



IGBE – Resources for CLD – 30th November 2022

A consultation response to Improving Gender Balance and Equality Group at Education Scotland on resources for CLD practitioners on embedding gender equality and intersectional practice.

Data Guide

4. How easy was the data guide to use? (later questions provide space for comments)

3 out of 5 stars because the questions are clear, but some terms are not defined.

5. To what extent did/will the different sections in the data guide support your practice?

Introduction

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

Participation

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

Personal learning and achievement

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

Health and wellbeing

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

Workforce and volunteer development

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

References

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

6. How effectively do you think the data guide links to multiple inequalities and provides a foundation for exploring these further? For example, has it

helped you to think about the impact that gender and ethnicity combined may have on participation, achievement or progression in CLD?

Zero Tolerance is an organisation that focuses on the primary prevention of men's violence against women and girls (VAWG) by tackling its root cause: gender inequality. We have several strands of work focused on children and young people, including co-chairing the Scottish Government's Gender Based Violence in Schools Working Group and sitting on the Gender Equality Taskforce for Education and Learning. We have produced resources for practitioners, including 'Gender Equal Play' for the early years, and Under Pressure, a bespoke programme on gender equality and healthy relationships for youth workers. This has given us valuable experience in communicating about gender equality with practitioners in an accessible way.

Overall, we are pleased to see a strong emphasis on intersectional approaches in the 'Using the Data Guide' section – this gives a clear framing of the importance of taking this approach to data collection. However, as this approach will be new to many CLD practitioners, we would recommend that the document define all the terms it uses and give examples to improve clarity. Where the section encourages users to consider 'which boys' and 'which girls,' it would be helpful to give examples of questions they might ask themselves and service users, such as 'What are girls of colour experiencing?' 'What is it like for disabled girls of colour?' 'What about queer, disabled girls of colour?' The term 'disaggregate' needs to be defined and explained – it may be understood by social researchers, but not all CLD practitioners will have come across it before.

On page two, one paragraph reads: 'The story behind the data: Data, of course, does not in itself improve outcomes. Careful interrogation of the data can be used to identify underlying patterns and, crucially, to inform dialogue about what is creating and upholding those patterns. Those deeper improvement questions are likely to include reflections on unconscious gendered expectations.' (pp. 2) This paragraph could be made easier to understand. There is a lot of jargon, and it tries to explain a lot in a short space. It is one example of a place where the document could be simplified to be more usable for practitioners who will have had varying experience with this sort of language.

To improve the accessibility and usability of this resource, a worked example of a small dataset which has been disaggregated by gender and other factors (such as race and class) would be helpful. It can be challenging to understand the journey from a raw dataset to useful data, particularly if we are asking practitioners to add a layer of intersectional analysis. Giving an example (even with a pretend dataset) to show the process step by step would make clearer what is being asked of them and how they can achieve it.

Despite the strong emphasis on intersectionality at the outset of the Data Guide, this emphasis somewhat dwindles as the document goes on. Throughout the sections, data examples given should be disaggregated by more than gender and SIMD – more data on the intersection of race and gender, disability and gender, and on the intersection of at least three characteristics, would be beneficial to give readers an example of what good, disaggregated data looks like. In the section on Health, only gender is mentioned, which does not give the full picture as race and class have strong impacts on health outcomes.

7. How effectively do you think the data guide is/will be in supporting your service / organisation to make long term realistic changes to policy and practice that addresses inequalities and gender balance?

The 'Reflect' questions are useful for encouraging practitioners to consider the role of gender in their practice. However, we suggest providing more guidance on how to turn the reflection and data collected into action to improve services and practice. Data without action does not serve a real purpose. If the data guide is not the place for guidance on action, it could refer to other resources.

8. Do you have any suggestions for changes to the data guide?

The term 'disaggregate' needs to be defined and explained – it may be understood by social researchers, but not all CLD practitioners will have come across it before.

