CSIP Working Paper 2024

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in the Private Sector Domestic Grant-Making Philanthropic Lands

September, 2024

Amod Khanna[1]

Centre for Social Impact and Philanthropy, Ashoka University

[1]Amod has been working in the civil society development space for the past three decades. He has worked to strengthen civil society in developing their strategic pathways with a focus on intersectionality of gender, caste, tribe, access, and expressed needs of the communities. His work includes knowledge generation through qualitative research, participatory evaluations, process documentation and capacity building in thematic areas that include livelihoods, child rights, climate change, community resilience, natural resource management and governance.

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in the Private Sector Domestic Grant-Making Philanthropic Landscape

Amod Khanna

September, 2024

ABSTRACT

The research paper tracks the journey of domestic philanthropic organisations with respect to diversity, equity and inclusion in their respective workspaces. The paper reviews the paradigms of the DEI (Diversity, Equity and Inclusion) framework in academic discourse and the perception of DEI practitioners in building arguments for DEI in workspaces in general. Empirical research is conducted to assess the location of philanthropic organisations on the DEI spectrum to identify what has been achieved, what could have been done better, and what are the blind spots in this journey.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ANNEXURE

1. INTRODUCTION

This research paper aims to marry two interest areas that are increasingly drawing attention: the philanthropic sector and the discourse on diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) in India. Philanthropies focusing on humanitarian causes often work with the marginalised, exploited, vulnerable and excluded sections of society. As part of their work, they recognise diversities and work diligently to bring equity and establish inclusive mechanisms through which all social groups feel empowered enough to participate and gain from such participation. The DEI discourse deals with social identities and how these identities play out in workspaces: with the discourse demanding equity in their treatment and their inclusivity within the organisation. This research paper focuses on the organisational policies and management strategies whereby philanthropic organisations address DEI in their workspaces with the aim of assessing where the philanthropic sector stands in its journey of DEI.

1.1.   DEI

Diversity: *The Oxford English Dictionary* defines *diverse*, an adjective, as showing a great deal of variety, and diversity, a noun, as the state of being diverse and the practice or quality of including or involving persons from a range of different social and ethnic backgrounds, genders, sexual orientations, etc. Within the DEI framework, diversity is often explained by the *diversity wheel*[2] (Loden and Rosner 1990) that has four layers or dimensions of the human condition, namely, *global* (economic and political systems; historical, cultural, world and generational events); *organisational* (mix of title, seniority, professional and union affiliations, pay band, work locations, etc.); *external* (religion and religious beliefs, marital and relationship status, educational background, appearances, geographical locations and so on); and *internal* (language, sex, gender identity, mental and physical ability, age, place of birth, etc.). The diversity wheel advocates first, that personality is influenced by a myriad of factors, some of which may be under greater control than others; and second, that when the word diversity is used it means everyone and not just a few specifically identified persons. Diversity is, thus, the variety of characteristics that makes everyone unique (Kohl 2022).[3]

Equity: Equity, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, is the quality of being impartial. Equity in workspaces is thus about ensuring fair treatment, access, opportunity and advancement for all people, while at the same time striving to identify root causes and eliminate barriers that have prevented full participation from some groups (Kohl 2022)[4]. DEI practitioners (Bach 2020)[5] emphasise the distinction between equity and equality. Equity is levelling the playing field so that everyone has the opportunity to succeed, while equality is about treating different people exactly the same. The main reason why DEI practitioners prefer equity to equality is because

---

[2]Loden and Rosner book in 1990 Workforce America! Managing Employee Diversity as a Vital Resource
[3]Driving Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, Kohl K, 2022, CRS Press
[4]Kohl K, 2022 Driving Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, CRS Press
[5]Bach Michael, 2020, Birds of All Feathers- Doing Diversity and Inclusion Right, Publisher Page Two

equity recognises differences (that is diversity) and focuses on equal outcomes, whereas equality is a system where everyone has same opportunities and resources and thus does not account for the fact that the starting point for all is not the same. More succinctly, Dr. Naheed Dosani in one of his tweets differentiated the two as: 'Equality is giving everyone a shoe. Equity is giving everyone a shoe that fits' (Bach 2020).[6]

Inclusion: Inclusion refers to the practices and policies designed to provide equal access to opportunities and resources for people who might otherwise be excluded or marginalised (Kohl 2020)[7]. Tapias (as quoted in Bach 2020)[8], using both diversity and inclusion to clarify both the terms, states that diversity is a mix and inclusion is getting the mix to work well together. Steve Robbins, a DEI consultant, uses the catchy phrase to state: 'Diversity is about counting people. Inclusion is about making people count.'

Another term that is often used in the DEI discourse is **intersectionality**. The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines intersectionality as "the complex, cumulative way in which the effects of multiple forms of discrimination (such as racism, sexism, and classism) combine, overlap, or intersect especially in the experiences of marginalized individuals or groups'. Within the DEI discourse, Crenshaw (1989)[9] defines intersectionality as 'the interconnected nature of social categorisation such as race, class, and gender as they apply to a given individual or group, regarded as creating overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage'. The concept of intersectionality gains traction as building inclusive and equitable organisations requires creating a culture of belonging to all. This necessitates reframing of the concept of dominant culture to which all must conform to an equitable culture in which all have access, opportunities and belonging (Kohl, 2020)[10].

The literature on DEI mostly uses three different variations: diversity, equity and inclusion; or equity, diversity and inclusion; or diversity and inclusion. The discourse however makes no distinction between the individual terms in whatever sequence they are placed. The present research prefers to use the term DEI to draw attention and to establish the interrelationship between the three concepts: **diversity** is both the reason and the result of recognising differences; **equity** is the process through which differences are addressed; and **inclusion** is the outcome that reflects on the impact of the processes and the ability of the organisation to sustainably work with diversities.

1.2 Philanthropic organisations

Philanthropy is an altruistic act that comprises private initiative (as against public initiative of government) for the public good (as against private good of business). Philanthropic organisations are the formal mechanisms that work not-for-profit to channelise philanthropic acts (initiatives) towards humanitarian goals.

[6]Quoted in Bach Michael 2020
[7]Ibid Kohl K 2022
[8]Quoted in Bach Michael 2020 from the book by Andres Tapias, The Inclusion Paradox: The Post Obama Era and the Transformation of Global Diversity, 2009, Lincolnshire
[9]Crenshaw K, Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics, The University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989; https://philpapers.org/archive/CREDTI.pdf
[10]Kohl K, 2022 Driving Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, CRS Press

There are no sectoral estimates of the number of philanthropic organisations in India nor the number of people employed by them, though the philanthropic landscape comprises small grassroot organisations at one end and large grant-making organisations at the other. In India, public spending (that is, by the government) comprises 95 percent of social sector spending, has experienced an annual growth of 13 percent and forms 8.3 percent of the GDP in FY 2023. The remaining 5 percent is private philanthropy, which grew at 10 percent in FY 2023 and stood at Rs 1.2 lakh crores (India Philanthropy Report 2024).[11] Private philanthropies are involved in raising funds, making, managing, and supervising grants to ensure that these are expended for the pre-approved purposes. The present study focuses on domestic grant-making philanthropic organisations in India.

1.3 Objectives and scope of the study

In a multi-cultural country like India with a long and varied history, diversity is manifested in social and geo-cultural identities, regional and linguistic groups, gender and gender-based differences, sexual orientations, food habits, religion and the sects within these religions, clothing and class differences. Expansion of business and formal institutions have created formal workspaces that too reflect/should reflect diversities as they exist in the country. Do workspace diversities reflect the prevailing diversities in the country, and does it require specific measures to manage diversities in workplaces? How does diversity in workspaces deal with issues of inclusivity and equity amongst, and within, the diverse workforce that are employed by a formal organisation?

The workspaces that form the scope of the study are defined by the domestic philanthropic organisations that include domestic grant-making organisations, corporate trusts, CSRs (public and private sector organisations), family philanthropies and the emerging trend of retail philanthropy, mostly defined by crowdfunding organisations. The study aims to explore the policies, programmes, practices and accountability mechanisms related to diversity, equity and inclusion by the domestic grant-making organisations. The central issue of the research is to assess **how far** and in **what manner** the philanthropic organisations express the values of DEI; the framework that defines it; the types of investments that they make for its implementation; and the transformational processes that they have undertaken to incorporate the principles of DEI in their policies and practices.

The hypotheses to be tested by the research is *Indian philanthropic organisations have formulated policies and have initiated action for the implementation of DEI within their organisations.* The central research question that drives the study is: *How far and in what manner have the philanthropic organisations adopted DEI in their intent, content, development and implementation of policies and practices?* Intent relates to the form of expressing the values of DEI; content refers to the framework that defines DEI; development implies the investments and the initiatives undertaken for DEI; and implementation includes the transformational processes undertaken for DEI in the organisations.

[11]India Philanthropy Report 2024, India Philanthropy Report 2024 | Bain & Company

The specific areas of inquiry for the study are the policies and practices of the organisations related to staffing and human resource development; the manner in which the organisations define their select groups and communities; how they commit their resources for the benefit of these groups; their practices related to implementation of DEI; and the accountability mechanisms and measures that the organisations follow to report on DEI achievements. The methodological approach for the research includes review of secondary literature to gain from the insights into the different perspectives that drive DEI, and to find out the main concerns in DEI in corporate India. This is followed with empirical research of selected philanthropic organisations to understand their present location on the DEI spectrum.

