

# Review of Equity Function

## Purpose and scope

The purpose of this review was to make recommendations on leadership, governance, structures and processes necessary to ensure the University of Auckland will deliver Taumata Teitei Vision 2030 and the Strategic Plan 2025 by providing appropriate, effective and consistent equity support for staff and students. The review has been overseen by a governance group who are charged with providing advice to the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendations arising from the Review. Margaret Hanson from Top Drawer Consultants was appointed as the independent reviewer.

The scope of the review was to cover the leadership, governance, structures and processes of the:

- Equity Leadership Committee (ELC)
- Equity Community of Interest (ECOI)
- Pro Vice-Chancellor Equity's role
- Equity roles of the faculty and service division Equity Committees including the positions of Associate/Deputy Deans Equity
- Service provision to Equity groups by central services divisions
- Equity Office.

The full terms of reference are attached as Appendix A.

## Methodology

The methodology encompassed:

- Review of relevant documentation
- Interviewing key individuals and groups – the list of these is attached as Appendix B
- Calling for submissions from staff – 52 submissions were received
- Desktop review of approach of some of the other Go8 universities and discussion with the University of Sydney
- Workshopping different scenarios with the Equity Review Governance Group.

I would like to thank all the people who made the time to speak with me or to write in, for their thoughtful and constructive comments.

These inputs have been used to recommend a path forward for implementing equity at the University.

## Context

There is a continuum as to how organisations attempt to address equity issues. At one end, a very centralised approach, through to a totally integrated approach. Both have advantages and risks. The University has been operating towards the centralised end of the spectrum and this has driven much of its success to date. The question is whether it would now be better served by moving further along the spectrum toward a more integrated approach, and if so, how much movement is

appropriate at this time. Organisations that move too quickly, or are not prepared for the move, run the risk of undoing the work they have done and having the drive towards equity be diluted or even disappear. Organisations that stay at a centralised end of the continuum, particularly large and complex organisations, find it difficult to have the whole organisation take ownership and truly integrate equity. The risk is that equity remains an add-on or is constrained by the limits of the centralised resource to touch and influence the thinking, planning, design and implementation of the wider policy and operation of the organisation.

Key indicators as to whether organisations are ready to make a move include:

- Leadership commitment
- Organisational strategy that incorporates why and how equity will enable success
- Clearly articulated equity strategy that supports the organisation's overall strategy
- General awareness
- Level of good intent around equity issues
- Robust accountability systems
- Effective data collection and storage
- Robust and insightful monitoring and analysis
- Skill and confidence levels of key leaders and managers
- Sufficient resource (time, budget, training, access to information and advice) to support leaders and managers
- A "joined up" and collaborative organisation, not a "siloed" organisation.

In considering this for the University of Auckland, recognition needs to be given to:

- What has bolstered success to date?
- What drives change in the University?
- How well the University is doing on the above indicators?
- How to maintain staff faith and commitment? This is about perception as well as reality.

## Key issues to emerge from feedback from interviews, group discussions and submissions

### **Good intent, but variable application**

General awareness of the need for equity is high. It is supported by considerable good will and good intentions regarding equity though out the University. People are encouraged by the equity messages in Taumata Teitei.

Application of equity principles, however, is seen as very variable. Many<sup>1</sup> feel that there is much more talk than action.

---

<sup>1</sup> As guided by the terms of reference, this was a qualitative consultation. The term "many" is used when there is a recurring theme or view

### **Application limited by lack of confidence and skills**

Many feel that they, and others, are not sure how to effectively achieve equity in their areas of responsibility. In part this is because the issues can be complex, but they also report not having the skills and knowledge needed, and not feeling they can easily access expertise to work with them.

### **Reactive rather than proactive**

Although there are pockets of good initiatives in different part of the University including those driven by the Equity Office, people feel that equity issues are considered reactively when problems arise. Active consideration of equity implications is not consistently undertaken when planning, developing and implementing policies, programmes and initiatives.

### **Equity is seen as someone else's job**

Many reported that equity is too often seen as an add-on or afterthought. That it is someone else's job. People perceive there to be boundary issues between the Equity Office and other parts of the organisation which has discouraged or limited equity responses.

