

**Making environment and health equal, diverse, and
inclusive:
Reflections from a Centre of Environment and Human
Health
The (REACH) Project**

<https://www.ecehh.org/research/reachproject/>

May 2022

*This work was supported by the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC)
[2021EDIE025Fleming]*



Abstract/Executive Summary

The European Centre for Environment and Human Health (ECEHH; www.ecehh.org) (a WHO Collaborating Centre) in the University of Exeter Medical School has a strong track record of interdisciplinary research and training around environment and human health interconnections, working with diverse communities locally and internationally. Although there has been a health and environment inequalities theme to Centre research, only recently have Centre members begun to critically examine issues of intersectionality, diversity, inclusion, colonisation and racism in both research/training activities and the Centre culture. Currently, the Centre members (and the environmental sciences) are predominantly white able-bodied privileged persons; in general, the ECEHH research and training activities have lacked an informed focus on decolonisation and racism in environment and health.

The Reflections from a Centre of Environment and Human Health (REACH) Project was funded under the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) Making environment and health equal, diverse, and inclusive Programme. The Project members, supported by the project Advisory Board, undertook to begin reflecting on their research and the Centre work culture through a lens of decolonisation and anti-racism. The Reach Project members reviewed the past decade of Center research publications as well as other resources in anti-racism and decolonisation in environment and human health. They collaborated with an external consultancy, INCLUDED (<https://www.included.com>) to create an anonymised online survey administered and analysed by INCLUDED. Individual interviews with members of the Centre were conducted to explore power dynamics and inequalities experiences and approaches to incorporate a critical, decolonial and anti-racist sensitivity. The Health and Environment Public Engagement (HEPE) Group began its own explorations; and a programme of speakers (including Advisory Board members) was produced, as well as REACH Project drop-in sessions and dialogue workshops with the Centre. The processes and findings will be shared with other national and international institutions working on environment and human health.

The REACH Project has allowed the Centre to take initial stock of current and future research and training as well as the Centre culture through a lens of decolonisation and anti-racism. However, we believe that the activities of the NERC funded REACH Project are only the beginning for the Center and for other national and international institutions working on environment and human health.

Background

For over a decade, the European Centre for Environment and Human Health (www.ecehh.org) (a.k.a. ECEHH and the 'Centre') in the University of Exeter Medical School (Cornwall UK) has led interdisciplinary research, training and other activities around the interconnections between the environment and human health (<https://youtu.be/2nTXzNsKcRE>). In a relatively short time, the Centre has gained international recognition in a number of research and training areas, including: Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) in the environment; Nature, Biodiversity and Health; Communities and social inequalities; Food systems and Planetary health; Climate change and health; and Blue environments and health.

To increase the relevancy and sustainability of these activities, the Centre has always tried to interact with diverse¹ community partners including Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), Small to Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs) and other businesses, government agencies, and international research institutions, as well as the ongoing collaborations with the Health and Environment Public Engagement (HEPE) Group (<https://www.ecehh.org/about-us/engagement/>). These partnerships have become increasingly more global and diverse over the past decade, including being designated a World Health Organisation (WHO) Centre in Natural Environments and Health (<https://www.ecehh.org/about-us/who-cc/>).

Various Centre members have increasingly been interested in the need to consider all the activities of the Centre as they relate to health and environment inequalities, intersectionality, racism, and colonialisation. To that end in early October 2021, a small group of Centre researchers in collaboration with a Project Advisory Board successfully applied for pilot funding from the UK Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) (<https://www.ukri.org/opportunity/making-environmental-science-equal-diverse-and-inclusive/>) to review the Centres culture, research, training and other activities.

