

# The Network Newsletter: tackling social exclusion in libraries, museums, archives and galleries

Number 199, September 2017

(Formerly published as *Public Libraries & Social Exclusion Action Planning Network Newsletter*, issue 1, May 1999 – issue 29, September 2001)

The Network's Website is at [www.seapn.org.uk](http://www.seapn.org.uk) and includes information on courses, good practice, specific socially excluded groups, as well as the newsletter archive.

---

## Contents List

### Tackling social and digital exclusion – Government, Government Agencies and Local Government

- *What works? Eight principles for meaningful evaluation of anti-prejudice work* – page 2

### Tackling social and digital exclusion – Other Agencies

- *The real digital divide?* – page 4
- *Islamophobia: still a challenge for us all* – page 6
- *Equality: making it happen ...* – page 10

### LGBTQ issues – Other Agencies

- *The cost of being out at work ...* – page 11

### Broader issues – Other Agencies

- *Museums environmental framework* – page 12

Abbreviations and acronyms – page 14

---

## Tackling social and digital exclusion – Government, Government Agencies and Local Government

### ***What works? Eight principles for meaningful evaluation of anti-prejudice work***

This new guidance<sup>1</sup> from the EHRC:

“[...] has been developed to help organisations measure the effectiveness of interventions that have been designed to tackle, prevent or reduce prejudice, discrimination, identity-based violence or harassment. Presented as a set of eight principles, the guidance should be used as a planning tool to identify whether a new or existing intervention is working and where there may be opportunities for improvements.” [p2]

Previous research<sup>2</sup> from the EHRC had shown that there was a need for better evaluation of the impact that anti-prejudice interventions were having, and also for greater understanding of why certain interventions were having such an impact, “particularly for organisations that experience challenges and barriers to evaluating the difference they make.” [p5]

“This guidance is concerned with evaluation processes that allow you to measure the difference your work makes to tackling prejudice, discrimination, identity-based harassment or violence in Britain. Knowing if and how your work makes a difference is important. If your work isn’t making a measurable difference, why do it?

This guidance is intended to support improved self-evaluation; that is, evaluation that is planned and conducted by the same organisation that is delivering the intervention.” [p7]

The guidance document sets out the value of evaluation; outlines some of the barriers (such as resourcing; design); suggests ways of achieving ‘good enough’ evaluation; and then lays out a set of principles, arranged in three sections – Designing the project, Planning the evaluation, and Carrying out the evaluation.

The principles are:

- Principle 1: Our decision to make an intervention is based on a robust assessment and specification of the need to make an intervention.

---

<sup>1</sup> Colin Duff and Carol Young. *What works? Eight principles for meaningful evaluation of anti-prejudice work*. EHRC, 2017. Available to download as a pdf (4900 kb) from: [https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/prejudice-unlawful-behaviour-guide-to-evaluation\\_1.pdf](https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/prejudice-unlawful-behaviour-guide-to-evaluation_1.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Dominic Abrams, Hannah J. Swift and Lynsey Mahmood. *Prejudice and unlawful behaviour: exploring levers for change*. EHRC (Research Report 101), 2016. Available to download as a pdf (2760 kb) from: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/research-report-101-prejudice-and-unlawful-behaviour.pdf>.

- Principle 2: We are clear about the difference we wish to make through our intervention.
- Principle 3: We have reason to believe that the intervention we propose to deliver will produce that difference.
- Principle 4: We are clear about the nature of the data required to demonstrate that we have made a difference.
- Principle 5: We are clear about the methods we will employ to collect that data.
- Principle 6: We know how we will analyse the data we collect to produce conclusions.
- Principle 7: We know how we will use our conclusions.
- Principle 8: We have assessed and committed the resources required to deliver the evaluation. [Taken from p15]

Each of these principles is expanded to show how it can be used and developed. For example, Principle 7 shows how Nesta's 'standards of evidence'<sup>3</sup> can be applied to assess which standard you have reached:

