



## **BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme**

### **General guidance**

#### **About the scheme**

Following the publication in 2011 of the BPA/SWIP Report, *Women in Philosophy in the UK* ([www.bpa.ac.uk/uploads/2011/02/BPA\\_Report\\_Women\\_In\\_Philosophy.pdf](http://www.bpa.ac.uk/uploads/2011/02/BPA_Report_Women_In_Philosophy.pdf)), the BPA/SWIP Committee for Women in Philosophy is pleased to launch its Good Practice Scheme. This involves a batch of policy documents, covering:

- Gender bias
- Conferences and seminar series
- Sexual harassment
- Staff-student relationships
- Caregivers
- Research projects
- Learned societies
- Journals

The Good Practice documents, along with some links to relevant further information, are available on the BPA Good Practice website ([bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice](http://bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice)).

The documents have been approved by both the BPA and SWIP Executive Committees. Each lists a range of recommendations. The documents collectively cover departments (or equivalent units), learned societies, journals, and large-scale research projects based in the UK and Ireland. (Henceforth, please read 'department' as a generic term covering all of the above.)

Departments are requested to consider the relevant Good Practice documents in a departmental committee meeting (or equivalent), and to decide whether or not to adopt the relevant Good Practice policy.

### **Adoption of Good Practice policies: procedure**

Where a department adopts a particular Good Practice policy, the Head of Department (or chair of learned society, lead journal editor, etc.) is requested to:

- (a) ensure that this is formally minuted in the meeting at which the decision is taken,
- (b) devise an agreed implementation plan (see below) including a specific timetable for implementation, and
- (b) inform the BPA, so that a list of subscribing departments (learned societies, journals) is publicly available on the BPA's website.

Departments may also wish to note publicly that they have adopted the relevant policy (e.g. on an appropriate webpage, in staff or student handbooks, etc.); please feel free to use the Good Practice Scheme logo. However, if you do not sign up to *all* of the policy documents, you should make it clear in anything you say publicly (e.g. in wording accompanying the logo) which policies you have adopted.

The BPA/SWIP Women in Philosophy Committee will not monitor subscribing departments', learned societies' or journals' activities; rather, we shall leave it in the hands of the departments (etc.) themselves to ensure that they abide by their own agreed policies.

Departments may wish to include 'BPA/SWIP Good Practice' as an annual agenda item for departmental/executive committee meetings, to ensure that plans have been, and continue to be, implemented.

### **What counts as 'adopting' a Good Practice policy?**

1. Simply *deciding* to implement the recommendations does **not** constitute adoption of the relevant Good Practice policy. There must be a clear plan for actual implementation. This may involve a wide variety of activities, including adding/changing information in student handbooks, changing training or induction sessions for teaching assistants, assigning a particular role to a member of staff, etc. The department should deem itself to have 'adopted' the relevant policy only at the point where a clear plan has been drawn up. This must include a timetable for implementation (e.g. where information in student handbooks cannot be altered until the start of the next academic year).
2. The recommendations vary in their degree of specificity. In some cases, there is considerable flexibility in how the recommendation might be implemented (e.g. the department is merely asked to 'consider ways of' achieving some end). In such cases, we leave it up to departments (etc.) to make their own decision about whether the agreed changes or activities constitute adoption of the policy, since we recognise that different practical constraints will apply to different departments.
3. Similarly, many of the recommendations are open to different interpretations. For example, the Gender Bias document states that hiring panels should include at least

one woman unless ‘there are exceptional practical reasons why this is impossible’. Interpretations of ‘exceptional’ (not to mention ‘practical’ and ‘impossible’) may differ both between and within departments. In such cases, we simply leave it up to departments to interpret the recommendations for themselves.