The making environmental and health equal, diverse, and inclusive: **Reflections from a Centre of Environment and Human Health (REACH) Project** (<https://www.ecehh.org/research/reachproject/>) began in December 2021 with £100,000 funding from the UK Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) through May 2022. The Centre members involved had interdisciplinary backgrounds with varying amounts of relevant expertise/knowledge and time working at the Centre and in academia. The Advisory Board (including one international member) had significant experience and roles within the University and beyond in inequalities, intersectionality, racism and colonisation in research, training and other activities (**Appendix: Reach team members plus**). In addition, the REACH Project team was supported by the external impact-led diversity and inclusion (EDI) consultancy, INCLUDED (<https://www.included.com>) and interacted with the Health and Environment Public Engagement (HEPE) Group (<https://www.ecehh.org/about-us/engagement/>).

¹ ¹In some contexts, this is defined as individuals from more than one social, cultural or economic group and specifically around race and cultural backgrounds

The **REACH Project Aims** included:

- To understand the extent to which the ECEHH has considered the relevance of colonisation, race and racism and intersectionality in research, curriculum and working practices
- To consider and learn from the ways environmental sciences and health sciences are (de)colonising, and how research institutions have protocols and practices to ensure they are anti-racist and inclusive
- To influence research agendas, education and employment processes
- To have an open and evolving process that privilege input from people with lived experience and expertise in intersectionality, decolonisation and anti-racism, and allow space for reflection, learning/unlearning and dialogue

The project **values** included:

- To centre well-being and care for the whole person in their complexities
- Kindness and compassion
- Commitment to critical thought and reflexivity
- Reflection and action (should be at the forefront of anti-racist and/or decolonial practice).
- Non-horizontal organisation as much as possible; challenging power dynamics through democratisation of decision making

Planned activities and methods

In the original Project Proposal (**Appendix: Original Proposal**), a number of activities were proposed to try to: 1) gather data on the past and current Centre research, training and other activities; and 2) provide information and expertise for moving forward towards better understand and applying the ongoing process of intersectionality, decolonising and anti-racism both within and beyond the Centre in the future.

These proposed activities included:

- **Outreach activities**

The aim was to open up spaces at ECEHH for a diverse range of speakers (including academics and non-academics) to come and discuss their work with colleagues at ECEHH, especially where and/or decolonial and anti-racism lenses are used within the work or praxis.

- **Resources Review**

The Resources Review was a non-systematic review led by Beth Roberts which aimed to utilise already produced knowledge around decolonising academic spaces to inform Centre practices going forwards. In particular, we hoped to identify existing strategies of implementing decolonisation practices within institutes similar to the ECEHH. From these resources, recommendations and reflective questions could be produced. Another aim of the review was to create a library of further reading for Centre members to utilise for their own learning, both personally and professionally, when writing grants, teaching and undertaking research. These resources will hopefully support individuals within the Centre to consider their own areas of research through the lens of decolonisation.

To achieve these aims, an initial literature search was conducted by Morwenna Rogers, an information specialist working within the Evidence Synthesis Team at the NIHR funded Peninsula Applied Research Collaboration (PenARC). This produced an extensive list of resources which were categorised into those relevant to the review, and those relevant for further reading (**Appendix Resource Search**). The abstracts were used to identify which resources would be most useful for the Centre, and papers were chosen for reading based on perceived relevance. Notes on each paper were taken, and new resources were added from the initial resources. Resources were also added using new searches e.g. for 'decolonisation AND': 'environment and health'; 'environmental science'; 'quantitative AND environment'; 'environmental justice'; 'decolonising spaces' and 'indigenous AND': 'environment and human health'; 'environmental science'; 'relational spaces'.

- **Publications**

We were curious about several aspects of the research that had taken place throughout the lifetime of ECEHH led by Dan Derbyshire. In particular, the peer-reviewed publications (co-)authored by people working at ECEHH.