- "Level 1: You can give an account of impact. By this we mean providing a logical reason, or set of reasons, for why your intervention could have an impact and why that would be an improvement on the current situation.
- Level 2: You are gathering data that shows some change among those receiving or using your intervention.
- Level 3: You can demonstrate that your intervention is causing the impact by showing less impact among those who don't receive the product or service.
- Level 4: You are able to explain why and how your intervention is having the impact you have observed and evidenced so far. An independent evaluation validates the impact. In addition, the intervention can deliver impact at a reasonable cost, suggesting that it could be replicated by (potential) customers and purchased in multiple locations.
- Level 5: You can show that your intervention could be operated by someone else and somewhere else, and scaled up, while continuing to have a positive and direct impact on the outcome, and while remaining a financially viable proposition." [pp31-32]

This is followed by a brief guide to carrying out a stakeholder analysis, and suggestions on how to write an evaluation report.

The guidance concludes:

"This guidance is intended to make evaluation as simple and achievable as possible, and to help organisations to evaluate their interventions in a way that is proportionate and realistic. Everyone reading this guidance is likely to be committed to the reduction or elimination of prejudice. If we don't evaluate well, we'll never know more about what works, and never be able to do better with the resources we have.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ruth Puttick and Joe Ludlow. *Standards of evidence: an approach that balances the need for evidence with innovation*. Nesta, 2013. Available to download from: [https://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/standards\\_of\\_evidence.pdf](https://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/standards_of_evidence.pdf).

We know, however, that evaluation can become complex and hard to manage. You should not be put off by this. If you are still unsure how to go about evaluation, do what you can. Select one or two of the principles to improve and work on them. It's better to improve some of your processes than none at all. Once you feel you've accomplished those, you can look at building on your success by incorporating other elements of this guidance, or some of the other published guidance and support materials available.

What's important is that you can make evaluation work for you, for your organisation, for the people your activity is intended to benefit, and for the sum of knowledge about what works in tackling prejudice." [p38]

This seems a timely and helpful piece of guidance – recommended.<sup>4</sup>

---

## Tackling social and digital exclusion – Other Agencies

### ***The real digital divide?***

This important report<sup>5</sup> was published by the Good Things Foundation in June 2017:

“This new research breaks down the demographics of people who are not gaining full benefit from the internet – either because they're complete non users, or that they're using the internet in a limited way – be it only using one site or a couple of apps, or going online less than once a week.” [p3]

As Helen Milner (CEO) says in the Foreword:

“The demographics of these people don't really come as any surprise. 90% of non users are likely to be disadvantaged – which takes into account poor health and disability, social class and those who left school at 16 or under.” [p3]

Some of the headline statistics are:

- “There are 15.2 million people in the UK who are either non-users, or limited users of the internet
  - An estimated 7.8 million people (14.9%) do not currently use the internet in the UK.
  - A further 7.4 million people (14.3%) in the UK are 'limited users' of the internet, giving a total population of 15.2 million people who are not using the internet to its full potential.

---

<sup>4</sup> Source: MEMO [*Minority Ethnic Matters Overview*], 547, 20 Nov 2017.

<sup>5</sup> Good Things Foundation and Simeon Yates. *The real digital divide? Understanding the demographics of non-users and limited users of the internet: an analysis of Ofcom data*. Good Things Foundation, 2017. Available to download as a pdf (1160 kb) from: [https://www.goodthingsfoundation.org/sites/default/files/research-publications/ofcom\\_report\\_v4\\_links.pdf](https://www.goodthingsfoundation.org/sites/default/files/research-publications/ofcom_report_v4_links.pdf).

