



UCD School of Philosophy Implementation plan for adopting the BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme

<http://bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice>

Background

One member of the School attended the launch of the BPA/SWIP good practice process in London in January 2014. A committee for Women in Philosophy was set up in the School that year. Some questionnaires and statistical analysis of the question of why female undergraduates were disproportionately less inclined to specialize in philosophy were produced and the issue of women's representation in philosophy was discussed and broadened to include representation of minority groups. This culminated in a very successful half-day workshop on issues facing women in philosophy. At the start of the 2016/17 academic year the committee was instructed by the School to set about working on specific policies to implement the BPA/SWIP guidelines where appropriate and practicable. The committee was enlarged to include student, postdoc and administrator representation and the recommendations were discussed at two further meetings of the School Committee culminating on 7th December 2016.

The UCD School of Philosophy committee for Women in Philosophy continues to exist after the adoption of these guidelines, with the remit of monitoring their implementation, considering possible policy changes and organizing workshops or other events that are deemed useful.

The following document includes relevant sections from the BPA/SWIP guidelines with agreed implementation policies of the UCD School of Philosophy interpolated in italics.



Gender bias

Introduction

There is evidence from a wide range of sources that even the most well-intentioned people – male and female – can exhibit unconscious biases in the ways they deal with women (and other social groups that are negatively stereotyped in a particular context). In academia, these biases can affect the way we treat students, colleagues and job candidates; how we grade students' work; what we say in academic references; and so on. These biases interact with other biases related to race, ethnicity, gender identity, age, disability and other stigmatized or under-represented groups. The BPA and SWIP recommend that philosophy departments take steps to reduce the influence of these biases. Although the focus of these recommendations is on gender, many of the suggestions will also help with other forms of bias.

For further information on the BPA/SWIP 'Good Practice Scheme, please see the general guidance notes on the BPA Good Practice website (bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice).

Recommendations

Hiring panels

- Departments should make sure that members of hiring panels know about the workings of unconscious bias. (A good source of general information for hiring panels is here wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/BiasBrochure_3rdEd.pdf.)

UCD currently provides voluntary implicit bias training (half-day courses) for all staff who may take part in appointment boards. The School of Philosophy is putting on a workshop involving implicit bias awareness in Spring 2017. The aim of such training and information is to ensure committee members acknowledge and understand their own unconscious biases, rather than for them to eliminate them. All members of the School who will serve on appointment boards from the end of 2017 onwards will have had appropriate training and familiarity with implicit bias awareness. The School disapproves of any manifestation of explicit bias that interferes with neutral evaluation.

- Departments should ensure that hiring panels (at both shortlisting and interview stages) include at least one, and preferably more than one, woman, unless there are exceptional practical reasons why this is impossible. But they should be aware that the presence of women on the panel on its own will not correct for bias.

UCD HR currently communicates this requirement to the chairs of appointment committee and does not approve hiring panels that have no women on them. Whenever possible the School will have committees with more than one woman, this to be put into action by the HOS in preparing future appointment committees.

- Departments should agree specific hiring criteria (and their weighting) in advance and stick to the agreed criteria (and weighting).

This is already insisted on by UCD HR and is ensured by the requirement to send back to HR feedback forms using the agreed criteria after every interview process.

- As far as possible, departments should strive to allow sufficient time for non-rushed consideration of job applications.

An appropriate timeline for consideration of applications is agreed in the process of gaining permission for each job to be advertised, including replacement teaching posts. This is ensured by the HOS, in consultation with other members of academic staff involved in teaching and organizing the teaching.

- Departments should consider ways of anonymising parts of their hiring process (e.g. by considering writing samples anonymously), and implement any ways of doing so that are practically feasible.

While acknowledging the ideal of anonymizing the recruitment process, applications cannot be made fully anonymous. Nevertheless gender can and should be made less visible in the assessment process, e.g. by using only candidates' surnames in communication within the committee. Exactly how this is to be implemented needs to be decided in advance of the shortlisting process by the committee chair in each case.

Teaching

The School should encourage awareness of how various aspects of teaching might discourage female students and students from some minority groups. In particular it should encourage awareness of the impact of gendered and ungendered language in lectures, seminars, tutorials and written course materials as well as representation on reading lists, and other aspects of teaching style. Some of this is included in further sections below. But the School will organize workshops, which all members of staff are encouraged to attend, in which female students and staff are given the opportunity to express what they have found difficult in teaching situations. The first will be in spring 2017, and its aim will be less about determining policy and more about establishing a good working culture.