We were especially interested in the following with respect to ECEHH publications;

- The geographic locations where research has taken place (research location)
- The extent to which publications include international collaborators as co-authors (co-author location)

- The extent to which ECEHH research has considered marginalised groups and colonial contexts with their research (marginalisation/decolonisation) as well as related topics such as inequalities

This search was also conducted by Morwenna Rogers. First the search was run on Scopus for the affiliation name with several terms to cover variations². This returned 802 records which were exported into EndNote. For the first 100 records returned in Scopus, each named author from ECEHH was selected. A search was then carried out for each author using their unique Scopus identification number. Publications that did not include ECEHH in the author's affiliation were only added to EndNote if published during or within a year after their contract with ECEHH, and if their affiliation was broadly 'University of Exeter.' After the first 100 records, the remaining names of ECEHH researchers were combined with the affiliation, and then author IDs searched separately in combination with the affiliation 'Exeter'. Other affiliation words were tested, e.g. 'knowledge spa', 'Truro' and 'Plymouth' in combination with the author names but made no additional finds. An institution search was also run in MEDLINE and CAB Abstracts, then deduplicated against the EndNote library³. A total of 962 individual records attributable to ECEHH authors were found and saved to EndNote of which 897 came from Scopus, 46 from MEDLINE and 5 from CAB Abstracts (**Appendix Publications Search**).

For the keyword frequency analysis, specific search terms were constructed in the EndNote library that include several terms to cover variations of language (e.g., and operate across multiple fields (e.g., title or abstract) where appropriate. Groups and group sets were created in EndNote to collate these various search terms. The results of these search terms were then converted into an Excel file for use in data reporting and visualisation.

A piece of software called VOSviewer was used to create interactive keyword co-occurrence maps. A thesaurus file was created to combine similar terms such as human and humans or women and female.

▪ **INCLUDED Survey**

We thought it was important for Centre members to have an opportunity to consider the key areas of intersectionality, colonisation and racism within the Centre culture as well as in their own research, teaching and other activities in a confidential space. To that end, INCLUDED was added to the Project as an outside EDI expert with experience evaluating inclusivity within diverse (or not) workplaces. With input from INCLUDED, the team (including the Advisory Board) created a bespoke online anonymised survey (**Appendix REACH INCLUDED Survey**).

There were extensive and useful discussions around the following: the most appropriate way to ask, for example, one's race, ethnicity and/or cultural background (ultimately in the spirit of intersectionality, kept open ended; this meant that data summarising was done by INCLUDED); the evidence for using certain questions around safety; and the difficulties with anonymisation when relatively low participant numbers and open ended answers as well as other issues.

The University of Exeter College of Medicine and Health (CMH) Research Ethics Committee was consulted about the Survey; since it was anonymised, online and administered and analysed by the

² (AFFIL ("european centre" OR "european center") AND AFFIL (environment*) AND AFFIL ("human health") OR AFFIL (ecehh))

³ 1) (European adj (centre or center)).in.; 2) (environment* and "human health").in.; 3)1 and 2; 4) ecehh.in.; 5) 3 or 4; 6) (exeter or truro).in.; 7) 5 and 6.

outside Consultancy, formal ethics approval was not deemed to be necessary by the Ethics Committee. The REACH team did not have access to the survey data, only to the Final Report prepared by INCLUDED.

The survey was distributed online over a 2 week period to a current list of Centre members as well as to Centre members who had left the University with several recruitment emails (**Appendix Centre emails for Survey**). In addition, the team initiated 30 minute Zoom drop-in sessions open to all Centre members to answer any questions or concerns about the survey and/or the REACH Project more generally; in general these sessions were well attended with far ranging discussions and reflections, and thus continued for the rest of the Project.

- **Ethics and Interviews**

An ethics proposal led by Olivia Barnett-Naghshineh for both individual interviews and small group focus groups was created for the College of Medicine and Health (CMH) in the University of Exeter with extensive input from the REACH project team and advisory board. There was also considerable and valuable input from members of the European Centre as well as other discussions and feedback from the Ethics Committee. In addition, the Ethics Proposal was discussed with the HEPE Group (see below for further discussion). The Ethics Proposal was finally approved by the CMH Ethics Committee (Ethics Application ID: 513281) in mid April 2022 (**Appendix Ethics Proposal**).