The following section presents an overview of select secondary literature on different perspectives and arguments for the adoption of DEI in corporate workspaces including the present DEI concern expressed in India. The subsequent section on methodology for the empirical research recounts the sampling plan, tools and methods of data collection, and the limitations and challenges faced in the conduct of research with philanthropic organisations. The findings of the study and conclusions emerging therefrom are discussed subsequently.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

DEI discourse follows two broad streams: one is the academic discourse, mainly from sociology and psychology, that seeks to explain and create a framework for diversity; and the second, the arguments developed by DEI practitioners to build DEI as a value proposition for the organisations. The following paragraphs give a brief overview of perspectives from both these streams. Towards the end, the section reviews the literature from India to identify DEI achievements of the corporate India and to explore the areas of concern expressed therein.

2.1 Perspectives from sociology

Sociologists have been focusing on power positioning and relations between different social identity groups to understand diversity in workspaces. The frameworks used emphasize the importance of context, impact of intersectionality and presence of inequality regimes within organisations.

Pringle (2009, 77)[12] believe that workplace diversity cuts across society, organisational groups and individuals and hence proposes four factors that are key to identifying power positioning of social identity groups, namely historical and socio-political events, population demography, legislation and labour market forces. However, to bring in macro and micro forces he suggests the adoption of Bourdieu's social action theory that is based on the concept of *habitus*.[13] In Bourdieu's construct participants create a complex of social relations and through practice develop a certain disposition for social action, and their engagement with different fields constitutes a system of disposition that is habitus. Habitus works both at the level of explicit consciousness and in practical and pre-reflexive ways (similar to muscle memory).

While Bourdieu's framework acknowledges dynamic interactions across systems and identifies conditioned response, it does not account for intersectionality that is driven by multiple social identities. Healy (2009, 88)[14], recognising intersectionality, observes that inequalities in organisations need to be understood in the wider social, economic and political context. It is the understanding of context that helps in understanding the persistent and entrenchment of such inequalities. This shifts the locus of investigation from one aimed at explicating elements of race or gender or class to one that recognises links among these systems. Addressing intersectionality, Acker (2006)[15] proposed the concept of inequality regimes to identify barriers to creating equality in work organisations. Inequality regimes are interlocked practices that result in perpetuating inequalities in all work organisations, and this analysis focuses attention on the detail of inequalities in organisations where discrimination is played out in both organisational structures and in the relational interactions.

---

[12]Pringle Judith K in the book Equality Diversity and Inclusion at Work- A Research Compendium, Edited by Mustafa F. Ozbilgin, 2009, page 77
[13]Habitus is the way people perceive and respond to the social worlds they inhabit, by way of the personal skills and disposition of character.
[14]Healy G, Reflections on researching inequalities and intersectionality in the book Equality Diversity and Inclusion at Work- A Research Compendium, Edited by Mustafa F. Ozbilgin, 2009, page 88
[15]Acker, Joan (2006). Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations. Gender and Society 20 (4):441-464.

Sociological perspectives have largely focused on organisations and the relational forces within them, contributing to a global diversity discourse that primarily arises from the workplace dynamics of large organisations mostly from Western countries. Managing diversity has thus come to imply advancing a globalising capitalist economy (Acker 2006, 75, quoting Humphries and Grice 1995)[16], giving a partial view on workplace diversity.

2.2 Perspectives from psychology

From a psychological perspective, diversity concerns are the behaviours and feelings of different people and how managers deal with them. Thus, diversity means differences among people that are likely to affect their acceptance, performance, satisfaction or progress in an organisation (Rosemary-Hays 2016).[17] This view of diversity makes it contextual to specific organisational setting, and managing diversity a process of how organisations design processes and structures to covert differences in to organisational strengths, and diversity management a systematic programme to improve interactions among diverse people and making diversity a source of innovation and increased effectiveness(Rosemary-Hays 2016, 19).[18]

To understand diversity in work organisations, Roosevelt Thomas (1996)[19] used culinary metaphors and propounded four models: the *jelly bean model* (representative diversity) where there are jelly beans of different colours. In this model, the mixture itself is diverse and not the individual beans. This model does not account for the fact that people who are different do influence each other and develop differences through these interactions. The second *salad model* (assimilative diversity) is where ingredients contrast and complement each other and yet they retain their individuality and bring different tastes in combination. The third *gravy model* (blended diversity) is one where different components have blended together to create a taste that is different from that of the individual components. The fourth is the *sauce model* (melting diversity) where the ingredients have been combined and cooled together and then assimilated into a homogenous thick substance that is different from any of its components.

Cox (1991)[20] on the other hand uses the typology of acculturation[21] and proposed three organisational types: *monolithic organisations* that are internally homogenous in terms of culture and demographic characteristics; *plural organisations* that are superficially diverse and in which members of non-dominant groups work in certain areas or levels and socialise on a limited basis across these divisions; and *multi-cultural organisations* where diversity is valued and appreciated.

---

[16]Ibid page 75 quoting Humphries and Grice, 1995
[17]Rosemary-Hays Thomas (2016), Managing Workplace Diversity and Inclusion – A Psychological Perspective
[18]ibid page 19
[19]Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1996). Redefining diversity, New York, NY: AMACOM.
[20]Cox, T., Jr. (1991). The multicultural organization. The Executive, 5(2), 34–47; Cox, T., Jr. (1993/1994). Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research, and practice. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers; and Cox, T., Jr. (2001). Creating the multicultural organization. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass as referred to in Rosemary-Hays Thomas (2016), Managing Workplace Diversity and Inclusion – A Psychological Perspective
[21]Acculturation refers to change in norms, expectations and other aspects of the cultures of two or more groups as they combine and adjust.

Describing the strategies for incorporating diversities in organisations Roosevelt Thomas (1991)[22] used motivation as the critical factor and defined three strategies: 1. *Affirmative Action* that is based on the presumption that without intervention conditions will not change, and therefore some degree of coercion by law will be required to nudge for change. 2. *Valuing Difference* is where diversity is viewed as an asset and the aim is to increase the tolerance, acceptability and knowledge of people and the organisation. 3.*Managing Diversity* is a strategy that acknowledges organisational systems prevent full incorporation of benefits, and hence there is need for organisational development to enable people who are different from the majority to benefit.

Management of diversity as a function of perspective of paradigm of organisational leader has been proposed by Thomas and Ely (1996)[23]. According to them, there are three paradigms that lead change in organisations: *Discrimination-and-Fairness* paradigm, based on fairness and legal compliance as the reason to change; *Access-and-Legitimacy* paradigm built on the premise that diversity will improve access to, and elicit response from, a diverse customer base and hence high business success; and *Learning-and-Effectiveness* paradigm that internalises differences among employees so that the organisation learns and grows. The factors that facilitate employment of the third paradigm include organisational leadership, culture and a structure that encourages innovation and sharing of ideas.

Perspectives from psychology are significant for the description of diversity and creating typologies of organisations. They however fall short of exploring factors that give rise to inequalities from such differences, and the limitations that the organisations experience in addressing them in workplaces without taking cognizance of the world outside the organisations.

2.3 Arguments for DEI

Among DEI practitioners there are two arguments that state the case for DEI in organisations. The first argument is based on social justice and the second on the business case for DEI.

Social justice: The social justice argument traces its roots to the post-industrial revolution scenario with a vision of an egalitarian society and concerted efforts made to reduce exploitation of marginalised groups due to widening disparity between the rich and the poor. In the context of DEI, social justice focuses on the concept of fairness in relations between individuals in society and equal access to wealth, opportunities and social privileges.[24] The philosophical underpinnings for social justice lie in the universal applicability of human rights that recognises diversity and includes non-discrimination in all its forms.

---

[22]Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1991). Beyond race and gender: Unleashing the power of your total work force by managing diversity. New York, NY: AMACOM.
[23]Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. Harvard Business Review, 74(5), 79–90.
[24]Available at https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/esg/social-justice/ (accessed on 3 June 2023).

Within the framework of social justice, seclusion is not limited to a mathematical minority. Seclusion (Halder and Squires 2023)[25] implies having lower control or power over lives and decision-making; experiencing narrow opportunities and access to services and facilities; being subjected to subordination and discrimination; being set apart physically and culturally from the dominant group(s); sharing of collective identity and common burdens; sharing social rules around membership; and tending to marry within the group. There are social groups in each country that require protection historically, and in modern times new collectives of citizens are formed and identified as they also face unfair treatment (e.g. LGBTQ+). Social justice is about recognising inclusion as a human right, and societies, which also include organisations as corporate citizens, need to work collaboratively to operationalise the inclusion of people with diversities in their respective working spaces.