- Departments should make sure that those involved in teaching know about the workings of unconscious bias. Information about and discussion of gender bias should be included in any training or induction sessions run by the department for staff, including teaching assistants.

All members of the School will have had the opportunity for appropriate training and familiarity with implicit bias awareness. UCD Learning and Development currently provide faculty and staff development courses on Unconscious Bias, but the School of Philosophy will put on its own workshops too – starting in spring 2017. New members of staff should be made aware of the importance of these courses by their mentors. New tutors currently undergo initial training in meetings with the Head of TLAC at the start of the year, and receive a Tutor handbook. The training and the handbook should be changed during the summer of 2017 to include treatment of implicit biases (gender and other). <http://www.biasproject.org/recommended-reading> is a useful resource that will be included in this literature.

- Departments should practise anonymous marking at all levels, and maintain anonymity in determining degree classification, as far as practically possible.

Exam marking is anonymous at all levels. Thesis marking is not, as the grader will very often be involved with the student in helping them prepare the work. Essay marking, which is currently not anonymous should be made anonymous, but in such a way that the grader can de-anonymise the scripts after grading them in order to make comments that are directed to particular students and how they are progressing. The practicalities of this policy will be an agenda item for the TLAC in

January 2017. Determination of degree classification is currently implemented using anonymous processes, though agreed at programme board level, where the names are brought in at the very end of the process.

Promotions and appraisals

- Departments should make sure that those involved in the promotions and appraisals processes know about the workings of unconscious bias.

There is no appraisal process and the promotions and appeals processes are all independent of the School. To the extent that the HOS may need to sign off on promotion applications it is important that the HOS keeps their own unconscious bias training up to date.

- Promotions committees/Heads of Department should, where consistent with institutional policy, ask for CVs from all eligible department members, rather than inviting specific members of staff to apply or only considering those who put themselves forward.

There is no promotions committee in the School. The role of the HOS is to make sure all colleagues are aware of the opportunity, and to give advice to colleagues who are thinking of applying concerning what sorts of things will count for and against them rather than to encourage particular individuals to apply or to supply particular individual support.

General

- Departments should help to break down stereotypical associations of philosophy with maleness, for example by striving for diversity in seminar speakers, syllabi and course reading lists; ensuring that pictures of philosophers/students on websites etc. include women; etc. It is also worth giving thought to *how* women are included. Adding women in the final week of a module, or only to provide a feminist perspective, can give an impression that women's contributions are secondary or limited. Ideally, they should be fully integrated into the syllabi. Specific proposals and/or targets should be discussed and agreed by the department – see below for some suggestions – and progress monitored.

Undergraduate reps, graduate reps, Philosophy Society committee, Perspectives (graduate journal) committee, etc.

The School is not directly involved in choosing these representatives, but there is always at least one senior member of the School who is advising or acting as Senior Treasurer or informally involved. Student reps should be encouraged to take issues of gender and minority representation seriously; this document should be made available to them and the HOS should invite committee

members to consider whether to adopt the BPA/SWIP guidelines.

*Open-day presentations and other recruitment and social events for students
Organisers should take measures to ensure that women are well-represented during open day presentations and other similar events.*

Images of women philosophers

The School will ensure that there is a diversity of representation on the website and in the pictures on the walls of the School area. This will be implemented by the School's web manager, the School Committee and the HOS.

SWIPI

The School's central involvement in the Society for Women in Philosophy Ireland should be continued and made a central feature of its self-presentation. This should be ensured by members of SWIPI in the School and the HOS. Also regular 'get togethers' of women in philosophy in UCD, including students, will be set up.

Reading lists

While acknowledging that there are many more male than female authors of philosophy books and articles up until the middle of the twentieth century, a representative reading list of work since then in many areas would include at least a quarter women and in some areas of philosophy a lot more than that. Module co-ordinators should include the best and most helpful texts, independent of the gender of the author, but women should be clearly visible and a good target is at least 25%. The APA provide some sample syllabi in their Diversity and Inclusiveness program. TLAC will monitor this in the annual module review process and liaise with the Women in Philosophy committee if any further action is deemed necessary.