- 90% of non-users can be classed as disadvantaged
  - This takes into account the most common indicators - social class DE and being disabled, as well as leaving education at 16 or under.
- Although age is a factor in defining non and limited users, it isn't the only one:
  - 18.9% of under 65s are non or limited users of the internet; a population of approximately 7.5m people.
  - Nearly half (48.9%) of non or limited users of the internet are under the age of 65.
- The most pronounced indicators of non and limited use include age, disability, social class, income and the age at which people leave education:
  - 64.4% of non-users are aged 65 or over: 25.3% aged 65-74; and 39.1% aged over 75.
  - 47.7% of non-users have a disability or long standing health issue.
  - 49.5% of non-users are in DE social class.
  - 44.5% of non-users have an annual household income less than £11,500.
  - 78.3% of non-users left education at aged 16 or under." [p4]

The report then goes on to segment the non-user population. They are defined as:

“Non users are those who do not currently use the internet on any device or connection (281 people or 14.9% of the survey respondents) – estimated as 7.8 million in the UK. [...] 83% do not have access to the internet at home or elsewhere and 16% do have access at home but do not use the internet there or anywhere else. Remaining respondents did not know whether they had access at home. This suggests that 6.4 million people in the UK do not have access at all, and can be classified as offline.” [p7]

In terms of segmentation, the categories looked at include:

- Disadvantage and social exclusion (which includes social class; low levels of basic skills; poor health and/or disability)
- Age
- Annual household income
- Employment status.

There then follows a look at segmenting limited users: they are defined as “[...] those who do very little with the internet, and who do it infrequently.” [p16]

Factors for limited use include:

- Age
- Social class
- Annual household income

- Education
- Disability and/or poor health.
- Employment status

For both categories, there are also regional variations:

“As with the non-user population only, The West Midlands and Yorkshire & Humber regions stand out as those with proportionally high levels of limited and non-users. When focusing on limited users only, we see that the East Midlands stands out with 17.5% and that a significant population exists in the South East region in real terms.” [p21]

Finally, the report identifies some key gaps and area that require further research. These include:

- “Trends within different ethnic groups and any language barriers that may exist;
- Understanding the role of specific disabilities or health conditions - i.e. segmenting the population of disabled people;
- Drilling down into the regional data to understanding more localised ‘non-user hotspots’.

It is clear that there are interconnecting factors between non and limited users, as demonstrated by the high levels of limited users in the South East, but the low proportion of those being non-users. To understand these factors fully, further research would be required at the regional or demographic-specific level.” [p22]

This report is very useful in terms of planning and targeting our services – recommended.<sup>6</sup>

---

### ***Islamophobia: still a challenge for us all***

Runnymede have just published this report<sup>7</sup> to mark the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of their 1997 report, *Islamophobia: a challenge for us all*<sup>8</sup>. A major development has been the redefinition of Islamophobia. In the 1997 report, Runnymede defined it broadly as:

- “Unfounded hostility towards Islam;
- Practical consequences of such hostility in unfair discrimination against Muslim individuals and communities;
- Exclusion of Muslims from mainstream political and social affairs.” [p1]

---

<sup>6</sup> Source: *Good Things Foundation News*, Jul 2017.

<sup>7</sup> Farah Elahi and Omar Khan (eds). *Islamophobia: still a challenge for us all*. Runnymede, 2017. Available to download as a pdf (1400 kb) from: <https://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/Islamophobia%20Report%202018.pdf>.

<sup>8</sup> *Islamophobia: a challenge for us all*. Runnymede, 1997. Summary available to download as a pdf (69.7 kb) from: <https://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/islamophobia.pdf>.

Runnymede now offer a revised definition, in a short and long version:

Definition: Islamophobia is anti-Muslim racism.

This is obviously a short definition. We have also developed a longer-form definition, building on the United Nations definition of racism generally.