4. We recommend that, where a department wishes to adopt a Good Practice policy in the sense described above, the HoD takes the bullet-pointed list of recommendations and supplements each bullet point with a clear list of changes or activities that the department intends to carry out in order to implement the recommendation, together with a clear timetable for completion. (The Good Practice documents are also available as Word documents from the website to facilitate this.) They may, of course, wish to delegate this task to the chair of a sub-committee – perhaps involving student and TA representatives. The resulting document should be approved at a departmental meeting and made available to all relevant people (including e.g. administrative staff and teaching assistants where necessary), so that it is easy to check whether the department has kept to its timetable and, thereafter, is continuing to adhere to its own policy.
5. We appreciate that not all groupings of philosophers in UK and Irish HEIs have any formal status (as a ‘department’ or ‘discipline area’ etc.), and that departments are bound by their own institutions’ existing policies and procedures. Hence there may be some recommendations that a particular department or group does not have the power either (a) to formally endorse or (b) to implement. In such cases, the group in question will be deemed to subscribe to the policy if (re (a)) it has ensured that the policy adopted is known and informally agreed by all members of the group, or (re (b)) it has adopted as many of the Good Practice recommendations as it reasonably can, given any impediments posed by its lack of formal status.
6. Where a grouping of philosophers is within a larger unit with other disciplines there are two ways that the policies might be adopted. It might be that only the philosophers decide to adopt the policies (in so far as this is possible for a non-departmental group; see (5) above). In this case, they count as adopting the policies only for the philosophers, which should be made clear in all documentation. However, it might be that the larger group decides to adopt the policies. In this case, the mixed unit counts as having adopted the policies.

#### **A note on dissemination of information**

Many of the recommendations involve informing relevant people about policies, procedures, etc. We have not specified how this should be done, but the spirit of the recommendations is that the relevant people should actually find this information out, and not merely that they could in principle get hold of it if they made a considerable effort to do so. We request that departments think carefully about how the relevant information is transmitted to colleagues and students. In general, including information in staff, student and teaching assistant handbooks is a good way of ensuring that the

information is available not just to existing staff and students but to future ones as well. In the case of learned societies, some information will need to be transmitted to applicants for conference funding and to conference organisers.

Please bear in mind that many of the potential problems that the Good Practice recommendations aim to address apply much more widely than just to the ways in which members of permanent academic staff interact with students (or each other). Issues such as gender bias and harassment apply across the board, to undergraduate, PGT and PGR students, teaching assistants, support staff, postdocs, and any honorary, visiting or emeritus staff as well as permanent academic staff.

This makes it especially important that departments think carefully about how information about policies and procedures is transmitted/made available.



## **BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme**

### **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 our general guidance notes on the BPA Good Practice website ([bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice](http://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\\_2ndEd.pdf](http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/BiasBrochure_2ndEd.pdf).)
- 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.

- Departments should agree specific hiring criteria (and their weighting) in advance and stick to the agreed criteria (and weighting).
- As far as possible, departments should strive to allow sufficient time for non-rushed consideration of job applications.
- 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.

### **Teaching**

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

### **Promotions and appraisals**

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

### **Research Excellence Framework**

- Departments should make sure that those involved in REF selection know about the workings of unconscious bias, and also that they are fully informed of REF policies regarding leave for caregiving.
- Departments should consider anonymising outputs that are under review when deciding which to include.

### **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 worth 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.

- 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. See below.
- 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 (see the link on bystander training in the Good Practice document on sexual harassment).

### **Some suggested ways of breaking down gender stereotypes**

- Aim to ensure that a specified minimum number of publications by women appear on all course reading lists and/or are set as required seminar reading.
- Ensure that pictures of women philosophers are in a prominent position e.g. on the departmental website and on walls. These might be, for example, past or present members of staff or past visiting speakers. The APA have some posters for sale, available at [www.zazzle.com/apacsw](http://www.zazzle.com/apacsw).
- Adopt an official departmental ‘seminar conduct’ policy. See the BPA Good Practice Website, under ‘Conferences and seminar series’, for some specific proposals you might consider implementing. These include such proposals as a ‘one question per question’ rule, having brief break prior to the question period, and giving priority to those who rarely speak.
- List academic staff on the website/in student handbooks alphabetically rather than in order of seniority.

More suggestions, along with links to further information (e.g. relevant literature) can be found on the BPA Good Practice website. If your department has done anything that has worked well, please let us know so that we can add it to the list of suggestions on the website.



## **BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme**

### **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](http://feministphilosophers.wordpress.com/gendered-conference-campaign).

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](http://bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice)).

Please note: Although these recommendations are directed at departments, conference organisers are urged to consider the suggestions below even if their departments have not adopted these policies.

#### **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. Women may well be at lower-prestige institutions and/or in lower-ranked jobs. (E.g. in the UK, only 12% of professors in Russell Group philosophy departments are women.) They may therefore have less access to institutional funding. 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.
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.
  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.
  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.



## **BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme**

### **Sexual harassment**

#### **Introduction**

‘Sexual harassment’ is a relative 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.

*Sexual harassment (your institution)*: Institutional definitions of ‘sexual harassment’ differ greatly from one another. Some institutional definitions focus solely on sexual conduct, while others include also include non-sexual harassment related to sex.