On page two, one paragraph reads: 'The story behind the data: Data, of course, does not in itself improve outcomes. Careful interrogation of the data can be used to identify

underlying patterns and, crucially, to inform dialogue about what is creating and upholding those patterns. Those deeper improvement questions are likely to include reflections on unconscious gendered expectations.’ (pp. 2) This paragraph could be made clearer by saying: ‘Careful consideration of the data can be used to pinpoint underlying patterns and, importantly, to inform conversations about what creates and maintains these patterns. This will likely include reflections about our unconscious gendered expectations in order to make significant and widespread improvements across a range of activities.’

In the section on ‘Personal learning and achievement,’ one piece of evidence used reads: ‘There is a recognised “gender gap” in use of the outdoors.’ We would suggest that this be further explained – what is the gender gap? Which gender/s have more access to the outdoors? Stating that there is a gender gap is not that helpful unless the text also explains what the gap is.

In the ‘Workforce and volunteer development’ section, it would be beneficial to add a question around whether, how many, and how CLD staff are trained on gender in/equality. This kind of data would be useful internally, but if it were collated nationally would also benefit organisations like Zero Tolerance who work to influence how practitioners are trained.

In the same section, there is a ‘Reflect’ question which reads: ‘Is your organisational culture accepting, welcoming accessible and safe for people of all genders?’ If this resource is aimed at those at managerial level, it is important to consider how power and hierarchy may impact the way this question is answered. It is vital that in this section and throughout the resource, users are reminded that they themselves may not be the best person to answer questions such as this. If the user is privileged in terms of gender, race, class, disability, sexuality, et cetera, their answer may be very different to staff members who face different and intersecting oppressions. Therefore, we would suggest that the Data Guide would also benefit from distinguishing between questions which are appropriate for individual reflection, and those which would merit qualitative research.

Self-evaluation Framework

9. How easy was the self-evaluation framework to use? (later questions provide space for further comments)

4 out of 5 stars – I think this document is actually very good!

10. To what extent did/ will the self-evaluation framework support your practice?

Introduction

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

Leadership and direction

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

Performance and outcomes

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

Management and delivery

- Very effective

- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

Links to additional supports and resources

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

National Performance Framework

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

Bibliography

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

Action Plan

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective

- Very ineffective

11. How effectively do you think the self-evaluation framework links to multiple inequalities and provides a foundation for exploring these further? For example, has it helped you to think about the impact that gender and disability combined may have on participation, achievement or progression in CLD?

As with the Data Guide, it is encouraging to see a strong emphasis on intersectionality in the introduction. However, this emphasis must be maintained throughout the document. Currently the focus tends to fall back to gender in isolation, particularly in the blue text.

12. How effective do you think the self-evaluation framework is /will be in supporting your service/ organisation to make long term realistic changes to policy and practice that address inequalities and gender balance?

The introduction of the framework is useful in providing the right framing for practitioners to be able to make changes in their service/organisation. It is encouraging to see an explanation of unconscious bias and the impact of differential treatment, and a note that one-off interventions are less effective than embedding change across practice, attitudes and environments. It may be beneficial to add an explanation of the fact that young people learn most from the behaviour of adults rather than what they are told (Fawcett Society, 2020) in order to emphasise the importance of CLD practitioners modelling gender equality through their own actions.

In the main sections of the framework, it is good to see examples of what success would look like. However, there should be more emphasis on what steps can be taken to achieve this success. This could be done through increased information about indicators and how to measure them. The indicators should be neutral statements so it is easier for them to be measured. For example, they should include language like the 'level of', staff 'ability to' or 'number of' so they can be effectively measured on more than one occasion. For example:

- **Overall outcome:** Our vision, values, aims and objectives promote equality, diversity and inclusion.
- **Indicator:** All staff report understanding of equity vs equality.
- **Measurement:** X number of staff report understanding the difference between equality and equity.
- **Indicator:** Most practitioners report a positive change in their response to gender and other multiple imbalances.
- **Measurement:** Practitioners provide examples, best practice, case studies that demonstrate positive change in their response to gender and other multiple imbalances.
- **Indicator:** Staff at all levels report using increased responsibility and implementation that drive improvements gender and other equalities.
- **Measurement:** Staff provide examples of best practice and case study examples.