Longer definition: Islamophobia is any distinction, exclusion, or restriction towards, or preference against, Muslims (or those perceived to be Muslims) that has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life.” [p1]

The report makes 10 recommendations:

1. The government should adopt our definition of Islamophobia as anti-Muslim racism.
2. Public services but also private and charity sector employers should collect more data on Muslims and other faith/non-faith groups.
3. The government should reintroduce a target to reduce child poverty, and develop a wider anti-poverty strategy. Given that over half of Bangladeshi and Pakistani children live in poverty, and given that the rates of poverty among Muslims generally are much higher than the average, tackling poverty would greatly improve British Muslims’ opportunities and outcomes.
4. Following up on its strong and commendable commitment to collecting race equality data, the government should adopt a wider strategy to tackle those inequalities which particularly affect British Muslims.
5. Employers and employment support organizations should address barriers to equal labour market participation.
6. Race equality, Muslim and other faith-led civil society groups and organizations should work more closely together to build a common platform to challenge all forms of racism and prejudice.
7. Local mayors and Police and Crime Commissioners should ensure appropriate resources are allocated to tackling hate crime effectively at a local level.
8. There should be a full independent and fully transparent inquiry into the government’s counter-terrorism strategy.
9. Full protection of freedom of speech and the freedom of the press is consistent with tackling inaccurate and discriminatory reporting.
10. Tackling Islamophobia is a responsibility for all of us. There is a need for greater awareness of how Islamophobia and all forms of racism affect people’s lives in modern Britain. [taken from pp2-3]

The report is divided into three parts: “Understanding”; “Mapping”; and “Different conceptions of Islamophobia”.

“Understanding” includes:

- The introduction – “What is Islamophobia?”

- “Raceing Islamophobia”, which argues that “[...] it is crucial that we recognize that Islamophobia is not simply ‘a Muslim problem’, that it implicates and affects everyone, and that, importantly, we must build alliances across other minoritized and discriminated people and groups, and all people of good will, to stand against racism in all of its forms.” [p15]

“Mapping” includes:

- “British Muslims: an overview”
- Poverty and the labour market
- Racism and health: “Racism has been argued to be a focal element of ethnic inequalities in health [...], impacting on the health of ethnic minority people through differential exposure to socioeconomic, environmental, psychosocial and healthcare-related pathways. In this chapter we explore the implications of this for the health of Muslim people in the UK, with the intention of illustrating how Islamophobia, racism targeted towards Islam or Muslims, harms the health of Muslim people.” [p31]
- “Impacts of anti-Muslim hate crime”
- An examination of the effects of the Prevent strategy
- “Framing Muslim integration”, which looks briefly at the changing attitudes towards integration (and takes a critical view of some of the reports which put forward the social cohesion arguments)
- “The challenges facing Muslim communities and civic society” – this chapter concludes that: “On critical reflection, Muslim communities and civic society groups and organizations have faced an insurmountably difficult task in trying to address Islamophobia in the two decades since the publication of the original Runnymede report. The socio-political factors that continue to cast a long shadow over this period, combined with the political mechanisms that not only restricted and constrained but also demarcated on the basis of distinguishing ‘good’ from ‘bad’ Muslims through affording political legitimacy to particular groups, created an environment where Islamophobia was far from being a political priority and where Muslims could not meaningfully engage.” [p54]
- “Islamophobia across borders”
- “‘Everyone is a feminist when it comes to Muslim women’: Gender and Islamophobia”

“Different conceptions of Islamophobia” includes:

- “Islamophobia and the Muslim struggle for recognition”, which looks, for example at: “Recognition of course does not mean thinking of Muslims as a group with uniform attributes or a single mindset, all having the same

view on religion, personal morality, politics, the international world order and so on. In this respect Muslims are just like any other group – they cannot be understood in terms of a single essence.” [p66]

- “What’s in a name?”, which examines whether Islamophobia is still the correct term to use
- “Fear, indifference and engagement: Rethinking the challenge of anti-Muslim bigotry”, which argues that:

“Diversity is too often ‘managed’ by putting individuals from minority communities into particular ethnic and cultural boxes, defining needs and aspirations by virtue of the boxes into which people are put, and allowing the boxes to shape public policy. Muslims in particular have come to be seen less as citizens who happen to be Muslim than as Muslims who happen to live in Britain.