In recent times, the argument of social justice as a foundational factor for DEI finds renewed energy through the SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals). The SDGs envisions that all nations and people of all sections of society should reap the benefits of prosperity and enjoy minimum standards of well-being. SDGs call upon all stakeholders, governments, businesses, civil society and individuals to address inequalities, empower marginalised groups and ensure inclusive participation for sustainable development (Halder and Squires 2023)[26]. Diversity and inclusion are thus essential for the achievement of this vision and goals, as these are not only integral to specific SDGs but also permeates the entire framework.[27]

Business case argument: Popularised by DEI practitioners, the rationale for the business case for DEI is driven by economic outcomes as the central argument to change. This makes business case argument organisation-specific as the business case will have to state why the organisation should focus on diversity and inclusion and it will need to explain the reasoning behind creating and executing a diversity and inclusion strategy (Bach 2020, 2).[28]

The framework for business case is based on the three fundamental areas defined by people, customer, and brand. *People* is about whom the organisation attracts, hires, retains and promotes and thus it is all about engagement. *Customer* is the factor that asks the question whether the organisation understands customer's needs. The assumption being that if the profile of organisation's workforce and the community are not aligned, the organisation is missing out on the lived-in experience of their customer and is thus missing out on understanding their needs and aspirations. *Brand* indicates the public impression of the organisation, which is deeper and subtle than marketing materials that are displayed on websites and advertisement. It is this brand image that makes people say, 'This is the place where I want to work: because it is diverse and inclusive' (Bach 2020).[29]

[25]Halder S and Squires G, 2023, Inclusion and Diversity Communities and Practices Across the World, Routledge
[26]ibid
[27]Available at https://sdgresources.relx.com/diversity-and-inclusion (accessed on 09.06.2023).
[28]Bach Michael, 2020, Birds of All Feathers- Doing Diversity and Inclusion Right, Publisher Page Two
[29]Ibid page 27

The advocates of the business case for DEI quotes empirical studies that conclusively provide evidence of the direct relationship between DEI and the gains to the organisation. Notable among them are the two reports of McKinsey: Why Diversity Matters[30], 2015, and Delivering through Diversity, 2018, that are based on empirical research of companies. Both concluded that companies in the top quartile for ethnic and racial diversity are 35 percent and companies in the top quartile for gender diversity are 15 percent, and they are more likely to have financial returns above their respective national industry medians. The latter study covering companies across different countries found that there is statistically significant correlation between a more diverse leadership team and financial performance and that companies in the top quartile for gender diversity were 21 percent more likely to outperform on profitability and 27 percent have superior value-creation. The report concluded that many companies find DEI as a source of competitive advantage—while for some, it's a matter of social justice or corporate social responsibility or even regulatory compliance, for others it is simply essential to growth strategy (McKinsey 2015)[31].

2.4 DEI in India

In the West, the Civil Rights movement was instrumental in leading the development and acceptance of DEI within workspaces. The initial focus on racial equality and gender later moved to other aspects of identity such as religion, sexual orientation, gender identity and country of origin. In India, the making of Constitution has been a watershed event that brought forth the diversities that exist in society and has also created a framework that prohibited discrimination on grounds of such diversities, namely religion, race, sex, caste, language and place of birth. Subsequent social legislation upheld the constitutional mandate of equality, non-discrimination and inclusivity along with the diversities that existed in the society.

The DEI discourse in India is mainly driven by reports of large consultancy firms, namely NASSCOM, EY (Ernst and Young), Sattva, and Randstad amongst others. NASSCOM (2023)[32], EY (2022)[33] and Sattva (2023)[34] reports focus on the actionable insights on DEI in the corporate sector, on gender diversity in boardrooms, and how inclusion impacts absenteeism and attrition in companies, respectively. The Randstad[35] reports (2021, 2020) are specific to the position of the Indian corporate sector with respect to the LGBTQ+ community post the judgment for the decriminalisation of section 377, and the integration of persons with disability within workspaces.

[30]McKinsey, Why Diversity Matters 2015
[31]Ibid
[32]*The DEI Landscape in India Inc. Bridging the Gap between Rhetoric and Reality (2023)*, NASSCOM
[33]*Diversity in the Boardroom- Progress and the way forward* (2022)
[34]*Understanding Aspects of DEI: Indian Perspective* (2023)
[35]*Inclusion without Exception* (2021) and *Embracing All Abilities* (2020),

The studies by the consultancy firms highlight that for the Indian corporate sector the paradigm of DEI has shifted from a nice-to-have initiative to a *must-have* business imperative. This was brought out by the survey that found that 80 percent organisations (out of 220 organisations surveyed by NASSCOM) have a formal DEI policy and 82 percent have formal targets within it. The women representation in the boards of the companies has steadily increased from 6 percent in 2017 to 7.2 percent in 2022; and from 16 percent to 21.4 percent in non-executive position during the same period as found out in the survey of FTSE[36] 350 companies by EY. A significant statistic compiled by the EY report found that there are 605 women in 803 board positions, in NIFTY500 companies, which indicated that the Indian corporate sector has successfully bypassed the *golden skirt*[37] phenomena. Qualitatively, the role of women representatives on Board is also undergoing a change with women increasingly being nominated on committees that were customarily reserved for the male board members.

In terms of the impact of diversity, these studies found that companies (FTSE 350) that have at least 33 percent women on their board have 21 percent higher stock prices compared to others, and that these companies are less likely to experience shareholder dissent. The impact of inclusion on employees was on their regularity at workplace, reducing the cost of absenteeism and employee attrition, which cost Indian employees around INR 1.1 lakh crores per year.[38] The same report quotes a Deloitte report that when 10 percent or more employees feel included, a company can increase work attendance by almost one day per year per employee.

Randstad's report on inclusion of LGBTQ+ community post decriminalisation of Section 377 found that 70 percent of the respondents believed there no significant efforts had been made for the inclusion of LGBTQ+. Among those who believed that significant change had taken place, 70 percent were working with multi-national companies. The assessment led them to place the surveyed companies in three zones of LGBTQ+ focus: peripheral, deep and immersive. With respect to persons with disabilities, the study found that 65 percent of the companies have policies to hire and include persons with disabilities, of which more than half of them (65 percent) are multi-national companies. An important finding of the study was that more than 67 percent of the respondents from the Indian public sector and 55 percent from private sector stated that inclusion is present but not *mandated in their goals*. Some of the multinational companies have aligned inclusion as part of their business goals.

[36]Financial Stock Exchange
[37]Golden skirt phenomenon occurs, when due to lack of women leaders, a small group of prominent women leaders hold corporate directorships in a large number of companies.
[38]Available at Understanding Aspects of DEI: Indian Perspective, Sattva https://www.sattva.co.in/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Understanding-Aspects-of-DEI_-the-Indian-Perspective.pdf

The Randstad report on persons with disabilities recognises that inclusion does not end with hiring but requires investment in creating an accessible and enabling structure where gaps are evidently visible. The study found that only 25 percent of the workspaces have been equipped with basic necessities for people with disabilities, and that the presence of persons with disabilities decreases as one moves up the organisational hierarchy.

In addition to the reports by consultancy firms, there has been discussion on DEI in India through the blogs of SHRM (Society for Human Resources Management (India) run by the HR practitioners. These blogs have noted that DEI issues for India include discrimination on the basis of gender, disability and LGBTQ identity; however, caste is an area where least has been done, as corporates flag merit, and merit alone, as the criteria for recruitment and promotion.[39] Another area identified by the blogs is that when corporates work with multiple generations of employees, it requires an inclusive workplace to utilise a diverse range of expertise.

At the SHRM Annual Conference in 2022,[40] there was consensus that instead of identifying a single priority for promoting diversity, a business should seek to become more open to different points of view and the DEI agenda in the country should be to build a critical mass of workers; adopt a bottom-up approach to inclusion that implies training an identified social group to prepare them to join the workforce so that they (and the others) do not feel that they are a separate group; give voice to persons from diverse groups; and work towards the removal of bias.

Industry publication by ASSOCHAM (2022)[41] has articles that are normative *what should or ought to there*, rather than a discussion on the challenges faced and models developed by corporate India. The publication falls short of highlighting contextual challenges in DEI by type of industry and hence fails to provide deeper insight into DEI within the organised sector.

DEI writings in India have mostly been descriptive. There have been no serious attempts at developing DEI framework or theories that are more suited to the socio-cultural milieu of the country. As a result, there are two areas that have been completely left out in the reports/studies and blog writing are, first, *caste and tribe* as issues of diversity and their assimilation within equity and inclusive frameworks (in contrast to the reservation framework laid down for the public sector) and second, *intersectionality*, which, given the wide range of existing social identities, is much more complex and requires a deeper understanding and complex frameworks that will help practitioners develop programmatic interventions for the promotion of DEI workspaces. The other areas where the discourse falls short is its inability to provide industry or sector-wise data on DEI.

---

[39]Available at https://www.shrm.org/shrm-india/pages/diversity-equity-and-inclusion-dei-in-india.aspx.)
[40]Anand, S. (2022). The next level of Diversity for Companies in India; https://www.shrm.org/shrm-india/pages/the-next-level-of-diversity-for-companies-in-india.aspx
[41]Diversity and Inclusion at Workplace (2022)

3. METHODOLOGY

The study uses qualitative methodology to identify and locate the journey of the philanthropic sector for the implementation of diversity, equity and inclusion within different types of domestic philanthropies. The study began with a literature review of different perspectives on DEI followed by DEI achievements and concerns within corporate India. Subsequently, the study examined the publicly accessible documents of the selected organisations and conducted semi-structured interviews with selected employees of the sampled philanthropic organisations.

The secondary sources of information for empirical research include annual reports, vision and mission statements, values and principles of the organisations, strategic plan documents, business responsibility and sustainability reports, and the DEI policies of the selected organisations. The primary information was collected through semi-structured tools from the employees nominated by the sampled organisations.

3.1 Sampling Plan

The sampling plan for the study included a selection of organisations based on types of philanthropy, and a selection of respondents in each of the selected organisations for the detailed interview.

Sampling of philanthropic organisations: Samples were drawn from each of the five categories of philanthropic organisations by identifying the largest philanthropic spenders. The study assumed that being leaders in spending these organisations will be the driving force in building the DEI eco-system and setting benchmarks for other organisations. For the assessment of amount of spending, the philanthropic spending during the financial year 2022[42] was used as the benchmark. The list of philanthropic organisations selected for the study are given in Annexure 1.