If this document is not the place to support with developing actions, then we would suggest that other resources should be referred to more clearly. As the focus of this document is evaluation, it would be beneficial to include more evaluation methods so that users can understand not only what information they are looking for and what success would look like, but *how* to make those measurements.

In the leadership section specifically, the document should be explicit that organisations should be aiming for a 50:50 gender split in most cases.

References

Fawcett Society (2020) Unlimited Potential: Report of the Commission on Gender Stereotypes in Early Childhood. Available:
<https://www.fawcettsociety.org.uk/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=17fb0c11-f904-469c-a62e-173583d441c8> [Accessed 24/11/2022]

13. Do you have any suggestions for changes to the self-evaluation framework?

There are some overall reflections for how the self-evaluation framework could be improved. Firstly, the document should clarify at the beginning who it is meant for. Some of the suggestions in blue text read as though they are for practitioners as they use practice examples, and others read more as being for managers or those with strategic oversight of the whole service. Different people at different levels have distinct responsibilities when it comes to embedding gender equality into practice. We would recommend that there needs to be a clear indication of who the document is for, and if it is for a mix of people the recommendations should be split into those on practice and those on running the service, with equal emphasis on both.

On each page the evidence boxes are very small. Gathering evidence is one of the most important parts of any robust evaluation process. This should therefore be given more physical space, and perhaps include guidance on what kinds of evidence should be included.

In terms of the challenge questions, many of them are best answered by the most marginalised staff or service-users, not those in positions of power or those with privilege. We would suggest that users of the guide should be reminded of this, and questions for personal reflection should be distinguished from those which merit qualitative research.

There are also a number of specific suggestions for specific pages:

On page three it reads: 'Research suggests that the intersect between gender, class and race may make it particularly difficult for a Black, working-class young woman, for example, to access and progress in science. (ASPIRES 2, 2020)' (pp.3). The word 'intersect' should read 'intersection.'

On page three it reads: 'A gender pay gap exists in the CLD workforce in Scotland and women are overrepresented (75%) (Working with Scotland's Communities, 2018) Scotland's overall mean gender pay gap currently sits at 13% (Close the Gap, 2020) The

gender pay gap for women with disabilities can be as high as 18.9% depending on the impairment. (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2018)' (pp.3). It is useful to say that there is a gender pay gap, but it is not useful in the absence of information of which gender is paid more. It would be good to make this explicit.

On page three when exploring the impacts of gender equality, it would be good to include some statistics on the rates of violence against women and girls (VAWG). VAWG is a direct cause and consequence of gender inequality and making the link between the two is vital. You can find out more about this on the Zero Tolerance website.

On page four it reads: 'There is, of course, nothing inherently wrong with making choices along gendered lines, but stereotypical male or female behaviour may potentially be problematic if wellbeing and opportunities in life are limited because of preconceived notions regarding gender roles.' (pp.4) This phrasing implies that there are no negative consequences of gender stereotypes. This may not be how it is intended, but it could be read that way or taken out of context. Instead, we would suggest phrasing it as, 'Whilst some children and young people may genuinely enjoy activities typically associated with their gender, this can often be because they have not had the opportunity to try other options due to gender stereotypes. Gender stereotypes are problematic because they limit wellbeing and opportunities in life.'

On page five it reads: 'This framework focuses largely on gender equality, but it is important to bear in mind that no social identity category exists in isolation of others. Reflection and planning will need to consider how gender intersects with poverty, race and disability, for example. Finally, it is important to consider which girls/women and which boys/men each issue will affect most pointedly through an awareness of wider inequalities and ensure the needs and experiences of all learners are taken into consideration.' (pp.5) It would be helpful to give examples of questions they might ask themselves and service users, such as 'What are girls of colour experiencing?' 'What is it like for disabled girls of colour?' 'What about queer, disabled girls of colour?'