While departments need to attend to their institution’s definition of ‘sexual harassment’, and to make use of institutional procedures where appropriate, this is not the end of their responsibilities. Where sexist or sexual behaviour is taking place that contributes to an unwelcoming environment for women (or other groups), departments should act whether or not formal procedures are possible or appropriate.

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](http://bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice)).

## **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.
- Where the University or Faculty has a list of Harassment Contacts (see e.g. [www.southampton.ac.uk/diversity/how\\_we\\_support\\_diversity/harassment\\_contact\\_s.page](http://www.southampton.ac.uk/diversity/how_we_support_diversity/harassment_contact_s.page)), all staff – including non-academic staff – and students should be made aware of it. If no such list exists, the department should consider suggesting this approach to the university. It is very important for department members to be able to seek advice outside their department.
- All members of staff should read the advice given at [www.oed.wisc.edu/sexualharassment/guide.html](http://www.oed.wisc.edu/sexualharassment/guide.html) on how to deal with individuals who approach them to discuss a particular incident.
- 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.
- The HoD and others with managerial responsibilities (such as Directors of Postgraduate and Undergraduate Studies) should make sure that they have full knowledge of university procedures regarding sexual harassment.

### **Departmental culture**

- The department should take seriously the harms of an atmosphere rife with dismissive or sexualizing comments and behaviour. (It is worth noting, however, that the right way to deal with this may vary. For more on this, see Saul, ‘Stop thinking (so much) about “sexual harassment”, available on the Good Practice website.)
- The department 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. What this entails will vary from person to person and situation to situation. But at a minimum it includes a responsibility to reflect on the consequences (including unintended consequences) of one’s own behaviour towards women. It may also include a responsibility to intervene, either formally or informally. (For more on the range of responses available, see Saul, *op. cit.*)
- The department should ensure that those raising concerns about sexual harassment are, as far as possible, protected against retaliation.
- 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.)



## **BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme**

### **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](http://bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice)).

#### **Recommendations**

Departments should adopt an explicit policy concerning caregivers, which covers as many of the following points as is practically possible:

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

- Make sure that students and staff are made fully aware of any university services for caregivers.
- Make sure that staff have an adequate understanding of what caregiving involves. (E.g. don't expect a PhD student to make lots of progress on her dissertation while on maternity leave.)
- Make sure that parental leave funds provided by the university are actually used to cover for parental leave.
- Those involved in decisions about the REF should be fully informed about current REF policies regarding output reduction for caregivers. Currently, there are specific policies related only to mothers; but other caregiving may be taken into account through making a specific case.



## **BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme**

### **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.

Please note that the recommendations below are not intended to be read legalistically. Individual institutions may have their own policies, and these will constitute formal requirements on staff and student behaviour. The recommendations below are intended merely as departmental norms, and to be adopted only where not in conflict with institutional regulations.

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](http://bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice)).

### **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.

### **Undergraduate students**

- Staff and postgraduate teaching assistants should be informed that relationships between teaching staff and undergraduates are very strongly discouraged, for the reasons given above.
- If such a relationship does occur, the member of staff in question should:
  - inform a senior member of the department – where possible, the HoD – as soon as possible;
  - withdraw from all small-group teaching involving that student (in the case of teaching assistants, this may involve swapping tutorial groups with another TA), unless practically impossible;
  - withdraw from the assessment of that student, even if anonymous marking is used.
  - withdraw from writing references and recommendations for the student in question.
- 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 TA), 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 Department, if appropriate), and to request that the above steps be taken.

### **Graduate students:**

- Staff and graduate students should be informed that relationships between academic members of teaching staff and graduate students are very strongly discouraged, especially between a supervisor and a graduate supervisee.
- If such a relationship occurs between a member of staff and a graduate student, the member of staff should:



- inform a senior member of staff – where possible, the HoD – as soon as possible;
  - withdraw from supervising the student, writing letters of recommendation for them, and making any decisions (e.g. distribution of funding) where preferential treatment of the student could in principle occur;
  - in the case of PGT students, withdraw from all small-group teaching involving that student, unless practically impossible;
  - in the case of PGT students, withdraw from the assessment of that student, even if anonymous marking is used.
- As much as possible, the Department should encourage a practice of full disclosure in the case of such relationships' continuance. This avoids real or perceived conflicts of interest, as well as embarrassment for others.