Sampling of respondents: Samples of respondents for the interview from each organisation were drawn in consultation with the designated person (Human Resource In-charge) from each organisation. The study aimed at interviewing five persons from each organisation, and the selection of these persons were at the discretion of the organisation, with the caveat that these persons should be from senior, middle and junior management levels. None of the organisations nominated any of their board members for the interview.

---

[42]For CSR in Public and Private sectors, the information on top spenders for the financial year 2021–22 from the website of Ministry of Corporate Affairs was accessed. Information related to spending of family philanthropies was accessed from Hurun Indian Philanthropy List 2022.

3.2 Tools and methods of data collection

Two tools were developed to conduct interview with the respondents nominated by the selected organisations as follows:

Mapping diversity in workforce, inclusion and equity: The Mapping Tool was designed to elicit responses related to *what the existing situation* is in the organisation and not what the respondents aspire the organisation to be. The tool, adapted from the Meyers[43] Mapping tool for DEI, is multi-dimensional and maps different parameters of DEI on a five-point scale (Not yet started – Ready to start – Launched – Well on the Way – Leading and Creating Examples of Good Practice). The parameters were related to each area of inquiry, namely intent, content, practice, transformational aspects and accountability. To bring consistency in mapping by different respondents each cell of the grid was defined to assist the respondent to map their respective organisations.

Questionnaire about policy and practices related to DEI: The questionnaire was aimed to gain additional information on the responses given in the mapping tool. The questionnaire was divided into five sections and the questions were a combination of open-ended ones and close-ended questions. Former were aimed at seeking explanations and additional information and the latter aimed to get the opinion of the respondent on a five-point scale on specific areas in DEI.

The original plan of collecting data from the nominated respondent by the researcher through face-to-face interaction was shelved as respondents were located in different cities and there were difficulties in coordinating for the interviews because of pre-existing scheduled commitments. Consequently the process of informed consent and the interviews were taken through on-line mode for the study.

3.3 Challenges

The researcher faced multiple challenges in the conduct of the study that became a limiting factor in deepening the analysis and in painting a comparative picture of how DEI is treated across different groups as defined by the study. The researcher does find that the challenges and limitation, and hence findings, are representative of the sample group and is not a reflection of the sector as such.

Response of CSRs to participate in the study: The study faced challenges in seeking and eliciting responses from philanthropic organisations that were identified as representative organisations in different categories.

---

[43]Available at Meyer DEI Spectrum Tool 2018.pdf (mmt.org) (accessed on 9.6.2023).

None of the Public CSRs responded to the emails and the phone calls that were made to their corporate/head offices. The emails were accompanied by a letter of introduction from the University and a brief overview of the study and an explanation of what participation in the study would entail for the organisation. The public CSR organisations did not share any of their documents, nor nominated persons from their organisation to respond to the interviews. Consequently, the study relied on the documents[44] that were placed in the public domain for assessing DEI within these organisations.

Among the six private CSRs, four responded: one to politely refuse to participate in the study without ascribing any reason, the other shared their documents but did not nominate persons for the interview, the third was not able to take the decision whether they would participate or not participate in the study, and the fourth started the process but had to withdraw as their HR Department did not give them permission to proceed further. The other two organisations did not respond to the emails sent to them.

The lack of participation by the public and private CSRs constrained the study and hampered its ability to generate their respective perspectives on DEI and thus trace their journey as part of the philanthropic landscape. Yet the hesitancy for participation by public and private CSRs was taken as a finding by the study that is discussed in the conclusion of the present research.

Contact details of family philanthropy: The Hurun India Philanthropy List 2022 lists the major spenders amongst family philanthropies, but does not provide for the contact details of these philanthropies. Moreover, except for the Shiv Nadar Family Philanthropy none of the other philanthropies have their websites or contact details available in the public domain. The study thus was not able to establish contact with this group of philanthropies and they were not covered as part of the data collection, data analysis and part of the research process.

Retail philanthropy: The four Retail Philanthropies identified and selected for the study were contacted over email and only one responded. They however refused to participate in the study. The mail did not record the reason for their refusal but over phone the researcher was informed that they do not consider themselves as a philanthropic organisation, though it was told to them that they still are a significant player in the philanthropic ecosystem.

The other three retail philanthropic organisations did not respond. Nor did they place documents in the public domain, and hence the study was not able to generate any information related to DEI within the retail philanthropies.

---

[44]Business Responsibility and Sustainability Report 2023; Integrated Annual Report 2023; Equal Opportunity Policy; Human Rights Policy; Code of Conduct of Board Members; Whistle Blower Policy; and CSR Policy.

Grant-making organisations: Among the five domestic grant-making organisations shortlisted for the study, one did not participate in the study on grounds that their foundation did not have any DEI bandwidth. The other four organisations participated in the study and their involvement entailed sharing of relevant documents of the organisation and conducting interviews with employees nominated for the study. However, the interviews with employees of one organisation could not take place as they were not available during the period of the study.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 DEI is implied in vision and value statements but there are no policies on DEI

Vision: The vision and mission statements of the PSU CSRs and the grant-making organisations refer to their respective area of business **and** also lay down the broad framework within which the expression of DEI is articulated. The underlying theme in vision statements of the PSUs recognise the value of diversity in the workforce and are aimed to create a space where *employees are treated with respect and dignity; an environment that is warm and fair, and a harmonious workplace. For grant-making organisations the organisations envision a plural, equitable and democratic society; a society that is built on respect for dignity, justice and equity; and safe sustainable water for all.*

Vision to values: The vision statements do recognise the DEI, yet the intent is much more clearly expressed through the values that steer organisational policies and practices. For example, the values that drive one of the sampled organisation *inter alia* include *dignity* (how the organisation feels, thinks and behaves in relation to others in a way that is respectful of all) and *equality* (equal access and opportunity for all, non-discrimination between people on account of religion, class, gender, caste etc.). The values are operationalised through the guiding principles that include *participation*, *non-discrimination*, and *equity*. Similarly, the values of another sampled organisation include *respect* that is defined as concern for welfare, dignity and feelings of others by taking steps to protect their interests. The traits listed for respect included being inclusive, empathetic, collegiate, informally formal, open and approachable, and one who avoids undermining the credibility of others.

Values to policies: PSUs are signatory to the UN Global Compact[45] and are mandated by SEBI (Securities and Exchange Board of India) to adopt sustainable business practices and report on them through Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR), which is aligned with the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)[46] and the UN Global Compact. Governed by the Government of India guidelines, the PSUs have a stated Equal Opportunity Policy that has primarily been formulated to conform to the Persons with Disabilities Act.[47]

---

[45]The UN Global Compact (UNGC) is a non-mandatory pact to get businesses worldwide to adopt sustainable and socially responsible policies and to report on their implementation. Announced in 1999 at World Economic Forum, it was officially launched in 2000 at UN Headquarters. The UNGC is a principle-based framework stating 10 principles in the areas of human rights, labour, environment and anti-corruption. The participants to the UNGC are expected to mainstream the 10 principles in business activities and catalyse action in support of broader UN goals such as SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals).
[46]GRI is an international independent standards organisation that helps businesses to understand and communicate their impacts on issues of climate change, human rights and corruption. It thus provides widely used sustainability reporting standards.
[47]The Rights to Persons with Disabilities Act 2016.

In grant-making organisation, the DEI intent is more sharply expressed in the Employee Code of Conduct (ECC) policy and/or as the stated DEI policy of the organisation. For example, the ECC policy of a sampled organisation declares that it is an equal opportunity employer and expects all employees to be treated with dignity; the organisational work environment will be free of sexual harassment; and that all employed will treat each other with respect and engage with others with people as they are and **not** for what they are. The code of conduct policy expects all employees to observe *secularism* at work, implying that employees will not demonstrate any religious, caste, language, gender, disability or colour bias in their working.

One sampled organisation has a declared DEI policy that states that the organisation *respects and promotes plurality and diversity in terms of gender justice, ethnicity and identity*. The organisation places special focus on the marginalised on the grounds of gender sexuality, class, caste, religion, location, ability and age. With respect to inclusion, the organisation places it both as an organisational principle that guides their organisational processes of decision-making, and as a determinant of their philanthropic work.

Does a DEI policy have organisational benefits? The study compared the responses of the employees across the three grant-making organisations and found that in the case of organisations with a stated DEI policy, there is greater clarity and consistency in understanding among the employees not only on the need for diversity in the workforce but also on equity and inclusion within the organisational processes and practices.

Policies to leadership commitment: The intent of leadership in case of PSUs is reflected in whether the organisation has identified employees as stakeholders, implying the need to identify and address their concern as a stakeholder. The term employees are subject to interpretation and only one PSUs has clearly stated that it identifies both employees and contractual workers as stakeholders. There are however two PSUs that have identified SC/ST and women employees as vulnerable within the stakeholder group identified as employee and/or contract workers.

In case of grant-making organisations the employee respondents assessed the leadership commitment for diversity as ***well-on-the-way*** based on their demonstrated commitment of working in a democratic manner, and by taking forward the discussions on DEI internally. The additional advantage of an organisation with a stated DEI policy is that the leadership demonstrates their accountability to both the internal and external stakeholders on a regular basis. For equity and inclusion, the organisations have been assessed at the ***ready-to-start*** and at the ***launch stage***, which indicates that a lot more needs to be done by the leadership to demonstrate their commitment for bringing greater equity and inclusivity within their organisations.