Ultimately there was not enough time to pursue the small group focus groups, only the individual interviews. These interviews were performed solely by Olivia Barnett-Naghshineh (although arrangements had been made for a member of the Advisory Board, Riahd Ghemmour, to interview if any interviewee felt uncomfortable being interviewed by a current Centre ECR employee).

The aim of the interviews was to garner what kinds of intersections currently exist within the Centre, what kinds of power dynamics and inequalities are experienced by people of different positionalities and what kinds of approaches could be taken within the Centre to incorporate a critical, decolonial and anti-racist sensitivity. The interviews served as a reflexive exercise where through dialogue with different employees, it was discussed what aspects of their work could be harnessed to consider the role of race and coloniality in more depth in the matters they are already looking at. Through these dialogues, practical tools and approaches were co-designed between the interviewer and the ECEHH member.

In order to protect the individual interviewed, the Ethics covered matters of anonymity and confidentiality, therefore only Olivia Barnett-Naghshineh knew who had interviewed and only she had access to the transcripts; only the generalised feedback from the interviews were shared more widely with the research team.

Other ethical issues included ensuring that the interviewer and the participants would have sufficient avenues for emotional and mental health support in case of any difficult issues arising. Because the ECEHH is a small community, the most important thing was taking confidentiality and discretion about what people share very seriously, especially considering the existing power dynamics and the precarious employment conditions for the majority of people working at the Centre.

- **HEPE**

Health and Environment Public Engagement (HEPE) is a network of critical friends who frequently engage with researchers, students and staff from the Centre led by Kath Maguire. They support research prioritisation, planning and dissemination and teaching. As part of their work with

researchers and medical students, HEPE have frequently discussed the role of racism and gender bias in health inequalities as well as diversity in health environments research. The REACH project provided a vehicle to further develop these discussions.

Olivia Barnett-Naghshineh and Lora Fleming joined online HEPE meetings to give an overview of REACH work being undertaken with Centre staff, including the Ethics proposal, and to discuss how members of the public could contribute. HEPE held a one day workshop with 15 people which included discussion of intersectionality, racism, sexism and the continuing impacts of histories which included unresolved consequences of colonialism and the transatlantic slave trade.

Results

The REACH team worked collectively, collaboratively and as far as time and resources permitted in a non-horizontal fashion albeit with people paid on different contracts and time commitments. Weekly meetings aimed to prioritise establishing a relational dynamic that could foster open communication and through weekly check-ins, reflections and a rotating chair sought to encourage participation from all members of the project regardless of status or position. The Advisory Board provided fundamental feedback on research design, as well as signposting the significance of a mindful anti-racist practice and ensuring personal reflections on whiteness and power were continuously enacted.

The REACH Project group met weekly for 1 hour as well as many additional discussion and task-focused meetings; the majority of these meetings took place online using Zoom. The Advisory Board members attended meetings on a regular basis, as well as multiple other interactions and individual presentations on their areas of expertise with discussions and presentations for the wider Centre through the mechanisms of the weekly Centre seminar series.

From the beginning, the project team tried to create an atmosphere conducive to respectful but free-ranging discussions as well as taking into account the different individual experiences and expertise. For example, each weekly REACH Project meeting started with asking how each individual was feeling, passed around among the meeting participants; and where possible each meeting ended with individual reflections and a close out. In addition, the position of meeting chair was rotated among all the project members and Advisory Board.

High level minutes were taken in general by Em Squire and shared among Project and Advisory Board members not able to attend. Towards the end of the Project, all Project members were encouraged to reflect on their Project experience (**Appendix Reflectional for REACH members**); it was up to each individual as to whether these (or other) reflections were shared or not with others.

▪ Outreach activities

Throughout the project, the REACH team gave frequent updates on the progress of the project. There were two primary foras within ECEHH that were used for these activities: (1) The ECEHH Centre Meeting, a monthly meeting for discussing organisational and procedural aspects of ECEHH as a research centre operating within a wider university environment; and (2) The ECEHH Seminar Series, a weekly seminar that consists of either one or two presentations by ECEHH members or affiliated colleagues either internal or external to the university.