On page nine it reads: 'Policies are regularly reviewed to ensure they reflect a zero-tolerance approach towards sexism, transphobia, homophobia, biphobia or incidences of sexual harassment and/or sexual abuse.' (pp.9) It would be good to add racism to this sentence. Sometimes harassment can be sexual harassment and racism at the same time.

On page twelve it reads: 'Data relating to access of provision is disaggregated by gender to analyse and evaluate whether access is equitable.' (pp.12) In order to maintain the emphasis on intersectionality laid out at the beginning of the document, this should read: 'Data relating to access of provision is disaggregated by gender and its intersection with other factors such as race, disability, sexuality and class to analyse and evaluate whether access is equitable.'

On page thirteen it reads: 'We can demonstrate we have increasing numbers of participants from under-represented communities or groups.' - (pp.13) We would recommend changing 'under-represented' to 'marginalised.' This is because it could be groups with privilege who are underrepresented because services are targeting the most marginalised, which is a good use of resources.

On page thirteen it reads: 'We work well with partners to identify gender-based barriers, including using Equality Impact Assessments, and take a collaborative approach to inclusion.' (pp.13) Identifying barriers will not affect change unless practitioners also make a plan for how to overcome them. We would therefore recommend that this line reads: 'We work well with partners to identify gender-based barriers and solutions, including using Equality Impact Assessments, and take a collaborative approach to breaking down barriers to ensure inclusion.'

On page seventeen it reads: 'Practitioners are experienced and well supported by leaders in building respectful, inclusive, trusting and equitable relationships with communities. As a result, practitioners' relationships with communities include an appropriate balance of relevant challenge and support, including around gender equality where appropriate.' (pp.17) We would recommend removing the phrase 'where

appropriate' - gender has an impact on every part of CLD practice, and thus is always relevant, even where people might not realise it, or its impact is more subtle.

There are some additional resources we would recommend including:

- Link to ZT specific pages on CYP rather than whole website:
<https://www.zerotolerance.org.uk/work-young-people/>
- Equally Safe at School: <https://www.equallysafeatschool.org.uk/>
- Jane Ellis and Ravi Thiara (2014) Preventing Violence Against Women and Girls: Educational Work with Children and Young People
- Rape Crisis Scotland National Sexual Violence Prevention Programme , delivered locally by Rape Crisis centres across Scotland:
<https://www.rapecrisisscotland.org.uk/files/rcs-preventing-sexual-violence-sample-version1.pdf>

In the action plan it may be useful to add a box for which marginalisations and intersections are being tackled by the action. This will help ensure that users continue to emphasise intersectionality and not fall back to considering gender alone.

14. Have you plans to embed IGBE development in CLD service improvement planning?

15. Do you think professional learning will be required before using the data guide and/ or self-evaluation framework? Or can they be picked up and used without prior professional learning to explore underlying issues?

As different CLD practitioners will have different levels of understanding on a range of topics mentioned in both of these resources, it is important that they are released alongside training. Both introductions are strong on the importance of gender. However, a few paragraphs or pages of reading are not enough to undo a lifetime of gendered socialisation. Therefore, specific training to help unpick practitioners' own bias is vital and should be mandatory for all CLD practitioners.

Specifically, the Data Guide requires existing data literacy which not everyone will have. Moreover, it asks users to undertake intersectional data analysis, which is hugely important, but is not even consistently done by social researchers yet, so specific training on this will be necessary. It would be helpful to make the Self Evaluation Guide simpler and less intimidating by simplifying what indicators should be used.

On a broader note, it would be helpful for the data gathered as part of this project to be collated nationally so that Education Scotland, COSLA, and organisations like Zero Tolerance can use it to inform policy on gender equality in CLD. In order for this national data to be meaningful, its collection would need to be mandatory, and very well supported and resourced.