4.2 Diversity is defined broadly but reported narrowly

Diversity based on gender, caste/tribe, disability and religion/creed and others based on language, region, age, marital status, race, sexual orientation and affiliation to political and religious association have been mentioned by PSU and grant-making organisations. Despite acknowledging a wide range of diversities, these organisations report on limited parameters: gender diversity (meaning proportion of women), caste, tribe, disability and religious minorities (only grant-makers) within their workforce. While defining gender as a parameter of diversity, neither the PSUs nor the grant-makers have accounted for transgender as one of the sub-categories in gender and hence it is neither mentioned in the statements nor in the disaggregated data placed in the public domain.

In respect of reporting on the government policy for reservation on the basis of caste/tribe, and disability, these form part of the reports of PSUs. The BRSR reporting framework further mandates reporting the number of employees based on gender and disability and hence all the PSUs do report on these data but not on any other parameter. Grant-makers reporting on diversity too is narrow and accounts for limited social identities.

Intersectionality reporting is done by PSUs where they recognise the multiple social identities of gender-caste and gender-disability. The grant-makers have not recognised intersectionality and hence they do not report on persons with multiple social identities.

4.3 Diversity enhancement is restricted by lack of targeting and limiting its scope

The policies of the organisations do not stipulate targets for different social identity groups that should be part of their workforce though the respondent employees among grant-makers indicate that there is a broad internal understanding that women should comprise half of the workforce. There has been no similar understanding for other parameters like caste or tribe or religious minorities.

Organisational policies are silent on whether diversity applies for promotions as well. The respondents too were not clear whether the principle of equal opportunity is at the stage of recruitment only or in promotions as well, and whether diversity refers to is applicable to different managerial (hierarchal) categories as well. As a result, reporting on gender does not take into account diversity at different levels of management. PSUs mandated to report on the BRSR framework report on gender and disability for permanent employees and on 'other than permanent' employees; on workers and 'on other than permanent' workers; and on the number of women board members and number of women in key management positions.

Respondents from grant-making organisations and the policies of PSUs indicate that diversity concerns are not addressed during appraisals, evaluations, training and grievance handling. The policies too have been silent on these aspects. Neither the organisations set targets nor do they define processes that will ensure that diversity concerns are taken care of by the decision-making process of the organisation.

4.4 DEI Index, an emerging good practice

Organisations have fallen short of developing metrices related to diversity, and as a result the reporting on diversity has been limited and does not allow assessment of organisations on their diversity matrix. An exception is the DEI Index developed by the IOC (Indian Oil Corporation), which has been collecting data on the Index though the same has not been placed in the public domain.

The DEI index has been developed to track DEI progress through metrics to *'consolidate workforce capacity and improve productivity'* by the IOC The DEI index is calculated using 15 items from the employee engagement and satisfaction survey called *Pratidhwani*. The aspects included in the DEI index are treatment of all employees equally and fairly, integrating differences, decision-making, providing psychological safety, instilling trust, belonging and meaningful work.

4.5 Lack of clarity in understanding of equity and inclusion

Based on the responses of the employee-respondent of the grant-making organisation there is lack of clarity in understanding the difference between equality and equity within the organisations, and one knows that each of them is targeting equity within their workspaces. The words used to describe equity are fairness, impartiality, equality in access to opportunity and growth, and positive discrimination for the marginalised and the discriminated. Inclusion has been expressed to mean ensuring complete expression and value addition to the organisation of the diverse groups that have been recruited, making sure everyone is respected, valued and included irrespective of their differences, and a culture where people from different backgrounds can come and work together.

It is apparent from the responses that gender diversity (meaning women) has gained the largest space in the discourse on equity and inclusion within the organisations, with some reference to disability. References were made by the employees on the need to look into equity across ethnic groups and the need for intersectional analysis, for example, whether women from different ethnic groups get the same opportunity and whether they feel inclusive or not.

4.6 Conducive DEI Policy environment enables organisations to push boundaries

For grant-makers, it has been their organisational values. For PSUs, it is their policy environment that has enabled them to bring equity across different social groups. These policies include the Human Rights Policy (HRP) and the Equal Opportunity Policy (EOP).

The HRP draws inspiration from national laws and international conventions and builds a business case that determines the value proposition for the organisation (e.g. *to emerge as a global leader*, ONGC). The rights stated guarantee *equitable treatment* of all employees (compensation benefits and terms of employment); *protection* (safe, clean work environment; protection from harassment, etc.); *prohibition* (child labour, forced labour); and are *promotional* in nature (career development and maintenance of work life balance).

The overall purpose of the EOP is to level the playing field, in all aspects, for persons with disability and create an equitable working environment for them. The EOP extends from pre-recruitment stage to recruitment, working conditions, promotion and career development using positive discrimination to build capacities of the employees so that they not only find equity at the workplace but also work in an inclusive environment.

The scope of policy includes the suppliers and the communities that they directly impact, and extends to the entire spectrum of employee engagement-recruitment, training, career development, benefits, and working in a safe and clean work environment. The study identified examples that indicated how the policies have created an environment and enabled a deeper level employee engagement that has led them to go beyond the stereotyping of facilities and services. For example, ONGC and one of the grant making provide m/paternity leave in case of child adoption, and the creche facility has been defined for both the male and female employees. In another example, ONGC has adopted the right to privacy for its employees based on the evolving principles of data and identity protection that is a challenge worldwide.

Though the policy environment is conducive yet there are examples where equity has been sought even in the absence of specific policies. This has been noted for women employees. The PSUs report on the men and women attending training programmes, and have also formulated specific programmes for women employees for enhancing their professional achievements. For example, the IOC has designed a promotive programme called Aarohi for women managers to give them additional inputs to emerge as future leaders. Aarohi is a customised, strategic learning and development programme that has been curated for grooming high-performing, mid-level women managers to take future leadership roles at IOC. This is a 6-month long intervention with different built-in modules that includes inputs on the functional and behavioural aspects. So far there have been five editions of Aarohi.

4.7 Lack of depth in policies and practices for inclusion in PSUs

For the PSUs the policies for inclusive work environment and work culture are based on the code of conduct (COC) for board members and senior management personnel including the conduct discipline and appeal rules (CDA). These policies owe their origin to the standards of compliance issued by the Government of India to the Department of Public Enterprise Guidelines, the Companies Act, and Clause 49 of the Listing Agreement with the National Stock Exchange. The COC and CDA cover aspects that guide the conduct of the board members, senior management personnel and the employees on standards of ethics, transparency, and moral turpitude. Elaborate provisions have been stated on conflict of interests, corruption, bribery and similar other issues. However, neither the COC nor the CDA mention that the behaviour of the board members, senior management and employees **will not discriminate** or respect diversity and aim at inclusive work culture (except PGCI (Power Grid Corporation of India)). In the absence of any disciplinary action on discriminatory behaviour, the value of developing respect for diversity in the organisation are less likely to become a part of the work culture.

PSUs have the policy of recognising associations of employees as forums through which they can engage with the management on issues related to work. PSUs have been promoting the formation of SC/ST Employee Welfare associations to enable the employees belonging to these social groups to align themselves with similar associations outside the organisation which can then dialogue with the organisation on issues that directly impact their well-being as employees of the organisation.

4.8 Grant-making organisations have done more in diversity and less in equity and inclusion

Responses of employees on the implementation of DEI within their organisation indicated that there is greater diversity at middle management than at senior and junior management levels, and that not enough diversity has been infused in the board. The board has started tracking inclusivity of its members but in some aspects of the organisational work, though the senior management is sensitive to inclusion it lacks wherewithal to promote it.

Except for the grant-making organisation that has a DEI policy as part of induction training, no **trainings** have been specifically conducted on equity and inclusion and on how to enhance inclusivity within the organisation. Neither have trainings been conducted on sensitisation towards transpeople, castes and tribes, sexuality, and similar other aspects of diversity. There seems to be an implicit and unexpressed need for training specifically in DEI by the employees.

HR practices have been reported to follow the principle of minimising bias and prejudices during recruitment, and the HR policies include diversity as a goal. With respect to equity and inclusion, the organisational values have been the guiding force in taking HR related decisions.

Budget lines for diversity are largely related to the POSH (Prevention of Sexual Harassment) training and to make infrastructural changes for the implementation of diversity related plans, for example, changes within the organisation to make toilets and office space accessible to persons with disability, and allocating office space for creche to support young parents. No budgets have been allocated for the implementation of equity and inclusivity with the organisations.

Organisations are not collecting data on demographics to reflect on diversity, and consequently diversity metrics are not included in the *accountability mechanisms*. The disclosure and accountability in equity and inclusion has been a non-starter in the organisations.

4.9 DEI culture is taking shape in grant-making organisations

Based on the response of the employees the study sought to make an assessment of where do the grant-making organisations stand in promoting a culture of DEI within their organisational policies and practices.

With respect to *diversity,* the grant-making organisations are placed on well-on-the-way stage, and the barriers that stand in their journey are instances of microaggressions[48] and need greater commitment from senior management towards diversity. Low tolerance for gender- and caste-based jokes and remarks, high commitment to the needs of diverse identities, and response to complaints of harassment and discrimination have been well appreciated by the employees.