We invited members of our Advisory Board and other experts to present periodically over the 6 months of the REACH Project on their research and other expertise in Centre seminars. We also included short updates in the monthly Centre meetings. When the INCLUDED Survey was being

disseminated online, we initiated drop in sessions continued for the rest of the Project. All these interactions took place online. Two final Dialogue and Reporting REACH Project Workshops were held open to the Centre with a review of the findings and time for discussion and short breakout groups; INCLUDED presented their findings at one of these Workshops (**Appendix ECEHH REACH Presentation 190522 and 260522 and INCLUDED REACH presentation**). There were also activities conducted by HEPE (see below).

A full list of these REACH Project activities can be seen in the **Appendix List of Events**.

- **Resources**

From the resources gathered and reviewed, a summary was produced outlining some key findings around important topics such as whiteness, hostile environments and decolonisation. These provide some initial key learnings for the Centre. Second, recommendations made by the resources which were appropriate for the Centre were gathered, and reflective questions included in the resources were tailored for the Centre. Finally, a resources library was produced including useful and important literature around decolonisation, indigenous knowledge, environmental justice etc. for use by the Centre in their personal learnings and to sign-post people to reading materials when they are writing grant and research proposals, creating methodologies and writing papers (**Appendix Resources Library**).

Some of the key themes that came through from the literature resource are around: whiteness; the difficulties of discussing ethnicity, race and cultural backgrounds; power dynamics; and EDI vs decolonisation. Whiteness could be considered the first step in the decolonisation journey. Because white, particularly white cis males, are considered as the default human, then often we (white people) have not had to consider our own whiteness, what white culture is, and the ways in which whiteness operates in order to maintain systems of oppression and racism. One of the key learnings from the resources review is regarding interest convergence, which suggests that '*Whites will advance the cause of racial justice only when doing so coincides with their own self-interest*' (Bell 1980,523). Athena SWAN is an example of an EDI practice that has mostly benefitted white middle class women (Bhopal 2018). Under this premise, white people will only accept the advancements for people of colour when their own interests and power are not threatened.

Becoming aware of our whiteness is therefore crucial to the understanding of how it impacts the educational system we work in, our teaching, our research, our culture and our structures. This process is likely to bring up difficult and uncomfortable feelings, and this is completely normal. It is important to sit with those feelings, and to process them, to ensure that you are not further centering whiteness in your actions and responses.

One of the challenges for people of colour, particularly those working in predominantly white institutions, is that when people bring up the topic of racism, it is met with discomfort. People who bring this topic up are perceived as being hostile, and there is a fear around alienating your colleagues who do not have lived experience of racism. Another challenge for people of colour is that there is a need to continuously provide proof that racism and racial inequalities are occurring. This means that they are investing energy in justification rather than in challenging the individuals or the systemic causes of these issues (Bhopal and Pitkin 2020).

Power dynamics are very important to consider within a working environment, and particularly within the University. Power dynamics exist at a number of levels: structural hierarchies exist at the University level; within teams; in meetings; between academic and professional services roles; academic hierarchies; between researchers and research subjects; and with interpersonal dynamics.

If these power dynamics are left unconsidered, then those in power may dominate conversations, decision making and idea creation. This means that voices are not being heard, and this disproportionately impacts people of colour. One way of addressing power imbalances is for teams to reflect on where the power lies to understand: “*who has power, who lacks power, and how power manifests relationally*” (Hattery et al., 2022).