### **Academic staff**

Between members of academic staff where there is a large disparity in seniority (e.g. senior staff/temporary lecturer; Head of Department/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 by, e.g., removal of the senior member of staff from relevant decision-making (e.g. promotions, appointment to permanent positions).



## **BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme**

### **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. We recognise that some such projects may wish to sign up to the scheme independently of (or in addition to) the departments of the project's investigators; this document allows this by, in effect, pulling together the relevant recommendations from the other Good Practice documents.

The term 'management team' below is used to refer to whoever takes overall responsibility for the project. This might be the PI, the PI together with co-investigators, or some larger group.

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](http://bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice)).

#### **Recommendations**

##### **Hiring panels**

- Management teams 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\\_2ndEd.pdf](http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/BiasBrochure_2ndEd.pdf).)
- Management teams 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.

- Management teams should agree specific hiring criteria (and their weighting) in advance and stick to the agreed criteria (and weighting).
- As far as possible, management teams should strive to allow sufficient time for non-rushed consideration of job applications.
- Management teams 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.

#### **Conferences and seminar series**

- Management teams should implement all of the recommendations in the 'Conferences and seminar series' document.

#### **Caregivers**

- Where members of the project team (including research students) have caregiving responsibilities, the management team should implement all of the relevant recommendations in the 'Caregivers' document.

#### **Publication of edited collections**

- Large research projects often produce edited collections as outputs. The editorial team should take steps to ensure that women are well represented amongst the contributors to any such collection.

#### **Advisory boards, research students and other associated people**

- Where the research project involves the formation of an advisory board, visiting fellowships, PhD studentships, etc., the management team should take concrete steps towards ensuring that women are well represented amongst the members/applicants.



## **BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme**

### **Learned societies**

#### **Introduction**

As national bodies with some influence, especially when it comes to philosophy conferences and journals, learned societies are well placed to make a concrete difference to the representation of women in philosophy. We suggest that learned societies adopt the following policy.

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](http://bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice)).

#### **Recommendations**

##### **Executive committee and officers**

- Learned societies should ensure that a reasonable proportion of women are nominated for positions on their executive committees and for official positions (President, Secretary, etc.).

##### **Conferences**

- Where learned societies organise their own conferences and seminar series, they should follow the relevant BPA/SWIP Good Practice recommendations (1(a)-(e)) on conference organisation.
- Where learned societies distribute funding to others to organise conferences and seminar series, they should make it a requirement of funding that the conference organisers follow the relevant BPA/SWIP Good Practice recommendations (1(a)-(f)) on conference organisation.
- Learned societies should consider adopting a formal policy on chairing

seminars/conference sessions, for their own events and/or for those that they fund. See the BPA Good Practice website, under 'Conferences and seminar series', for some specific proposals you might consider implementing.

- Learned societies should monitor the gender balance of conferences and seminar series that they fund. Where a conference or seminar series manifests an obvious gender imbalance, the learned society should make enquiries about the steps taken to promote the representation of women, in order to satisfy themselves that appropriate steps were taken by the organisers.

### **Journals**

- Where a learned society runs a journal, the Executive Committee should review its editorial policies and implement the proposals contained in the BPA/SWIP Good Practice document, 'Journal Editors/Editorial Boards'.



## **BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme**

### **Journal editors/editorial boards**

#### **Introduction**

Publication in philosophy journals plays a major role in the reputation and career progression of their authors, as – to a lesser extent – does participation in the selection process through membership of editorial boards, refereeing, etc. The recommendations below aim to ensure that, as far as possible, women are not disadvantaged in either capacity by their gender. Anonymity in the refereeing process is especially important here, given the well-documented potential for unconscious bias (see ‘Further Information’ below).

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](http://bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice)).

#### **Recommendations**

- The Editorial Board (or appropriate alternative) should review the extent to which the editorial and refereeing processes are anonymous. If any stage of the process is not anonymous, the Board should consider whether to introduce anonymity, and should only agree not to do so if there are very good practical reasons not to.
- The Editorial Board (or appropriate alternative) should seek to ensure that there is a reasonable proportion of women both on the Board itself and amongst the journal’s pool of referees.
- The Editorial Board (or appropriate alternative) should consider having, and making available to referees, an explicit editorial policy on refereeing; there is an example, from the journal *Cognition*, on the Good Practice website. Such a policy might also include specific requests concerning anonymity, e.g. that referees do not google paper titles, and that they alert the editor prior to refereeing the paper if they know or have a strong suspicion about who wrote it.