Equity in policies and practices contributes towards an organisational culture that sets into motion decisions that are taken fairly for all and are also perceived to be fair and equitable for all the employees in the organisation. Assessing grant-makers on fairness in terms of employment, equity in advancement and growth, and equity in treatment, the employees placed their organisations as *launched*, implying that the policies include equity and equal opportunity as a goal for human resource in the organisation.

Inclusion is a feeling that stems from the behaviour of others in the work space and is fostered by a supportive culture and is modelled and encouraged by leadership. Assessing on being respected and valued, belongingness, ability to handle discrimination, opportunities for growth, and communication, the organisations were placed as *well-on-the-way* in their journey of inclusion, implying that the inclusion has become the norm within teams and as part of the organisation.

---

[48]Microaggression are common slights and comments that relate to social identity or appearance of a person. For example, a new woman employee joining the organisation is asked whether she is married. On knowing that she is single, a comment is made "...oh life is simple for you no husband or children to take care of". The process of asking the marital status and the comment made later comprises microaggression.

5. CONCLUSION

DEI Journey well begun...

The present study had set out to test the hypothesis that the Indian philanthropic organisations have formulated policies and have initiated action for the implementation of DEI within their organisations. The findings of the research indicate that the Indian philanthropic organisations are well aware of the need for DEI and though they may not have formulated declared policies on DEI specifically, yet they have initiated action for the implementation of DEI within their organisations.

Where the public CSRs are guided by the government directives, legal provisions, and are signatories to international pacts, the grant-making organisations are largely guided and steered by their values and principles that define their vision, work and organisational processes. The study has generated sufficient evidence to conclude that implementation is not contingent to a declared DEI policy, and the elements and components of the same can be implemented provided the values of the organisation reflect DEI concerns. Having said this, the research also found that having a DEI policy enables the organisation to set targets, develop metrices, allocate budgets and align its HR policies to the overall DEI policy.

Scope for Improvement

The intent to incorporate DEI is expressed in the vision statements and expression of organisational values and more formally in the employee code of conduct, and in their stated DEI policies. The content of DEI is in the different types of diversities that are acknowledged by the organisations, the functional understanding of the DEI, and the culture of DEI that develops within the organisations. Presently, a range of diversities are acknowledged by the philanthropic organisations, but at most times they work on improving gender (mostly only women) diversity and reporting on the same. Other diversities are listed but there are no data that allows an assessment of which of these have been assimilated within the organisation. Further, the organisations so far have shied away from addressing intersectionality within diversity, and have not taken into account neurodiversity as an issue to be recognised.

Trainings are conducted on gender sensitisation and on POSH in all the organisations, mainly because the POSH act makes it mandatory for the organisations to conduct these trainings every year. Despite the implementation of other acts, like the Persons with Disability Act, Transgender Act and the SC and ST Prevention of Atrocities act, no training has been reported to have been conducted on these acts.

On the issue of whether the organisations are able to bring a transformational process, the philanthropic organisations need to do more by defining their respective pathway of DEI in terms of setting targets, defining metrices to assess DEI, and fulfilling their accountability by reviewing and reporting on how far they have travelled. Bringing structure to DEI within the organisational process will enable the organisations to allocate specific resources and conduct training that brings in a transformation in managerial human resources, decision-making and work culture of the organisation that regularly identifies its own fault lines and take corrective measures.

Blind spots in DEI journey...

Intersectionality and metrices for equity and inclusion are the major blind spots in the DEI journey in philanthropic organisations. Layered social identities give rise to multiple vulnerabilities and exclusion that demand deeper understanding and multiple layering of DEI in workspaces. Using single lenses of single social identity will not take the organisations far in their DEI journey. An intersectional lens will have to be employed for further embedding DEI within organisations. This will also entail the need for alternative frameworks for identification of social groups, an immersive processes for equity and a deeper understanding of inclusion within organisational workspaces.

Reporting, which lays the foundation for accountability, has focussed mostly on reporting on diversity. Metrices and indicators for equity have not been developed and hence are not brought into realm of disclosures and accountability. As a result, the organisations are not able to assess how far and how much of the playing field has been levelled and how much impact has it haf on the degree of inclusion within their workspaces. A lack of discourse around equity and inclusion has also restricted identification and dissemination of good practices that have been developed by organisations.

Hesitancy to walk together...

The author finds it confusing and unable to come to find credible reasons for the hesitancy by organisations, both in the public and private sectors, to participate in the study. No response, lack of enthusiasm, the inability to take time out for the interviews and denying being part of the philanthropic sector, all either indicate the low priority given to DEI or the hesitancy in sharing information with an external person.

Annexure 1 List of Philanthropic Organisations selected for the Study

Type of Philanthropic Organisation	Organisation Selected for the Study
Grant-making Organisations	1. Azim Premji Foundation 2. National Foundation India 3. Child Rights and You 4. Arghyam 5. Tata Trusts
CSR Public Sector	1. Oil and Natural Gas Corporation 2. National Thermal Power Corporation 3. National Mineral Development Corporation 4. Indian Oil Corporation 5. Power Grid Corporation of India
CSR Private Sector	1. Reliance Industries 2. Tata Consultancy Services 3. Infosys Foundation 4. HDFC Bank Limited 5. ICICI Foundation 6. Axis Bank Foundation
Family Philanthropy	1. Shiv Nader Family Foundation 2. Azim Premji and Family Foundation 3. Mukesh Ambani Family Foundation 4. Kumar Mangalam Family Foundation 5. Susmita and Subroto Bagchi Family Foundation
Retail Philanthropy	1. MILAAP 2. KETTO 3. Impact Guru 4. Fuel a Dream

Annexure 2 Tools for Data Collection – Mapping Diversity in Workforce, Equity and Inclusion

Number: _____

Place of Survey:____

Start Time:_____

The interviewee will map the organisation based on the components of Diversity, Inclusion and Equity within the organisation. The assessment is based on the **present state** of the organisation in its journey on DEI and not the stage that the organisation aspires to reach. The study will not disclose the opinion of the interviewee to the organisation nor disclose the name of the organisation as part of the report. An honest assessment will help the organisation and the philanthropic sector in achieving higher milestones in its journey.

If the interviewee has a different assessment of the stage the same can be mentioned for all or any of the components of assessment.

If the response is on paper, please tick (✓) your response in the relevant box.

If the response is digital, please colour the relevant box in grey ☐ colour. Save the document as PDF and mail it back as PDF document.

1. Organisational Mapping on Diversity

Where would you place your organisation on the following Map on **Diversity in Workforce (DiW)**?

Component	Not yet Started	Ready to Start	Launched	Well on the Way	Leading and Creating Examples of Good Practice
Vision on DiW	Does not see diversity as relevant to the work	Recognition of diversity as relevant to work and contemplating working on it	Recognised importance of diversity and developed shared vision on diversity	Developed shared vision on diversity and aligning operations to this vision	Integrated diversity in organisational vision and mission statements
Policies on DiW	No policy on DiW	Have started consulting others for the development of DiW policies	Review of organisational policies to assess their suitability for DiW policy	Formed DiW policy but lack clarity on its operationalisation	DiW policy with stated goals and plan of action
Leadership Commitment to DiW	Board and senior management have not taken lead on DiW	Board and senior management have started discussions on DiW	DiW team or point person nominated to take the process forward	All senior management asked to take leadership on DiW	Leadership demonstrates accountability on DiW internally and to external stakeholders
Diversity of Board	Not constituted as per needs of diversity	Board assessed in terms of diversity and preparation for its re-constitution	Resolution passed for re-constitution of the board based on diversity	New members inducted to bring diversity to the board	Board reflects values of diversity of the organisation
Diversity in Senior Management (Heads of Department)	Senior management does not reflect diversity	Internal review of senior management on principles of diversity	Board/policy on DiW recognise need for diversity at Senior management level	Senior management reflect values of DiW defined by the organisation	Promotional policies incorporate diversity in Senior Management positions
Training on DiW	No training has been undertaken or planned on DiW	Training on DiW being planned but not been delivered so far	Initial orientation on the need for DiW undertaken for all staff	Training on changes in attitude and behaviour amongst workforce for diversity undertaken	Regular Training Needs Analysis includes need for training on diversity and it forms part of the regular training programme of the organisation
Budgetary commitment for DiW	No separate budget for diversity allocated	Assessment undertaken for budgetary requirements for implementation of DiW policies and action	Budgetary allocations made for implementation of DiW action plan	Budgets being used for implementation of DiW in the organisation	Regular line item in the budget for promotion of diversity and for implementation of policy of DiW
HR policies and practices on DiW	HR policies do not include component of diversity	HR policies reviewed for inclusion of DiW	HR policies include diversity as a goal for human resource in the organisation	HR practices adopted for recruitment at all levels	HR policies and practices include diversity in recruitment, assessment and promotion
Infrastructural changes to promote DiW	Infrastructure has not been designed or created to cater for diversity	Infrastructure reviewed of its suitability for diversity	Funds allotted for change/modification in infrastructure to be friendly for diversity within the organisation	Infrastructure changed to suit the needs of diverse workforce	Diversity audit also includes appropriateness of infrastructure for workforce diversity
Disclosures on DiW	Do not collect data on demographics to reflect diversity in the organisation	Some demographic data is collected but not in systematic or comprehensive manner	Data on demographic collected and disaggregated but not analysed for assessment of diversity within the organisation	Data on demographic collected and disaggregated and analysed for assessment of diversity within the organisation	Data on demographic routinely collected and disaggregated and used form making assessment of diversity within the organisation
Culture of Diversity within the organisation	Workforce discriminates, jokes and give observations on basis of social identity	Workforce sensitised on the use of language to accept and celebrate diversity	Workforce alert on the language and accepts whenever such language is used and aim to rectify the same	Workforce identifies language and behaviour that impacts diversity and is willing to changes it	Workforce do not discriminate on the basis of social identities and they are careful in the use of their language and behaviour
Accountability on Diversity	Diversity metrics is not included in organisational accountability mechanisms	Have recognised the need to include diversity related metrics but have included them so far	Diversity metrics included in some aspects/ parts of the organisation but not the entire organisation	Organisational standard evaluation includes metrics on diversity	Organisational evaluation and accountability mechanisms report on diversity related metrices