### **Equity needs to be everyone's responsibility**

The work of the PVC Equity and the Equity Office are recognised as having contributed to the profile of equity at the University, which is acknowledged as being good for the brand of the University. Many feel, however, that the Equity Office is limited as to what it can achieve as it does not have a direct influence on the practices of most of the University. They believe there needs to be much greater ownership and accountability across the University.

### **The current equity governance and leadership structures are not being sufficiently effective**

The Equity Leadership Committee is not currently taking an active leadership role. They themselves feel that they are too often just receiving information without using it to identify priorities, determine appropriate responses and drive change.

The Equity Community of Interest's role has largely been confined to exchanging information and providing support, but could potentially add much greater value.

Faculties and Service Divisions are varied in their approach to equity. Their success or otherwise is largely due to the commitment of individuals. Where there are equity committees or Associate Deans Equity, their ability to support change in their faculty or service division can be hampered by competing work demands, lack of skills or knowledge, lack of influence, limited resources and lack of an overall framework to guide their work.

### **Lack of a clear equity direction**

Many feel that the University needs a clear strategy for equity to guide what needs to be done, and how different faculties and services divisions can contribute. They believe that without this, people are largely driven by individuals' areas of interest that may or may not reflect the critical equity issues in their work area.

### **Lots of data, not enough analysis**

Groups receiving equity data feel that they are presented with lots of data, but that not enough analysis is done to synthesise it and identify the key issues. The data is an important raw material, but analysis is needed to identify priorities, guide action and monitor progress. More thought is needed about what questions need to be answered.

### **The current advisory groups are an untapped resource**

The Disability, Rainbow and Students from Refugee backgrounds advisory groups have provided some support and guidance to the members but are an untapped resource for the organisation. They could potentially provide much needed experience and expertise around these issues.

### **Current vulnerability around equity**

Many feel that the departure of experienced staff leaves equity at the University as being vulnerable at this time.

Based on this feedback, the reviewer does believe that the University of Auckland needs to move further along the continuum towards a more integrated approach to equity in a way that allows coordination. The following recommends an appropriate way for doing this.

## **An approach for the future**

The following is recommended as the most useful approach for the University of Auckland to build on its success to date, address the difficulties it has faced in fully implementing equity, and to move to better embed equity into all of its thinking, planning and practices. It is based on the following principles:

- The University needs to build on its successes to date
- Those who have responsibility for implementation of the University's programmes and services need to be equipped and enabled to integrate equity into their work, and be held accountable for doing so
- The University needs to continue to seek the synergy of addressing student equity and staff equity in tandem
- A comprehensive and coordinated approach will be needed – making a few minor changes will not be enough.

## Overview

This approach recommends the University Integrating staff and student equity into the areas of the University that have responsibility for delivery whilst retaining a centralised overview which facilitates and coordinates an Equity Operational Plan and mechanisms for equity implementation. This will help drive action, whilst harnessing the synergies between student and staff equity.

## Leadership

### **Vice Chancellor and University Staff and Student Equity Committee**

The Vice Chancellor has made an explicit commitment to being an active champion of equity. This is welcomed by people throughout the University. To help her do this, she needs an active University Staff and Student Equity Committee that can drive the implementation of equity throughout the University. The role of this committee would be to:

- Develop the University's Equity Operational Plan
- Monitor and reflect on progress in the implementation of the Equity Operational Plan
- Ensure that appropriate accountability and monitoring processes for equity are in place and operating
- Foster and encourage good practice and innovation in implementing equity throughout the University
- Identify where synergies can be harnessed or gaps need to be addressed in implementing equity across the University for students and staff
- Advise Senate and Council on the University's equity progress
- Ensure the University's statutory and other compliance obligations are met.

A draft terms of reference for this committee is attached as Appendix C.

As changing or broadening the terminology fell outside the terms of reference for this review, the recommendations continue to use the term "equity". This committee may want to consider whether it broadens the terminology to "equity and inclusion".

### **PVC Equity**

The Vice Chancellor needs to be supported by a PVC Equity that would report directly to her. The focus of this role should be to:

- Lead the thinking about equity at the University
- Facilitate and enable the implementation of equity throughout the University and its integration into decision making
- Coach and support Deans and Directors to implement equity in their areas of responsibility
- Support the University Staff and Student Equity Committee's work with relevant analysis, research and access to contemporary best practice
- Mentor the staff working in other key equity roles in different parts of the University.