At the same time, defining equality in a ‘culturally sensitive way’ has led many to view respect for others as meaning the need to accept their ways of being, and to regard criticisms of, or challenges to, others’ values or practices as ‘insensitive’, even racist. As a result, boundaries between groups have increasingly become policed in an effort to minimize clashes and conflicts.

The one perspective encourages fear, the other indifference. What neither begins to address is the question of engagement. Engagement requires us neither to shun certain people as the Other, with values and practices inevitably inimical to ours, nor to be indifferent to such values and practices in the name of ‘respect’, but rather to recognize that respect requires us to challenge the values and beliefs of others. It requires us to have a robust, open public debate about the values to which we aspire, accepting that such a debate will be difficult, and often confrontational, but also that such difficult, confrontational debate is a necessity in any society that seeks to be open and liberal.” [pp76-77]

- “Islamophobia and antisemitism”
- “The Runnymede Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia: A history”

This is an important report which argues that Islamophobia should be recognised as a form of racism, and, along with other forms of discrimination, should be far more centre-stage in the fight for equality than it currently is. Runnymede have also produced an “Islamophobia” website<sup>9</sup>, with a link to the full report, and to the sections, and also to video testimonies about the effects of Islamophobia on ordinary Muslims<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> See: <https://www.runnymedetrust.org/projects-and-publications/equality-and-integration/islamophobia.html>.

<sup>10</sup> See: <https://www.runnymedetrust.org/projects-and-publications/equality-and-integration/islamophobia/video-testimonies.html>.

The blog<sup>11</sup>, *The prose and the passion*, also carries information about the report, plus a growing round-up of media coverage and other articles.<sup>12</sup>

---

## ***Equality: making it happen ...***

This useful guidance<sup>13</sup> has been produced by the Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education<sup>14</sup>. Although intended primarily for schools, the information in the pack is important, and would be of great value for background reading, training, and general awareness-raising.

The pack contains three sets of cards. The first set reflect some of the Protected Characteristics and includes: Disability (including learning difficulties); Sex and gender identity; Sexual orientation; Culture/Ethnicity; Religion or belief; Pregnancy and maternity; Socioeconomic background (with a note stating that this “[...] is included here on the grounds that it was part of the Equality Bill and remains a significant issue for equality.”)

Each of the cards has, on the front, a list of actions that you can take to ensure good practice (and also, neatly, has a reminder that people do not belong to just one Protected Characteristic – for example: “Whether a young woman is pregnant or is a mother, she has an ethnic, cultural & socioeconomic background, a gender identity, a sexual orientation, may have a religion or belief and may be disabled. We all have multi-faceted identities, some strands of which can change over time.” [Taken from the “Pregnancy and maternity” card])

On the reverse of the card are some statistics; a list of resources (with weblinks); and sources of further information and support.

The second set of cards contains useful background information:

- Examples of Equality Audits for pupils, very young pupils, parents, and staff and governors
- Frequently asked questions – “LGBT equality in education”; “Disability equality in education”; “Ethnicity equality in education”; and “Raising the achievement of all pupils”
- “Equality in education: what UK law says”
- “Learning about equality, diversity and human rights”

---

<sup>11</sup> *The prose and the passion*, 15 Nov 2017, <https://instedconsultancy.wordpress.com/2017/11/15/two-decades-of-islamophobia-awareness/>.

<sup>12</sup> Source: email from The Runnymede Trust, 14 Nov 2017.

<sup>13</sup> Artemi Sakellariadis (ed). *Equality: making it happen – a guide to help schools ensure everyone is safe, included and learning*. CSIE, 2016. CSIE price: £30.00, further details at: <http://www.csie.org.uk/resources/current.shtml#equality2016>.