Decision making mechanisms	*Decision-making in the organisation does not factor in D/W*	*Interested in factoring in D/W in decision making but mainly as an option or as an additional factor*	*D/W factored in accidentally or anecdotally in decision-making*	*Decision making on policies and practices are based on principles and values of D/W*	*Organisational policies and practices are guided by considerations of D/W*
Partnerships with Communities	*Do not view partnership with diverse/disparate communities as important for the organisation*	*Consider making partnerships with diverse/disparate communities but do not know how to do it*	*Beginning to build partnerships with disparate/diverse communities but mostly rare or selective*	*Engage with communities facing disparities to understand how to provide support to these communities*	*Formal partnership with organisations/ leaders of disparate communities to work out mechanisms of how to mutually benefit each other*
Diversity across grantees	*Organisation does not engage with grantees on D/W within their organisation*	*Organisation asks and collects information on D/W from the grantee organisation*	*Organisation analyses D/W data of the grantee and make suggestions to them*	*Organisation supports and handhold grantees to improve D/W within their respective organisation*	*Analysis of D/W is an important component of Due Diligence for selection of grantee organisations*

2. Organisational Mapping on Inclusion

Where would you place your organisation on the following Map on Inclusion in the organisation

Component	Not yet Started	Ready to Start	Launched	Well on the Way	Leading and creating Examples of Good Practice
Vision on Inclusion	*Does not see inclusion as relevant to the work*	*Recognition of inclusion as relevant to work and contemplating working on it*	*Recognised importance of inclusion and developed shared vision on diversity*	*Developed shared vision on inclusion and aligning operations to this vision*	*Integrated inclusion in organisational vision and mission statements*
Policies on Inclusion	*No declared policy on inclusion by the organisation*	*Have started consulting others for the understanding and development of policies related to inclusion*	*Review of organisational policies to assess their suitability for policy on inclusion*	*Formed policy on inclusion but lack clarity on its operationalisation*	*Inclusion policy with stated goals and plan of action framed and operationalised*
Leadership commitment to Inclusion	*Board and senior management have not taken lead on inclusion*	*Board and senior management have started discussions and assessing inclusion within the organisation*	*A team or point person has been nominated to make assessment of inclusion within the organisation*	*All senior management make assessment of inclusion within their domain*	*Leadership demonstrates accountability on inclusion internally*
Inclusivity in Board	*Board does not assess itself in terms of inclusivity of all its members*	*Board is aware for the need for inclusion of all its members, but does not know how to go about doing it*	*Board has started tracking inclusivity of its board members, but only in selected aspects of organisational work*	*Board has inclusive decision-making processes and works/ promotes participation of all its members*	*Board is inclusive in terms of discussion, decision-making process & allocation of responsibilities to member*
Inclusion practised by Senior Management (Heads of Department)	*Senior management are not sensitive to inclusion within their teams*	*Senior management are sensitive to inclusion and inclusive practices but do not know how to promote them*	*Senior management are sensitive to inclusion and inclusive practices and are implementing the same within their team*	*Senior management have adopted inclusive practices in some aspects of their work*	*Senior Management demonstrate inclusivity within their teams and address exclusionary or prejudicial practices within their teams*
Training on Inclusion	*No training has been undertaken nor planned on inclusion in the organisation*	*Training on inclusion has been planned but have not been delivered so far*	*Initial orientation on inclusion undertaken for all staff*	*Training on inclusion and inclusive practices conducted for all staff*	*Inclusion and exclusion are part of regular training programme in the organisation*
Budgetary commitment for Inclusion	*No separate budget for promotion of inclusion allocated*	*Assessment undertaken for budgetary requirements for implementation of inclusion policies & action*	*Budgetary allocations made to put promotion of inclusive practices in the organisation*	*Budgets utilised for implementation for inclusive practices in the organisation*	*Regular line item in the budget for promotion of inclusion in the organisation including exclusionary redressal mechanism*
HR policies and practices on Inclusion	*HR policies do not include component of inclusion*	*HR policies reviewed in reference to inclusion in the organisation*	*HR policies include inclusion as a goal for human resources in the organisation*	*HR practices adapted for addressing inclusion at all levels*	*HR policies and practices include inclusion in employee interactions*

Component	Not yet Started	Ready to Start	Launched	Well on the Way	Leading and creating Examples of Good Practice
					promotion, and career development
Inclusionary Infrastructural in the organisation	*Infrastructure has not been designed or created to cater for inclusion of diverse group of people*	*Infrastructure reviewed of its suitability for promoting inclusion*	*Finds suited for change in Infrastructure to be support and promote inclusion within the organisation*	*Infrastructure changed so that it does not exclude and promotes inclusion of diverse groups*	*DEI audit includes appropriateness of infrastructure for workforce inclusion*
Disclosures on Inclusion	*Do not collect metrics that reflect on inclusionary practices within the organisation*	*Inclusion metrics collected but not disaggregated or analysed*	*Metrics on inclusion collected and disaggregated and analysed for assessment of inclusion within the organisation*	*Metrics is on inclusion analysed for developing data on inclusion over a period of time*	*Metrics on inclusion analysed for developing Inclusion Index of the organisation that is tracked for making assessment on inclusion in the organisation*
Culture of Inclusion within the organisation	*Employees find exclusion discriminatory and prejudice dominate with in the organisational culture*	*Employees sensitised on inclusion-exclusion and promotion of inclusionary attitude and behaviour among the workforce*	*Employees from non-dominant groups increasingly observe their inclusion in organisational decision-making processes*	*Employees behaviour changes and inclusion gains the norm within teams and as part of the organisation*	*Employees from different groups claim that the organisation is inclusionary in recruitment, management, promotion and growth*
Accountability on Inclusion	*Inclusion is not a factor that is sought as feedback from employees*	*Inclusion has been introduced as a factor for employee feedback*	*Inclusion is used as part of performance assessment in some teams within the organisation*	*Inclusion is used as part of performance assessment within the organisation*	*Inclusion feedback becomes a regular feature of employee feedback through internal and third party feedback mechanisms*
Decision making mechanisms	*Decision making in the organisation does not factor in inclusion*	*Teams show interest in factoring in inclusionary practices in decision making as an option*	*Teams factor in inclusion occasionally or consistently in decision making*	*Decision making on policies and practices are based on principles and values of inclusion*	*Organisational policies and practices are guided by considerations of inclusion and inclusionary practices*

3. Organisational Mapping on Equity

Where would you place your organisation on the following Map on Equity in the organisation?

Component	Not yet Started	Ready to Start	Launched	Well on the Way	Leading and creating Examples of Good Practice
Vision on Equity	*Does not see equity as relevant to the work*	*Recognition of equity as relevant to work and contemplating working on it*	*Recognised importance of Equity and developed shared vision on diversity*	*Developed shared vision on Equity and aligning operations to this vision*	*Integrated Equity in organisational vision and mission statements*
Policies on Equity	*No policy on promoting equity in the organisation*	*Have started consulting others for the development of policies on equity for the organisation*	*Review of organisational policies to assess their suitability for policy on equity*	*Formed policy on equity but lack clarity on its operationalisation*	*Policy on equity framed with stated goals and plan of action*
Leadership commitment to Equity	*Board and senior management have not taken lead on promoting equity within the organisation*	*Board and senior management have started discussions on equity*	*A team or a point person nominated to take the process on equity forward*	*All senior management asked to take leadership for promotion of equity within the organisation*	*Leadership demonstrates accountability on equity internally*
Equity in Board	*Board does not assess itself in terms of equal opportunities of all its members*	*Board is aware for the need for equal opportunities of all its members, but does not know how to go about doing it*	*Board has started developing and tracking equal opportunities of its board members, but only in selected aspects of organisational work*	*Board has equal opportunities for all its board members and promote participation of all its members*	*Board has established norms for equity in terms of discussion, decision-making, and allocation of responsibilities to its member*
Equity as practised by Senior Management (Heads of Department)	*Senior management are not sensitive to issues of equity within their teams*	*Senior management are sensitive to equity but do not know how to promote them*	*Senior management are sensitive to equity and are implementing the same within their team*	*Senior management have adopted practices to promote & establish equal opportunities in some aspects of their work*	*Senior management demonstrate and are recognised for equity within their teams*