The critical competencies for this role will include analytical ability, relationship management and communication skills. Ideally they will come from an academic background. This could potentially be done in combination with other academic responsibilities, but it would need to be at least a .6 FTE position.

For this person to be effective, they will need to be engaged in planning and decision making. Many people felt strongly that the PVC Equity should attend the University Executive meetings. At the very least they should have access to agendas and papers ahead of meetings so they can provide meaningful comment at the relevant time.

### **Senior Managers, Deans and Directors**

As stated earlier, those who have responsibility for implementation of the University's programmes and services need to be equipped and enabled to integrate equity into their work and be held accountable for doing so. This will require:

- Setting clear expectations
- Ensuring the implementation of equity is included in their accountability mechanisms
- Providing them with appropriate training and support to enable them to carry out this responsibility.

### **Leadership Recommendations**

1. That the current ELC be replaced by a University Staff and Student Equity Committee chaired by the Vice Chancellor to actively lead the implementation of equity across the University.
2. That urgency is given to recruiting the PVC Equity to assist in facilitating the work that comes out of this review.
3. That Senior Managers, Deans and Directors are held accountable for implementing equity in their areas of responsibility.

## **Equity Operational Plan**

The University has now set a clear direction in Taumata Teitei. It is in the process now of developing operational plans related to:

- Education and student experience
- Research and innovation
- Partnerships and engagement
- Enabling environment
- People and culture.

Each of these areas has significant equity implications and opportunities which should be considered and made explicit with the relevant plan. These should then be collated into an overall Equity Operational Plan so people understand the linkages.

This will need to be aligned with the Maori and Pacific operational plans as there is highly likely to be some cross over. Although Maori and Pacific peoples are deliberately positioned as more than

equity groups at the University, both will have equity issues that need addressing and there will be equity initiatives and policies that impact on them as well. Aligning the work between the Maori, Pacific and Equity operational plans will be important to harness the synergy between them and prevent duplication.

The Equity Operational Plan can then be used to guide the work that is done in separate faculties, LRSIs and service divisions to achieve equity so the University is working to the same priorities.

An overall plan would also assist the issue of better use of data and inform decisions about what data is required for effective monitoring.

This will not preclude faculties, LRSIs and service divisions addressing equity issues that are specific to them, but will provide a framework for assessing where they should prioritise their effort and resources.

### **Equity operational plan recommendations**

4. That the five operational plans are explicit in considering equity implications and opportunities.
5. That an Equity Operational Plan be developed that reflects the five operational plans and is aligned with the Maori and Pacific operational plans.
6. That the Equity Operational Plan be used to guide the equity work in the faculties, LRSIs and Service Divisions.

### **Responsibility**

As discussed above, the senior managers, Deans and Directors have a responsibility for leading the implementation of equity at the University. All managers and leaders have a responsibility for implementation in the areas they work in and how they manage staff.

The training and development tools currently used by the University need to be expanded to equip these people to upskill them to carry out this responsibility and explore what it means in practice.

This may include:

- Training courses and workshops
- Discussion guides
- On-line training
- Guides and fact sheets
- Case studies
- Information exchange sessions.

The Professional and Organisational Development (POD) team are best positioned to do this work by further integrating equity into their current programme of work and developing equity specific programmes as appropriate. They will require some additional resource to carry out this work.

## **Responsibility recommendations**

7. That responsibility for equity be incorporated into all managers' and leaders' performance expectations.
8. An active programme be developed and implemented to upskill managers and leaders to equip them meet these performance expectations.

## Distribution of equity resources

To reinforce the message that equity is a University wide responsibility and to assist people to integrate equity into their work, it is recommended that equity resources be embedded with the areas of the University responsible for delivery. At the same time, care will be needed to maintain a coordinated approach to ensure that the potential synergies between student equity and staff equity are capitalised on.

## **Embedding equity resources**

There are four key areas that equity resources need to be embedded.

1. Human Resources – focussing on staff equity
2. Campus Life – focussing on the student experience
3. Under the Provost – focussing on the equity implications of pedagogy, curriculum and research
4. Communications and Marketing.

These resources may be new positions, a transfer of a role from the existing Equity Office or existing staff in these areas being given an explicit responsibility for driving equity in their area.

In Human Resources, a position of Associate Director Equity, as part of the Human Resources leadership team, will enable a proactive consideration of equity issues at the planning and development phases of HR policies, practices and initiatives. Additional equity resource in POD will enable wider upskilling in the implementation of equity.