<sup>14</sup> “Founded in 1982, the Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education (CSIE) is a registered charity and registered company working to promote equality and reduce discrimination in education. Our activities include: support for schools and other education settings; talks, training and consultancy nationally and internationally; research; lobbying and campaigning; and a wide range of resources for schools, local authorities, academy chains, parents and students, including student teachers.” Taken from: <http://www.csie.org.uk/about/index.shtml>.

- “Core (Fundamental) Values”
- “About this guide” – with suggestions on how to use it.

The third set of cards focuses on different aspects of school life, with practical suggestions for action, and, on the reverse, some examples of good practice. These cover:

- Learning Environment
- Leadership
- Behaviour
- Well-being
- Achievement.

There is also a CD with electronic copies of all the materials, plus additional resources, including examples of anti-bullying charters; training programmes; and assemblies.

The pack is gaining international recognition:

“Our 2016 resource continues to attract the interest of teachers and school leaders. "Equality: Making It Happen" is a succinct and user-friendly set of reference cards to help schools reduce bullying, address prejudice and promote equality holistically. It has been sponsored by teachers' union NASUWT, has won an Innovative Practice Award 2016 from the Zero Project, for a world with zero barriers, is being translated into Spanish and Portuguese with more translations in the pipeline and has been complimented in an independent review in Educational Psychology in Practice, the professional journal of the Association for Educational Psychologists.”<sup>15</sup>

This is a valuable resource, and serves as a handy ‘quick guide’ to the Protected Characteristics and to ways of ensuring that approaches to equality are being developed. Recommended.

## **LGBTQ issues – Other Agencies**

### ***The cost of being out at work ...***

The TUC have just produced this new report<sup>16</sup>. As the summary says:

“While the picture that emerges from this report is in many ways a bleak one, the research also indicates some positive experiences for LGBT+ people at work. The report also highlights the role that unions can and do play in supporting and representing LGBT+ workers.” [p5]

<sup>15</sup> Taken from news item 28 Jun 2017: “Happy Birthday CSIE!”, <http://www.csie.org.uk/news/>.

<sup>16</sup> *The cost of being out at work: LGBT+ workers' experiences of harassment and discrimination*. TUC, 2017. Available to download as a pdf (231.11 kb) from: <https://www.tuc.org.uk/sites/default/files/LGBTreport17.pdf>.

Amongst the findings are:

- “Nearly two in five (39 per cent) of all respondents have been harassed or discriminated against by a colleague, a quarter (29 per cent) by a manager and around one in seven (14 per cent) by a client or patient.
- Only a third of respondents (34 per cent) reported the latest incident of harassment or discrimination to their employer, one in eight (12 per cent) reported it to HR.
- Only half (51 per cent) of all respondents are ‘out’ (open about their sexuality) to everyone at work. This falls to just over a third (36 per cent) of young people. Over a quarter (27 per cent) of bisexuals are out to no one.
- Almost half of trans people (48 per cent) have experienced bullying or harassment at work compared to just over a third (35 per cent) of non-trans respondents.” [p4]

The report makes recommendations to the Government; to employers; and to unions. Those for employers are:

- “All employers should have an equality policy in place and this should be updated to include trans workers. This should be rolled out across the organisation so that the whole workforce understands the policy and their role in ensuring the workplace is supportive and free from harassment and discrimination.
- Equality training should be mandatory for all staff and, where possible, this should be delivered by a provider who specialises in this area of equality. This will ensure there is a good understanding of these issues across the organisation so LGBT+ staff, wherever they are, and whatever their grade, are supported.
- Workplace policies should be reviewed, with the relevant unions’ input if there are recognised unions, to ensure that complaints can be resolved in as short a timeframe as possible. It is good practice to engage the recognised trade union when developing these policies or an LGBT+ staff network if the workplace is not unionised.
- Employers should take a zero tolerance approach to all forms of discrimination and harassment. This should include workplace policies and training, including what bystanders can do to challenge harassment. Where such incidents do occur there should be clear disciplinary procedures in place for the perpetrator and support for the victim.
- Employers should develop mentoring and coaching schemes for LGBT+ staff so they are able to access development opportunities and support networks in the workplace.” [p18]

This is an important report – highly recommended.<sup>17</sup>

---

## **Broader issues – Other Agencies**

### ***Museums environmental framework***

---

<sup>17</sup> Source: Gay Business Association *FOCUS Newsletter*, Oct 2017.