- *Departments should consider ways of facilitating broad participation in seminar discussion periods, so that pushier individuals do not dominate and a constructive tone is maintained.*

At invited speaker sessions, the chairs should consider inviting graduate students to ask the first question. Generally Q&A sessions in the School employ fairly strict chairing with limits on follow-up questions and the use of the finger/hand distinction. A short break period between the talk and the questions is not usually insisted on, but chairs should be encouraged to try this out within the School during 2017 to see if it should become part of the culture of our seminars. The School will have a workshop in spring 2017 with further workshops in subsequent years to discuss a variety of issues about the culture of the School with respect to women in philosophy and this will be on the agenda. The following website identifies possible strategies:

<http://bpa.ac.uk/uploads/Good%20Practice%20Scheme/Seminar%20chairing.pdf>

UCD School of Philosophy Implementation plan for adopting the BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme

- Insulting, aggressive and unprofessional behaviour should not be tolerated – whether from staff (including support staff and teaching assistants) or students. This includes, but is not limited to, dismissive remarks about the intellectual abilities of certain sorts of people; hostile questioning and or/excessive interruption of speakers; and gratuitous sexual comments. Departments should try to ensure that all staff and students feel comfortable in dealing with such behaviour in the most appropriate manner.

The policy above should take this into account in establishing good seminar culture. But there also needs to be a practice for dealing with the situation when things go wrong. The 'MIT Active Bystander' document should be included in a portfolio of useful advice and information kept in the social space in the department, and is something that will be on the agenda for the Women in Philosophy workshops (<http://web.mit.edu/bystanders/strategies/>). The University also has a Respect and Dignity policy that can be appealed to when necessary.

*(<http://www.ucd.ie/t4cms/UCD%20Dignity%20&%20Respect%20Policy.pdf>)
Also female PGs and staff are encouraged to participate in the SWIPI mentoring scheme.*

The School's Committee for Women in Philosophy should establish a more robust mentoring policy for female graduate students, postdocs and lecturers and bring that to the School Committee at its first meeting in 2017.



Conferences and seminar series

Introduction

Events where all speakers, or all keynote/invited speakers, are male can help to reinforce the stereotype of philosophy as male. We suggest that departments adopt the following policy with respect to organizing conferences and workshops. We also suggest that organisers attend to other dimensions of diversity, such as race, ethnicity and disability.

This policy is closely modeled on the advice on how to avoid a gendered conference at feministphilosophers.wordpress.com/gendered-conference-campaign.

Recommendations

1. Departments should adopt a policy making the following requirements on those organizing conferences or seminar series (including staff, postgraduates and undergraduates):
 - a. When drawing up a list of potential invited speakers, take reasonable steps to ensure that women are well represented; see the Good Practice website for more information and advice.
 - b. Where possible, consult the women on your list before fixing the date of the conference, to ensure that women speakers are not just invited but will actually attend.
 - c. If you cannot fund all speakers, ask bigger-name speakers whether they can fund their own travel (they can always say no), freeing up resources for less well-known speakers.
 - d. Organisers should ensure that male and female speakers are treated equally on publicity material and the conference programme (e.g. to avoid the

situation where a male speaker is described as ‘Senior Lecturer in philosophy at ...’ but a female speaker, also an SL, is described as ‘teaches philosophy at ...’; or where the male speaker’s title (Dr, Prof.) is included by the female speaker’s isn’t).

- e. Investigate whether the provision of childcare facilities for the duration of the conference is possible. Many universities have crèches on or near campus, which may be able to offer a day rate for conference delegates. For larger conferences, if campus facilities are not available consider hosting the conference at a hotel that offers childcare and babysitting services. Consider setting aside funding to subsidise the use of childcare facilities by delegates; see the Good Practice website for more information and advice.

The School adopts a), b) and d). We don’t organize conferences where we do not fund the speakers. In the Republic of Ireland the insurance implications of providing crèche facilities to visitors makes this practically impossible, though ad hoc arrangements may be made when asked for and when possible.

Invited Speaker seminars

The invited speaker co-ordinator(s) should strive to ensure that at least 40% of the external speakers across the year are women, and should also monitor whether certain minority groupings are under-represented. This is to be done in the spring/summer of the previous year when the list is being formulated. It may mean that not all the suggestions made by members of staff can be accommodated in a particular year.

Agnes Cuming lecturers

The School should aim to have at least two women speakers in every five years of seminars. The School should also keep tabs on whether certain minority groupings are under-represented. These decisions are made at School Committee meetings.

2. Departments should ensure that this policy is available to staff and students who are organizing events in a permanent format (e.g. intranet, handbooks) and that they are aware of it.

The School will produce an event organization handbook by summer 2017.