Equity resources in Campus Life and under the Provost would usefully tap into the research and expertise of academic staff who work on related issues, help translate that into best practice for Auckland University and facilitate its implementation. Further work will need to be done to determine the best way to position these resources within Campus Life and under the Provost.

Embedding equity communications in Communications and Marketing will enable the ongoing communications about equity and assist in threading the messaging through out all of the University's marketing and communications. They would then work alongside the Campus Life communications staff who undertake the communications with students through the Communications and Marketing Community of Interest.

### **Ensuring a coordinated approach**

The PVC Equity will be critical in ensuring that the work done in these areas is coordinated. Although formal reporting lines of the embedded equity resources will be elsewhere, there should be a “dotted reporting line” to the PVC Equity. This will enable:

- Exchange of knowledge and ideas
- Capability development
- Coordination and the prevention of duplication
- Joint initiatives where relevant.

The work of the PVC Equity will need to be supported by a manager and staff who will assist the PVC Equity with:

- Undertaking the analysis, research, information gathering and policy development that is required for a coordinated approach
- Supporting the work of the University Equity Committee
- Facilitating the development of the equity operational plan
- Working with faculties, LRSIs and service divisions to help them translate the University’s Equity Operational Plan into their work
- Mentoring advisory groups and equity committees so they can contribute in a more meaningful way and facilitating the communication between these groups and the University Equity Committee
- Reporting to Council and Senate
- Ensuring other statutory obligations are met.

### **Distribution of equity resources recommendations**

9. That an Associate Director, Equity be appointed reporting to the Director HR.
10. That an equity resource be placed within Campus Life.
11. That an equity resource be considered within the Provost’s reporting line.
12. That an equity resource be placed within Communications and Marketing.
13. That a small team comprising an Equity Manager and researcher/analysts be set up to support the work of the PVC Equity.

## Processes/functions to support equity

### **ECOI**

The Equity Community of Interest (ECOI) currently has representation from some but not all parts of the University. It has had a useful role in sharing information and providing some support for people working on equity issues in faculties and Libraries and Learning. It provides reports to the current ELT, but both parties feel that this exchange of information has been of limited value.

ECOI has significant potential value as the ears and voice for equity across the organisation. To utilise that potential it needs to have:

- Representation from all Faculties, LRSIs and Service Divisions along with the current representation from AUSA and the Advisory Groups
- A focus on understanding the equity operational plan and how this can be translated into practice within a faculty, service division or LRSI context
- A focus on gathering information from across the University, analysing it to identify the common issues and exploring potential solutions, including making recommendations for the University Equity Committee to consider
- Members who have an understanding of how the University operates and how change occurs.

To keep this more strategic focus and to keep it directly linked to the Equity Operational Plan, the PVC Equity, should chair the group. It would be useful for the University Equity Committee to meet with ECOI on an annual basis to explore how ECOI can best support the Committee's work. To enable meaningful participation, ECOI members will need to be provided with induction training.

It will be important for the sharing of information between members to continue, but much of this could be done on line so people link with others with similar issues, so that time at meetings could be focused on common critical issues.

### **Advisory Groups**

The University currently has a Rainbow staff and students group, a disability advisory group and students from refugee backgrounds advisory group. Each plays a useful role in providing an exchange of information amongst participants and in some cases personal support. They are, however, an untapped resource for the wider organisation as they principally only connect with staff from the Equity Office. No one else spoken to in the course of this review had considered approaching them for advice or information on related issues.

To increase the likelihood that these group's concerns are considered and addressed, and to strengthen the areas of the University whose work impacts on them, a wider engagement and influence would be useful. To be effective this would require:

- A clear mandate to comment and provide advice on issues related to their sphere of interest
- Training and skill development to understand how the University works and how to effect change

- Promotion of their role to other parts of the University that could benefit from their experience and expertise
- An avenue to be able to feed into the ECOI and where appropriate to the University Equity Committee.

Responsibility for supporting, mentoring and liaising with these groups would need to be shared between the people working in the equity roles in Campus Life, the Provost's Office, and HR or the Equity Manager supporting the PVC Equity.

Care will be needed as to how these groups are utilised to ensure they are used for consultation and as a sounding board. They will not have the capacity to undertake related work.