Decolonisation has become a buzzword within society and particularly within Universities. There have been many student-led movements such as “Rhodes Must Fall Oxford” (Joseph-Salisbury 2019), and “Why Is My Curriculum White?” (Doharty et al., 2021). But within University staff, there is still confusion and lack of knowledge around what decolonisation means. This, and other factors, has led to it being integrated into the remit of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) (Liyange 2020). Whilst it is important to ensure decolonial work is systemic, conflating it with EDI practices is misguided and takes the focus of decolonisation away from restructuring the processing, teaching and research practices within the University. This conflation with EDI leads staff members to perceive activities such as decolonising the curriculum and getting rid of the attainment gap for Black students as the sole purpose of decolonisation (Liyange 2020). Therefore, more education and awareness of what decolonisation actually means are required in university settings before decolonial work can be undertaken in a way that is not short-term and tokenistic (**Appendix Resources Review Recommendations**).

▪ Publications

We explored the database of 962 peer reviewed publications by people affiliated to ECEHH; it was created to be shareable and may be of future use more widely for ECEHH colleagues.

VOSviewer was used to produce keyword and title/abstract co-occurrence maps that are interactive and easily shareable. These maps can be used to see the most commonly occurring keywords, as well as the keywords that co-occur most frequently. This is done separately for the keywords and the contents of the titles/abstracts of the publications. A link to an interactive example can be found here ([Interactive Abstract and Title Word Co-occurrence Map](#)). There was a gradual trend over the 10+ years from more clinical towards more public health and qualitative terminology in the keywords.

Quantitative keyword analysis was undertaken using EndNote. Search terms (including synonyms where appropriate) were developed collaboratively by the REACH team during a series of online meetings. Socio-demographic characteristics beyond age and gender are rarely used in the title, abstract or keywords of ECEHH publications. ECEHH research has taken place in a number of locations throughout the world (though predominantly in Europe), and ECEHH colleagues have frequently co-authored publications with international collaborators (**Appendix Publication Report**).

▪ INCLUDED Questionnaire

In total, 50 individuals completed the survey, providing ~50% response rate. This is in line with most organisations INCLUDED works with: on average, they receive a response rate of approximately 47%.

To protect the anonymity of respondents, INCLUDED only reported on groups of at least 10 respondents. As such, they were able to report results disaggregated by:

- Age
- Gender identity
- Disability
- Role/Staff position
- Employment contract type

- Tenure in academia
- Tenure at ECEHH

Due to small numbers, they could not report any results disaggregated by:

- Sexual orientation
- Race/Ethnicity

Key Findings:

1. Centre members believe that anti-racism and decolonisation are important to include in their work, but their lack of knowledge of how to incorporate it into their research/teaching prevents them from taking steps to do so.
2. ECEHH is quite inclusive overall and generally psychologically safe (especially compared to the medical school and wider university), but it is not very diverse (particularly for ethnicity and sexual orientation).
3. Perceptions of transparency and objectivity in decision-making are quite low, particularly for promotion, termination, and remuneration decisions.

Next Steps:

1. Conduct workshops or seminars focused on HOW to practically incorporate decolonisation and anti-racism into research and teaching.
2. The Centre should conduct a review from an anti-racism and inclusion lens of promotion, termination, and remuneration processes where possible.
3. Additional efforts should be made to diversify the Centre – and to identify the reasons why the Centre is so non-diverse in some demographic areas

The short presentation of findings and the complete Final Report of INCLUDED can be found in the Appendix (**INCLUDED ECEHH Presentation** and **INCLUDED Final Report**).

▪ **Interviews**

The interviews fed into the resource review as well as being informed by dialogue with the Advisory Board who added analytical insights into what kinds of inequities exist within the university due to ethnicity, race, gender, disability and social class. Recommendations for the Centre were informed by the interviews, the Advisory Board's expertise, the INCLUDED survey and the resource review.

Using ethnographic methods of interviewing, which involves having a clear interview schedule but allowing the conversation to be personal, dialogic and free-flowing. Over 8 interviews were carried out alongside having informal conversations and dialogues in personal conversations and drop-in sessions during the project.