3. Departments should, on a regular (e.g. annual) basis, monitor the gender balance at conferences and seminar series organized by colleagues within the department, and, if significant imbalance emerges, take steps to strengthen their policies.

This will be addressed at School Committee meetings at the end of each year.

4. Departments should consider adopting an official departmental ‘seminar chairing’ policy. See the BPA Good Practice Website for some specific proposals you might consider implementing.

See policy on pp. 6-7.



Sexual harassment

Introduction

‘Sexual harassment’ is a relatively recent term, dating back only as far as the 1970s, and its definition is still evolving. Sexual harassment can be carried out by persons of any gender, and persons of any gender may be victims. Although harassment of students by staff is often the focus of discussions, departments need to be aware that power differentials of this sort are not essential to sexual harassment. Sexual harassment may occur between any members of the department. Departments should attend equally seriously to harassment committed both by students and by staff, as both can have dramatically negative effects on particular individuals and on departmental culture. Departments should also be aware that sexual harassment may interact with and be modified by issues of race, ethnicity, religion, class and disability status.

There is good evidence that the proportion of incidents of sexual harassment that get reported, even informally, in UK philosophy departments is very low, and that this has created serious problems for some staff and students. We therefore urge even those staff who do not believe that harassment is a problem in their own departments to give serious consideration to the recommendations below.

Sexual harassment (EU): The EU defines ‘sexual harassment’ as ‘unwanted conduct related to the sex of a person occur[ring] with the purpose or effect of violating the dignity of a person, and of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment’. This includes both harassment related to sex (e.g. hostile and

dismissive though not sexual comments about women) and harassment of a sexual nature. Harassment related to sexual orientation or gender identity is often also considered to be sexual harassment. Note that sexual harassment, so defined, is not limited to one-to-one interactions but may include e.g. general comments made in lectures or seminars that are not aimed at an individual.

UCD's definitions (taken from the Policy on Dignity and Respect) of harassment, sexual harassment and racial harassment are here:

"5.2 HARASSMENT is defined as any act or conduct which is unwanted and unwelcome and which could reasonably be regarded as offensive, humiliating or intimidating on any of the following discriminatory grounds: gender, civil status, family status, sexual orientation, religion, age, disability, race, or membership of the traveller community.

The following are common but not exclusive examples of harassment -

- Treating people less favourably or subjecting them to ridicule on any of the nine grounds.*
- Demeaning and derogatory remarks, name-calling.*
- Isolation, non co-operation or exclusion within the workplace.*
- Unwelcome comments on appearance.*
- Unwarranted criticism of work performance.*
- Undermining the authority of a colleague in the workplace.*
- Production, display or circulation of offensive material.*

5.3 SEXUAL HARASSMENT is defined as unwanted and unwelcome conduct which could reasonably be regarded as sexually or otherwise on the gender ground, offensive, humiliating or intimidating. Sexual harassment undermines the dignity of the recipient, and adversely affects work or study performance. The following examples are some of the most common forms of sexual harassment -

- Sexually suggestive jokes or comments.*
- Innuendo or jokes about a person's sexual orientation.*
- Questions or insults about one's private life.*
- Unwelcome sexual attention.*
- Display of offensive material.*
- Leering, offensive gestures or whistling.*
- Threats of or actual, physical assault.*
- Groping, patting or unnecessary touching.*
- Suggestions that sexual favours may further someone's career, or that refusal may damage it.*

5.4 RACIAL HARASSMENT

Harassment on the grounds of race/ethnic origin is defined as unwanted or unwelcome conduct based on a person's race which is offensive to the recipient and which might threaten a person's security or create a stressful, hostile or intimidating work or study environment. Harassment on the grounds of race may include -

- Verbal harassment: offensive jokes or remarks about a person's race or*

ethnic origin (including membership of the traveller community), ridicule or assumptions based on racial stereotypes.

- *Visual harassment: Production, display or circulation of materials offensive to particular racial or ethnic groups, such as cartoons or racial propaganda.*
- *Physical harassment: physical assault, threats of physical assault.”*

Recommendations

Availability of information and advice

- All members of the department—undergraduates, postgraduates, academic and non-academic staff— should be made aware of the regulations that govern sexual harassment in their university. In particular, they should know the university’s definition of ‘sexual harassment’ and who to contact in possible cases of sexual harassment. They should also know who has standing to file a complaint (in general, and contrary to widespread belief, the complainant need not be the victim). They should be made aware of both formal and informal measures available at their university. Departments may wish to consider including this information in induction sessions for both students and staff, and in training for teaching assistants.