### **Faculty equity committees**

Currently, only faculties have equity committees, not the Service Divisions. There are wide ranging views on how effective these committees are. Where they seem to work best is when:

- There is a clear commitment to equity from the Dean and other senior faculty managers
- Committee members have a broad understanding and perspective of their faculty and the university and its workings as well as an interest and knowledge of equity issues
- Have a clear purpose and mandate to influence systemic change
- Committees are chaired by an Associate Dean Equity, who is also part of the Faculty Management team or who has an effective working relationship with the Dean so they have real influence and an avenue for raising issues.

People report them being less successful when:

- Committee members are focused principally on individual equity issues rather than systemic change
- They are focussing on their own agenda rather than what the faculty needs
- There is a turnover of committee members without appropriate training, induction and handover
- When they have no mandate or access to resources.

Equity committees potentially have an important role to play in assisting Faculties, LRSIs and Service Divisions translate and implement the Equity Operational Plan, using it to guide their work. To help them be effective it is recommended that:

- That Service Divisions and LRSI's also be expected to institute equity committees. This could either be one joint committee across Service Divisions and one joint committee across LRSIs or separate committees within Service Divisions and LRSIs depending on what the specific areas deem to be of most value
- A templated terms of reference be developed for these committees that reflects the Equity Operational Plan but that can be adapted to suit their specific circumstances and issues
- That a programme of capability building for committee members be developed and implemented by POD
- That there is a clear communication channel established between the equity committee and their faculty senior management team

- That these committees should be chaired by a Associate Dean Equity or another senior manager within the faculty.

### **Associate Dean Equity**

Currently four of the faculties have appointed Associate Deans, Equity. Again there is a range of views as to how useful these positions have been. The impact of these roles has largely been down to the commitment, interest and ability of the individuals appointed. People report that rather than actively recruiting for an appropriate person to undertake this role, volunteers have been called for or individuals shoulder tapped. Although that can result in the right people being appointed, it can also have the opposite effect.

Where they have been effective they have been involved in:

- The Faculty senior management team
- Faculty planning
- Promotion committees
- Acting as a sounding board or advisor to other managers in the faculty
- Being an information source or sounding board for staff members with personal equity issues
- Leading key equity initiatives in their faculty.

To increase the overall effectiveness of these roles it will be necessary to:

- Develop a standard position description for these positions alongside what a faculty needs to commit to, to get full value from this role
- Have POD develop and implement a professional development programme for people taking on these roles
- Have the PVC Equity actively mentor people in these roles.

At this time, it is not clear whether these should be mandated roles or not. It is recommended that the approach above be implemented and that the question of whether these roles should be mandated be reconsidered in a year's time.

### **Recommendations on processes/functions to support equity**

14. That the role and composition of ECOI be refocused to enable it to effectively operate as the ears and voice for equity throughout the university to assist in implementing the Equity Operational Plan.
15. That the role of the Rainbow staff and students' group, the Disability Advisory Group and the students from refugee backgrounds advisory group be developed as a resource for the University to tap into for expertise and experience around their areas of interest.
16. That Service Divisions and LRSIs should also establish equity committees, either individually or collectively.
17. That the functioning of equity committees be strengthened by a clearer terms of reference, a programme of capability building and that their work is guided by the Equity Operational Plan.
18. That active steps be taken to support the current Associate Deans Equity and that whether this role be mandated more widely be considered in a year's time.

## Separation of strategic and policy roles from operational roles

Separating from operational roles will enable the PVC Equity and their team to keep a strategic and policy focus.

### **Disability Services**

Although there have been benefits in being linked to the Equity Office, the feedback gathered in this review firmly suggests that there are greater benefits to be gained from positioning Disability Services within Campus Life. There is potential for improving student access to these services, smoothing cross referrals, utilising some of the systems that have already been developed for secure case management, and professional development for staff.

Care will be needed that the specific disability focus does not get lost, and that the requirements of the TEC funding are met.

### **Provision of advice and advocacy**

To date, staff have regularly turned to the Equity Office for advice and advocacy, both in person and through the equity web pages. Although staff submissions indicate that people turn to a range of different sources for this, the Equity Office has been seen as an important independent avenue, even though the Equity Office has largely been pointing people towards relevant policies or referring issues to the appropriate people in HR. The repositioned role of PVC Equity is not going to be able to undertake this service.