This timely guidance<sup>18</sup> has been developed by Julie’s Bicycle<sup>19</sup> with the support of Arts Council England and in consultation with a number of museums and museum organisations.

“Building on a growing body of environmental practice and leadership in the museums’ sector and the broader arts and culture sector, it aims to support UK museums in developing environmental practice and inspire them to use their unique role to foster environmental values, understanding and action with their audiences and communities, by providing:

- an overview of different levels of environmental practice across 12 key themes helping museums to better understand their current environmental practice and inform environmental thinking and action;
- examples of environmental practice demonstrating how museums are adopting environmental practice within their own operations, promoting environmental values and fostering environmental understanding with their audiences and communities;
- a summary of legal, funding and other requirements and standards for museums relating to environmental ambition and practice, from emissions reporting to environmental standards for buildings, and;
- an overview of environmental guidance, tools and networks available to help museums in developing and sharing their environmental practice.” [p2]

The overview of environmental practice covers:

- Values & mission
- Governance & management
- Commitment to action
- Understanding impacts
- Internal communication & engagement
- External communication & engagement
- Visitor & audience engagement
- Buildings & sites
- Collections & exhibitions
- Commercial services
- Finances, investment & fundraising
- Collaborations & partnership.

For each, there is a ‘distance-travelled’ measure:

---

<sup>18</sup> *Museums environmental framework*. Julie’s Bicycle, 2017. Available to download as a pdf (4190 kb) from:

<https://www.juliesbicycle.com/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=76da44fb-2d5e-404b-ae52-13bf05c7b834>.

<sup>19</sup> “Julie’s Bicycle is a charity that aims to inspire the creative and cultural sector to take action on climate change and environmental sustainability, as a sector uniquely placed to transform the conversation around our environment and translate it into action.” [p34]

- Making initial progress
- Well on the way
- Best practice
- Leading the way: best practice +

with a description so you can check where your organisation has reached (and what the next stage should be).

This is all followed by a “Summary of requirements”, ie “What are museums being required, asked or recommended to do on environmental sustainability?” [p24], with a brief description of each item, plus links to key information. An example is:

“Display Energy Certificates (DECs)

If total useful floor area >250m<sup>2</sup> and building frequently visited by public, DEC assessment required to establish A-G rating of **building energy performance and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions** which must be publicly displayed  
Guide to display energy certificates and advisory reports for public buildings, DECC, 2015” [p27, emphasis theirs]

Finally, there is a list of “Tools, guidance and resources”, with links to each, eg:

- “Rural Museums Network ‘turning green’ webpages
- Heritage Lottery Fund Reducing Environmental Impacts: Good Practice Guide
- Historic England range of resources on energy efficiency and historic buildings” [p33]

Very useful practical guidance – recommended.<sup>20</sup>

---

## Abbreviations and acronyms

CSIE = Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education

EHRC = Equality and Human Rights Commission

TUC = Trades Union Congress

---

This Newsletter was compiled by John Vincent, and all items are written by him, unless otherwise stated. Please send any comments or items for the next issue to:

John Vincent  
Wisteria Cottage  
Nadderwater  
Exeter EX4 2JQ

Tel/fax: 01392 256045  
E-mail: [john@nadder.org.uk](mailto:john@nadder.org.uk)

September 2017

---

<sup>20</sup> Source: email from Julie’s Bicycle.