The link to the University policy on "dignity and mutual respect"

(<http://www.ucd.ie/t4cms/UCD's%20Dignity%20&%20Respect%20Policy.pdf>) should be inserted as an appendix into the graduate student handbook. We should also include a link to UCD School of Philosophy’s code of good practice document currently under preparation. These regulations could also be referred to during induction events and similar.

- Where the University or Faculty has a list of Harassment Contacts, all staff – including non-academic staff – and students should be made aware of it. It is very important for department members to be able to seek advice outside their department.

The list of support colleagues in the College of Social Sciences and Law and the University can be found here:

<http://www.ucd.ie/t4cms/D&R%20Colleagues%20-%20Bios%20v5.pdf>

This should be advertised to staff and students in the same ways as the Dignity and Respect policy outlined in the previous bullet point.

- All of the information listed above should be made permanently available to staff (including non-academic staff) and students, e.g. through a stable URL and/or staff and student handbooks, rather than only in the form of a one-off email communication.

See above.

- The HOS and others with managerial responsibilities (such as the Postgraduate and Undergraduate co-ordinators) should have full knowledge of university procedures regarding sexual harassment.

Departmental culture

- The School should take seriously the harms of an atmosphere rife with dismissive or sexualizing comments and behaviour.
- The School should – from the top down – cultivate an atmosphere in which maintaining a healthy climate for all School members, especially those from under-represented groups and including non-academic staff, is considered everyone’s responsibility.
- The School should – from the top down – cultivate an atmosphere in which maintaining a healthy climate for all department members, especially those from under-represented groups and including non-academic staff, is considered everyone’s responsibility.

The School committee for Women in Philosophy will continue to exist and the chair of the committee will report to the School Committee, which will have Women in Philosophy as an agenda item. In years to come, the School should consider conducting a more systematic climate survey of staff and/or PG and/or UG perceptions (e.g. Based on the Rutgers Climate Survey) to provide an evidence base for further reflection on - and, if necessary, action concerning - the School climate.

- The department should ensure that those raising concerns about sexual harassment are, as far as possible, protected against retaliation.

Those raising such concerns should keep one of the School’s support colleagues from another School informed. He/she will then liaise with the HOS or others as appropriate. The importance of keeping the support colleague informed of any concerns about the harassment should be written into the relevant handbooks.

- Departments may want to give bystander training either to staff, or to staff and postgraduates, if this is available or can be made available by the institution. This can help bystanders to feel comfortable intervening when they witness harassing behaviour. (See the Good Practice website for more information.)

The School should encourage UCD Learning and Development to initiate Bystander training.



Caregivers

Introduction

Staff members and students with caregiving responsibilities—whether parental or other—face constraints on their time that others often do not. There are simple measures that departments can take to minimize the extent to which caregivers are disadvantaged.

For further information on the BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme, please see our general guidance notes on the BPA Good Practice website (bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice).

The School will foster a climate in which its academics, administrators and postgraduates feel perfectly comfortable and at absolutely no disadvantage in expressing their care-giving responsibilities. The School will, as a priority, take those responsibilities into account in order to ensure that care-givers can participate fully in the management of the School and as much as is practically possible in the intellectual life of the School.

Recommendations

- Schedule important events, as far as possible, between 9 and 5 (the hours when childcare is more readily available). When an event has to be scheduled outside of these hours, give plenty of advance notice so that caregivers can make the necessary arrangements.

Heads of School should restrict School meetings, including sub-committee meetings, to times that are manageable to care-givers, and with some consultation with care-givers

as to what those times are. Organizers of workshops/conferences should try when feasible to schedule all papers to these times too. The School committee should review on an annual basis the need to schedule the weekly Invited Speaker seminars at 5 p.m.

- Events should not be scheduled on weekends, unless this is absolutely unavoidable, and to show consideration to staff members whose care-giving responsibilities may make their attendance or participation difficult.
- Be receptive, as far as possible, to requests from staff of any gender for part-time and flexible working. (This is largely, but not exclusively, an issue for caregivers—requests from non-caregivers should also be taken seriously.) Also be receptive, as far as possible, to requests for unpaid leave.

As stated in the UCD Employee Booklet (2011), 'UCD supports a number of work-life balance policies such as job-sharing and part-time working which may be availed of subject to operational requirements and the support of your School or Unit.' UCD has a Parental Leave Policy. UCD offers unpaid leave opportunities geared towards parental responsibilities.