It will be important for HR to strengthen its ability and profile to be the first point of call for information and guidance about individuals' equity issues such as parental leave, bullying and harassment, discrimination or promotion. The Associate Director Equity positioned within HR will be able to assist with this, but it may also be useful for specific staff within HR to further develop their expertise in these areas so that they are known as an appropriate person to go to with queries on these issues.

It will also be important that the electronic equity resources are maintained and kept accessible. This will be a joint responsibility for the people in equity roles in Campus Life, HR and Communications and Marketing.

### **Scholarships**

Currently the Equity Office administers a range of different scholarships with specific equity purposes. These would need to be taken over by the section that is managing the University's other scholarships and awards.

## **Separation of strategic and policy roles from operational roles recommendations**

19. That Disability Services are positioned within Campus Life.
20. That HR strengthen its ability and profile to be the first point of call on individual equity issues.
21. That the equity scholarships be administered alongside the University's other scholarships and awards.

## Summary of recommendations

### **Leadership**

1. That the current ELC be replaced by a University Equity Committee chaired by the Vice Chancellor to actively lead the implementation of equity across the University.
2. That urgency is given to recruiting the PVC Equity to assist in facilitating the work that comes out of this review.
3. That Senior Managers, Deans and Directors are held accountable for implementing equity in their areas of responsibility.

### **Equity operational plan**

4. That the five operational plans are explicit in considering equity implications and opportunities.
5. That an equity operational plan be developed that reflects the five operational plans and is aligned with the Maori and Pacific operational plans.
6. That the equity operational plan be used to guide the equity work in the faculties, LRSIs and Service Divisions.

### **Responsibility**

7. That responsibility for equity be incorporated into all managers' and leaders' performance expectations.
8. An active programme be developed and implemented to upskill managers and leaders to equip them meet these performance expectations.

### **Distribution of equity resources**

9. That an Associate Director, Equity be appointed reporting to the Director HR.
10. That an equity resource be placed within Campus Life.
11. That an equity resource be considered within the Provost's reporting line.
12. That an equity resource be placed within Communications and Marketing.
13. That a small team comprising an Equity Manager and researcher/analysts be set up to support the work of the PVC Equity.

### **Processes/functions to support equity**

14. That the role and composition of ECOI be refocused to enable it to effectively operate as the ears and voice for equity throughout the university to assist in implementing the Equity Operational Plan.
15. That the role of the Rainbow staff and students' group, the Disability Advisory Group and the Students from Refugee Backgrounds Advisory Group be developed as a resource for the University to tap into for expertise and experience around their areas of interest.
16. That Service Divisions and LRSIs should also establish equity committees either collectively or individually.
17. That the functioning of equity committees be strengthened by a clearer terms of reference, a programme of capability building and that their work is guided by the Equity operational plan.
18. That active steps be taken to support the current Associate Deans Equity and that whether this role be mandated more widely be considered in a year's time.

### **Separation of strategic and policy roles from operational roles**

19. That Disability Services are positioned within Campus Life.
20. That HR strengthen its ability and profile to be the first point of call on individual equity issues.
21. That the equity scholarships be administered alongside the University's other scholarships and awards.

Margaret Hanson

Top Drawer Consultants

2 June 2021

## Appendix A: Terms of Reference: Review of Equity function at the University of Auckland

### Purpose:

To make recommendations on leadership, governance, structures and processes necessary to ensure the University of Auckland (UoA) will deliver Taumata Teitei Vision 2030 and Strategic Plan 2025 by providing appropriate, effective and consistent equity support for staff and students (see Appendix).

### Equity Review Governance Group (ERGG):

To provide advice to the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendations arising from the Review of the Equity Function at the University of Auckland.

### ERGG Membership:

Director HR (Chair)	Andrew Phipps
Acting Provost/DVC (Academic)	Professor John Morrow
DVC (Operations and Registrar)	Adrienne Cleland
PVC (Equity) Acting	Prue Toft
PVC (Pacific)	Dr Damon Salesa
PVC (Māori)	Dr Te Kawehau Hoskins
Dean of Arts	Professor Robert Greenberg
HR Representative	Georgina Whittenham

External reviewer: Margaret Hanson (appointed to conduct review).