During these interviews, a range of people from different positions within the ECEHH and different disciplines, genders, social backgrounds and ethnic identities participated. To maintain confidentiality and anonymity, nothing more specific can be said about these, but it provided a clear and interesting range of opinions and perspectives on the questions asked (**Appendix Interview Schedule**). The interviews provided a space for honest and frank dialogue between Olivia Barnett-Naghshineh and the interlocutors; and feedback their challenges and suggestions back into themes for discussion and feedback to the broader ECEHH (**Appendix Interview Report**).

▪ **HEPE**

The immediate results from the HEPE work included:

- 3 video shorts reflecting different visions for inclusive and decolonising health environments research (with more currently underway)
- Planning for further local partnership work with Rice and Peas CIC, the Radical Learning Cooperative Lanivet Parish Council and Cornwall Pride
- 3 new HEPE network members

It has also been agreed to co-design a proposal with National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) School for Public Health Research (SPHR) public engagement partners nationally to look at the different challenges to inclusion and decolonisation in public engagement, comparing urban and rural/costal settings.

A summary of these activities can be found in the **Appendix HEPE-REACH Report**.

Conclusions

The NERC funded REACH Project has allowed the Centre to take initial stock of current and future research and training as well as Centre culture through a lens of decolonisation and anti-racism. However, we believe that the activities of the NERC funded REACH Project are only the beginning for the Center and for other national and international institutions working on environment and human health.

- *Recommendations/Learnings*

In many of the **Appendices**, there are additional important learnings for future activities and actions that the Centre and its members can take around increasing diversity, anti-racism and decolonisation in research/training in environment and human health and beyond, both within the Centre and with their current and future collaborators as well as within the Medical School and wider university. Some of these over-arching recommendations include:

Process

- Engage in ongoing reflection around the continuous practice of inclusion, anti-racism and decolonisation as both individuals and the group. Use the reflexive questions at the end of the REACH Resource Review as prompts
- Do not rush and be kind to ourselves and others. Taking small, continuous steps is better than doing one big thing and stopping
- As a team, we can consider what power we each have and how this shows up in meetings and collaborations. We can commit to taking steps to address imbalances
- Consider a rotating chair, and check-ins at the start of meetings. This creates opportunities for all voices to be heard, and for us to connect as humans

Knowledge

- Seminars on whiteness, racism and colonisation to continue as part of the ECEHH seminar series
- Unconscious bias and allyship training, as part of a longer term commitment to learning and unlearning about whiteness, racism and colonisation
- Use the REACH Resource Summary and Resource Library as starting points to support with our learning on racism and anti-racist practices

- Centre the knowledge and experiences of people of colour to ensure policies and actions are not white washed or tokenistic. Note, this does not mean seeking out colleagues of colour and asking them to educate us, or assuming that colleagues of colour will want to take part
- Hire a person of colour with expertise in decolonial and anti-racist practices to support the ongoing work of the Centre in updating curriculum and research practices
- Utilise Indigenous and Western knowledge together

Collaborations

- Acknowledge and challenge power imbalances and work in dialogue to create more equitable partnerships, especially in international collaborations. Consider impacts of colonialism and white supremacy in such partnerships
- Reflexive dialogue between international collaborators and UK partners that enable feedback without negative consequences for partners
- Cultural differences discussed early in the project to ensure cultural sensitivity throughout
- Connect with the academics and scholars through the Exeter Decolonising Network

Appendices

- Project Members, Advisory Board, INCLUDED
 - Reach team members Plus
- Original project
 - Original Proposal
- Outreach activities
 - ECEHH REACH Presentation 190522 and 260522
 - List of Events
 - Reflectional for REACH Members
- Resources
 - Resource Search
 - Resource Library
 - Resources Review Recommendations
- Publications
 - Publications Search
 - Publications Report
- Centre INCLUDED Survey
 - REACH INCLUDED Survey
 - Centre emails for Survey
 - INCLUDED ECEHH Presentation
 - INCLUDED Final Report
- Ethics Protocol
 - Ethics Proposal
- Interviews Summary
 - Interviews schedule
 - Interviews Report
- HEPE
 - HEPE-REACH Report