- Try, as far as possible, to take caregiving commitments into account when scheduling teaching responsibilities.

The care-giving responsibilities of teaching staff should be accommodated by the School when scheduling teaching. During planning the Head of School and the School Administrator will use information from each member of School on those possible needs, and will endeavour to meet those needs within the overall framework of the timetable and the individual's teaching commitments.

- Be aware that students, not just staff, may have caregiving responsibilities. Have a staff contact person for students who are caregivers. Take student requests for caregiving accommodations seriously.

There is some flexibility in choosing tutorial groups and the undergraduate administrator will accommodate students with care-giving responsibilities wherever possible. Lecture time-tabling cannot take care-giving responsibilities into account, though all lectures are on weekdays between 9 and 5. Module co-ordinators should make all possible accommodations to ensure that students with care-giving responsibilities can complete their course requirements.

- Make sure that parental leave funds provided by the university are actually used to cover for parental leave.

New University policy – October, 2016 – puts in place a system to guarantee paid maternity leave and to cover costs of temporary replacement staff. There is no possibility of the School using funds intended for parental leave for any other purpose.



Staff-student relationships

Introduction

Romantic or sexual relationships that occur in the student-teacher context or in the context of supervision, line management and evaluation present special problems. The difference in power and the respect and trust that are often present between a teacher and student, supervisor and subordinate, or senior and junior colleague in the same department or unit makes these relationships especially vulnerable to exploitation. They can also have unfortunate unintentional consequences.

Such relationships can also generate perceived, and sometimes real, inequalities that affect other members of the department, whether students or staff. For example, a relationship between a senior and junior member of staff may raise issues concerning promotion, granting of sabbatical leave, allocation of teaching. This may happen even if no preferential treatment actually occurs, and even if the senior staff member in question is not directly responsible for such decisions. In the case of staff-student relationships, questions may arise concerning preferential treatment in seminar discussions, marking, decisions concerning postgraduate funding, and so on. Again, these questions may well emerge and be of serious concern to other students even if no preferential treatment actually occurs.

At the same time, we recognise that such relationships do indeed occur, and that they need not be damaging, but may be both significant and long-lasting.

We suggest that departments adopt the following policy with respect to the behaviour of members of staff at all levels, including postgraduate tutors.

Recommendations

- The department's policy on relationships between staff and students (and between staff) should be clearly advertised to all staff and students in a permanent form, e.g. intranet or staff/student handbooks. The policy should include clear guidance about whom students or staff might consult in the first instance if problems (real or perceived) arise.

Relevant sections of this document should, where possible, be included in the different handbooks published by the School, including the Supervisor's guidelines, graduate students handbook and the tutor handbook. Reference to this policy should be part of new tutor training at the start of each academic year.

Staff and postgraduate teaching assistants should be informed that relationships between teaching staff at all levels and students are discouraged, strongly and especially at undergraduate level and between supervisors and supervisees.

If such a relationship does occur, even when it is perceived to have been of short duration, the School insists on a policy of disclosure and withdrawal. The member of staff in question should inform a senior member of the School – preferably the HOS (in confidence) – as soon as possible. In the case of a relationship between a tutor and a student, the module co-ordinator must be informed too. The member of staff should withdraw from all assessment involving the student and from writing references and recommendations. Tutors should withdraw from teaching the student's tutorial group.

It should be made clear to staff and students that if an undergraduate student has entered into a relationship with a member of staff (including a tutor), while the responsibility for taking the above steps lies with the member of staff concerned, the student is equally entitled to report their relationship to another member of staff (e.g. Head of School, if appropriate), and to request that the above steps be taken. Other staff members and students are encouraged to do the same if it is clear that the issue is persisting unreported.

Academic staff

Between members of academic staff where there is a large disparity in seniority (e.g. senior staff/temporary lecturer; Head of School/junior lecturer):

- Disclosure of any such relationship should be strongly encouraged, in order to avoid real or perceived conflicts of interest.
- Any potential for real or perceived conflicts of interest should be removed.



Research projects

Introduction

Large-scale (and normally externally funded) research projects often engage in activities that fall within the scope of the Good Practice Scheme – hiring staff, running conferences, and so on.

Recommendations

The School applies all the policies described above to research projects based in the School – in particular with respect to hiring policy, the running of conferences, workshops and seminar series, and with respect to caregivers.