### Scope:

The Equity Review will cover the leadership, governance, structures and processes of the:

- Equity Leadership Committee (ELC)
- Equity Community of Interest (ECOI)
- Pro Vice-Chancellor Equity's role
- Equity roles of the faculty and service division Equity Committees including the positions of Associate/Deputy Deans Equity
- Service provision to Equity groups by central service divisions.
- Equity Office

Not in Scope: The Tuākana programme and the activities of the offices of the Pro Vice-Chancellors Māori and Pacific are outside the scope of this review. However, it is acknowledged that intersectionality will result in, for example, recognition of Māori students using disability services.

### Outcomes:

To provide recommendations on the strategic alignment of the equity function, taking into account:

1. The Terms of Reference and membership of a university-wide equity committee.
  - This committee will ensure co-ordination, support, implementation and delivery of equity in strategy and governance across the University
  - It will ensure the University's statutory and other compliance obligations relating to equity are met
2. The responsibilities of a Pro Vice-Chancellor Equity's role
3. What governance, structures, roles and processes are appropriate within Faculty, LSRI and Service Divisions to achieve the Equity goals of UoA
4. The most appropriate placement for the functions, roles and services currently undertaken by the Equity Office.
5. The appropriate linkages and interface within the broader Equity framework of UoA (including Service Level Agreements with the Equity Office).

### Process:

#### Information gathering

- An independent reviewer will engage with relevant stakeholders in confidence to understand views and opinions about the current state and preferred future state of the Equity Framework within UoA.
- Information gathering will be conducted through interviews, focus groups, benchmarking and a call for submissions.

#### Scenario development

- Information gathered will be analysed to identify themes, trends and suggestions (people contributing to that exercise will not be identified individually).

#### Framing of recommendations by reviewer

- Alternative scenarios will be workshopped with the ERGG.

#### Consideration by ERGG

- Final recommendations will be presented to ERGG.

#### Advice to the Vice-Chancellor

- ERGG will consider these recommendations and will provide their response to the Vice-Chancellor.

### Timeline:

Review: April –June 2021.

## Appendix B: People and groups interviewed

### Individuals

Acting Provost/DVC (Academic)  
DVC (Operations and Registrar)  
PVC (Maori)  
PVC (Pacific)  
PVC (Equity) Acting  
Associate Director HR  
HR Manager assigned to Equity Office  
Director Student Equity  
Director Resources (Equity Office)  
Director International  
Associate Director Organisational Development  
Manager Student Disability Services  
Director Libraries and Learning  
Director Academic Services  
Director Communications and Marketing  
Director Campus Life  
Associate Director Student Wellbeing and Engagement  
Director Planning and Information  
Director Human Resources  
Student Recruitment Manager  
Vice Chancellor

### Groups

Disability Advisory Group  
Rainbow Staff and Students Group  
Students from Refugee Backgrounds Advisory Group'  
AUSA Exec  
Deans and Directors  
Equity Community of Interest  
Equity Leadership Team  
Student Equity Stakeholders Group  
Academic Heads Group  
Equity Office staff  
Student Disability Services Team  
Human Resources Leadership Team

### Submissions

Submissions were received from 52 staff.

## Appendix C: Draft terms of reference for the University Staff and Student Equity Committee

### **Role**

To lead the implementation of equity for staff and students across the university. This includes:

- Developing the University's Equity Framework and operational plans
- Monitoring and reflecting on progress in the implementation of the Equity operational plan
- Ensuring that appropriate accountability and monitoring processes for equity are in place and operating
- Fostering and encouraging good practice and innovation in implementing equity through out the University
- Identifying where synergies can be harnessed or gaps need to be addressed in implementing equity across the University
- Advising Senate and Council on University equity strategy and progress
- Ensuring the University's statutory and other compliance obligations are met
- Ensuring an open and active channel of communication between the Equity Community of Practice and the relevant equity advisory groups e.g. Rainbow Advisory Group, Disability Advisory Group, Students from Refugee Backgrounds Advisory group.

### **Membership**

- VC (Chairperson)
- PVC Education
- PVC Equity (Deputy Chairperson)
- PVC Maori
- PVC Pacific
- Director HR
- Director Campus Life
- Director Libraries and Learning
- AUSA Equity Officer
- Student representative on the Council
- Dean, nominated by the Deans
- Director of LRSI, nominated by the Directors

### **Frequency of meetings**

The Equity Leadership Committee will meet at least four times a year