.
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Van der Toorn, J., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2014). Scientific diversity interventions. *Science, 343*, 615-616.
- Newheiser, A., Barreto, M., & Tiemersma, J. (2017). People like me don't belong here: Identity concealment is associated with negative workplace experiences. *Journal of Social Issues, 73*, 341-358.
- Nishii, L. H. (2013). The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(6), 1754-1774.
- Nishii, L. H., & Rich, R. E. (2014). Creating inclusive climates in diverse organisations In B. M. Ferdman & B. R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion* (pp. 330-363). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Reimann, R. (2001). Lesbian mothers at work. In M. Bernstein & R. Reimann (Eds.), *Queer families, queer politics: Challenging culture and the state* (pp. 254-271). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Robb, L. A., & Doverspike, D. (2001). Self-reported proclivity to harass as a moderator of the effectiveness of sexual harassment-prevention training. *Psychological Reports, 88*(1), 85-88.
- Rostosky, S. S., Black, W.W., Riggle, E. D. B., & Rosenkrantz, D. (2015). Positive aspects of being a heterosexual ally to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 85*, 331-338.

- Rudman, L. A., Ashmore, R. D., & Gary, M. L. (2001). "Unlearning" automatic biases: The malleability of implicit prejudice and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 856-868.
- Şahin, O., Van der Toorn, J., Jansen, W. S., Boezeman, E. J., & Ellemers, N. (2019). Looking beyond our similarities: How perceived (in)visible dissimilarity relates to feelings of inclusion at work. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 575.
- Smith, T., Constantine, M., Dunn, T., Dinehart, J., & Montoya, J. (2006). Multicultural education in the mental health professions: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 132-145.
- Toomey, R. B., McGuire, J. K., & Russell, S. T. (2012). Heteronormativity, school climates, and perceived safety for gender nonconforming peers. *Journal of Adolescence, 35*, 187-196.
- Walls, N. E., Kane, S. B., & Wisneski, H. (2010). Gay-straight alliances and school experiences of sexual minority youth. *Youth & Society, 41*, 307-332.
- Wolsko, C., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2006). Considering the tower of Babel: Correlates of assimilation and multiculturalism among ethnic minority and majority groups in the United States. *Social Justice Research, 19*(3), 277-306.

3.5. Intersectionality as a framework to understand the value and complexity of diversity, Isabel Hoving, Leiden University

- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Durham: Duke UP.
- Apple, M.W. (2001). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality*. London: Routledge.
- Banks, J. A. (2012). *Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education*. SAGE Publications.
- Banks, J. A. (2009). *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*. London, Abingdon Oxon: Routledge.
- Banks, J. A., & McGee Banks, C. A. (2010.) *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Hoboken NJ: Wiley.
- Bensimon, E. M. (2007). The Underestimated Significance of Practitioner Knowledge in Scholarship on Student Success. Presidential Address. *Review of Higher Education, 30*, 4, 441-69.
- Brage, T., & Lövkrona, I., eds. (2016) *Core values work in academia: With experiences from Lund University*. Lund: Lund University.
- Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S. (2010). The paradox of meritocracy in organisations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 55*(4), 543-676.
- Ching, C.D. (2013). *Why Race? Understanding the importance of foregrounding race and ethnicity in achieving equity on college campuses*. Los Angeles, CA: Center for Urban Education, Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California.
- Crul, M., Schneider, J. & Lelie, F. (2013). *Superdiversity*. Amsterdam: VU University Press.
- Dowd, A. C., & Bensimon, E. M. (2015). *Engaging the "race question": Accountability and equity in U.S. higher education*. New York and London: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*, 229-273.
- Equality Challenge Unit. (2009). The experience of black and minority ethnic staff working in higher education. Literature Review 2009. Retrieved from <https://www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/external/experience-of-bme-staff-in-he.pdf>

- Essed, P. (2004). Cloning amongst professors: Normativities and imagined homogeneities. *Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 12(2), 113-22.
- Essed, P., & Hoving, I., eds. (2015). *Dutch Racism*. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Gillborn, D., & Youdell, D. (2009). Critical perspectives on race and schooling. In J. A. Banks (ed.), *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education*, 173-85. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Krefting, L. A. (2003). Intertwined discourses of merit and gender: Evidence from academic employment in the USA. *Gender, Work & Organisation* 10(2), 260-78.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt. *Educational Researcher* 35(7), 3-12.
- Lamont, M. (2017). *Prisms of inequality: Moral boundaries, exclusion and academic evaluation*. Praemium Erasmianum Essay, Vol. 2017. Amsterdam: Praemium Erasmianum Foundation.
- Lamont, M. (2009). *How professors think: Inside the curious world of academic judgment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Odina, T. A. (2009). The education of ethnic, racial, and cultural minority groups in Spain. In J. A. Banks (ed.), *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education*, 474-85. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ouali, N. (2007). *Black, migrants, and ethnic minority women scientists position in research and academic careers in Europe*. Brussels: Université Libre de Bruxelles. Retrieved from <http://www.ulb.ac.be/is/gem/NEWS-Report.pdf>
- Puwar, N. (2004). *Space invaders: Race, gender and bodies out of place*. Oxford/New York: Berg.
- Roosevelt Thomas, R. (1991). *Beyond race and gender: Unleashing the power of your total workforce by managing diversity*. New York: AMACOM.
- Thomas, D., & Ely, R. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. *Harvard Business Review*, September/October, 79-90. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/1996/09/making-differences-matter-a-new-paradigm-for-managing-diversity>
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054.
- Wekker, G. (2016). *White innocence: Paradoxes of colonialism and race*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- White, D. G., ed. (2008). *Telling histories: Black women historians in the ivory tower*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Wilder, C. S. (2013). *Ebony and ivy: Race, slavery, and the troubled history of America's universities*. New York: Bloomsbury Press.
- Williams, D. A. (2013). *Strategic diversity leadership: Activating change and transformation in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

LERU publications

LERU publishes its views on research and higher education in several types of publications, including position papers, advice papers, briefing papers and notes.

Position papers make high-level policy statements on a wide range of research and higher education issues. Looking across the horizon, they provide sharp and thought-provoking analyses on matters that are of interest not only to universities, but also to policy makers, governments, businesses and to society at large.

LERU publications are freely available in print and online at www.leru.org/publications.



All LERU publications, unless otherwise stated, are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License



PUSHING
THE FRONTIERS
OF INNOVATIVE
RESEARCH

LERU Office

Minderbroedersstraat 8
3000 Leuven
Belgium

tel +32 16 32 99 71
info@leru.org
www.leru.org

 @LERUnews