Component	Not yet Started	Ready to Start	Launched	Well on the Way	Leading and creating Examples of Good Practice
Training on Equity	No training has been undertaken nor planned on equity within the organisation	Training on equity has been planned but have not been delivered so far	Initial orientation on equity undertaken for all staff	Training on equity and promotion of equal opportunities practices conducted for all staff	Issues of equity are part of are part of regular training programme in the organisation
Budgetary commitment for Equity	No separate budget allocated for promotion of equity in the organisation	Assessment undertaken of budgetary requirements to implement action on equal opportunities	Budgetary allocations made to put practices that promote equity in the organisation	Budgets utilised for implementation of practices for equal opportunities in the organisation	Regular line item in the budget for promotion of equity and equal opportunities in the organisation
HR policies and practices on Equity	HR policies do not include component of equity	HR policies reviewed in reference to equity in the organisation	HR policies include equity and equal opportunities as a goal for human resource in the organisation	HR practices adopted for addressing favouritism and biases at all levels	HR policies and practices include equity in employee interactions, promotion, career development, and employee feedback
Infrastructure that promotes equity in organisation	Infrastructure has not been designed or created to cater for equity between diverse group of people	Infrastructure reviewed of its suitability for promoting equity	Funds allotted for change/modification in infrastructure to support and promote equity within the organisation	Infrastructure changed so that it does promote equal opportunities for all the diverse groups	DEI audit includes appropriateness of infrastructure for promotion of equal opportunities and equity
Disclosures on Inclusion	Do not collect metrics that reflect on equity within the organisation	Equity metrics collected but not disaggregated or analysed	Metrics on equity collected and disaggregated and analysed for assessment of equity and equal opportunities within the organisation	Metrics on equity analysed for developing data on equity over a period of time	Metrics on equity analysed for developing the Equity Index of the organisation that is tracked for making assessment on equity in the organisation
Culture of Equity within the organisation	Employees find favouritism and bias dominates within the organisational culture	Employees sensitised on equal opportunities and promotion of equity within the workforce	Employees from non dominant groups increasingly observe equal opportunities for participation in decision making processes	Behavioural changes and decisions that promote equal opportunities within teams are increasing	Employees from different groups claim that the organisation promotes equity in recruitment, management, promotion and growth
Accountability on Equity	Equity is not a factor that is sought or feedback from employees	Equity has been introduced as a factor for employee feedback"	Equity and equal opportunities are used as part of performance assessment in some teams within the organisation	Equity and equal opportunities is used as part of performance assessment within the organisation	Equity feedback becomes a regular feature of employee feedback through internal and third-party feedback mechanisms
Decision making mechanisms	Decision-making in the organisation does not factor in promotion of equity	Teams show interest in factoring in equal opportunities in decision making as an option	Teams factor in equal opportunities occasionally or consciously in decision-making	Decision making on policies and practices are based on principles and values of equity	Organisational policies and practices are guided by considerations of equity

End Time:_____

Date of Survey:_____

Name of the Interviewee (optional):_____

Name of Researcher:_____

Annexure 3 Tools for Data Collection- Questionnaire related to Policies and Practices related to Diversity Inclusion and Equity

The questionnaire will be employed after the Mapping on Diversity Inclusion and Equity has been completed. The aim of the questionnaire it to explore detailed response that have been stated as part of the Mapping tool.

The interviewee will be encouraged to give examples that they have **seen or have experienced themselves**. They will be asked to refrain from narrating incidents that they have heard of or have been told to them by others.

The interview will be conducted by the Principal Researcher after taking the informed consent of the interviewee.

Question 1 and 2 will be filled in by the interviewee and no follow up questions will be asked on the same.

The word limit for the any of the answer will not be more than 100-150 words.

Number: _____   Place of Survey:_____   Interview Start Time:_____

1. Personal Information

1.1	Name (Optional)	
1.2	Age (in years)	
1.3	Department on which posted	
1.4	Present Designation	
1.5	Year(s) of working in the Organisation	
1.6	Education Level (mention from graduation onwards to the highest Educational Achievement)	
1.7	Languages	
1.7.1	Mother Tongue (specify)	
1.7.2	Other language you know (read/write/speak any one of them)	

2. Social Identity

2.1	Gender	Female		Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to disclose

2.2	Caste	SC	ST	OBC	Others	Prefer not to disclose

2.3	Religion	Hindu	Muslin	Christian	Sikh	Jain	Buddhist	Other	Prefer not to disclose

2.4	Disability				
2.4.1	Do you identify yourself as a person with disability?	Yes	No		Prefer not to disclose
2.4.2	If yes, what is the disability that you have?	Physical	Visual	Hearing	Intellectual

2.5	Region			
2.5.1	Do you associate yourself with any region in the country?	Yes	No	Prefer not to disclose
2.5.2	If yes, which region do you associate yourself with (specify)?			

2.6	Marital Status	Married	Divorced	Single	Prefer not to disclose

2.7	Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	Gay/Lesbians	Bisexual	Queer	Pansexual	Asexual	Prefer not to disclose

2.8	Parental Status	Parent	Caregiver	Neither	Prefer not to disclose

2.9	Food Preference	Vegetarian	Non-Vegetarian	Both	Vegan	Prefer not to disclose

3. Organisational Policy on Diversity

3.1	What do you understand by Diversity in Workforce?

3.2	Does the organisation have Policy on Diversity?	Yes Go to 3.3	No Go to 3.4	Don't Know Go to 3.5

3.3 If the answer is YES in 3.2 - Awareness of Organisational POLICY on Diversity

3.3.1	Has a document of the policy on diversity been shared with you?	
3.3.2	When was the policy on Diversity formulated and announced by the company?	
3.3.3.	What was the process of making the policy on Diversity in workforce by the organisation?	
3.3.4	Does the policy include the entire workforce or is applied to specific areas of workforce only? Do specify with examples.	
3.3.5	Why do you think the company has Policy on Diversity?	
3.3.6	What are the gains and losses to organisation if it has a Policy on Diversity in workforce? [**Go to 3.6**]	

3.4	If the answer is NO in 3.2	
3.4.1	Do you think organisation should have declared policy on diversity in workforce? Why?	

3.4.2	What are the gains and losses to the organisation if there is a policy on diversity in workforce by the organisation? **(Go to 4)**	

3.5	**If DON'T KNOW** in 3.2	
3.5.1	Who would you ask to find out whether the organisation has a policy on Diversity in workforce? Why?	
3.5.2	How does the organisation shares policies related to workforce with the staff? **(Go to 4)**	

3.6 Content of Diversity in Workforce (DiW) Policy		
3.6.1	Which of the diversities are recognised in the organisational policy on DiW? Caste/gender/religion/disability/region/language/marital status/parental status/sexual orientation/food preference/language/academic	
3.6.2	Which of the diversities you think should be included in the Policy? Why?	
3.6.3	Do you think there is shared understanding of the policy on DiW within the organisation? Does the understanding of policy on Diversity in workforce cuts across all the departments equally?	
3.6.4	Does the DiW policy of the organisation has exceptional clauses for any part of the organisation? Why? How were these exceptions identified?	

3.7	Does the policy on DiW state the overall purpose of the policy? What is the purpose of the policy in your understanding?	
3.8	Does the policy state the goals that is aims to achieve? Has the policy set targets and indicators to find out whether these goals are being achieved?	
3.9	Does the policy include the manner of its implementation and mechanism for its monitoring and review?	
3.10	Is the DiW policy applicable for recruitment only or is it applicable for promotions as well?	
3.11	Who has the responsibility to implement policy on DiW within the organisation?	
3.12	Has the department with the responsibility for implementing the policy on DiW incorporated it in its own vision and/or mission statements?	
3.13	Who has the responsibility to review the DiW policy of the organisation? What is the frequency of the review, and is the review placed before the Board?	
3.14	What are the practices employed by the organisation for the implementation of the policy on DiW?	
3.15	Are specific funds allotted for the implementation of policy on DiW? What are these funds allotted for? How is the amount decided? Who decides on this amount?	
3.16	What are the training or capacity development programmes conducted for the staff to understand the need	

		for DiW policy and practices within the organisation?	
3.17		How does the Human Resource department of the organisation creatively source candidates to increase the diversity of the workforce?	

4. Organisational PRACTICES on Diversity

4.1	What are the specific measures put in to practice for the implementation of DiW for each of the following area: recruitment, evaluation, promotion, training, grievance handling and reporting?	

4.2 Please rate the following on a scale of 0 to 5, where 0 is **Not at all** 5 means **Very High**

Diversity in Workforce		0	1	2	3	4	5
4.2.1	How diverse is the board of the organisation?						
4.2.2	How diverse is the senior management?						
4.2.3	How diverse is the middle management?						
4.2.4	How diverse is the lower staff?						

4.3 Rate on a scale of 0 to 5, where 0 means **Not at all** and 5 means **Very High**

Commitment to Diversity		0	1	2	3	4	5
4.3.1	When someone joins the organisation, do people ask about their social and cultural background?						
4.3.2	How comfortable are you with discussing your social and cultural background within the organisation?						
4.3.3	Caste-, religion- and gender-based jokes are not tolerated within the organisation (**not tolerated** will be towards **5** and **tolerated** will be towards **0**)						
4.3.4	The organisation regularly makes available information on diversity within the organisation						
4.3.5	Senior management is committed to diversity within the organisation						
4.3.6	The senior management is committed to diversity in the leadership positions in the organisation						
4.3.7	The organisation has demonstrated their commitment to support the needs of persons with disabilities						
4.3.8	The organisation has demonstrated their commitment to support the needs of different genders within the organisation						

4.3.9	The organisation has demonstrated their commitment to support the needs of people with different languages, and food preference within the organisation						
4.3.10	The organisation responds to complaints of discrimination and harassment based on any of the parameters of diversity						

4.4	What are the training programmes conducted for understanding and appreciating diversity? For whom within the organisation are these training programmes conducted?	
4.5	Have you attended any of these programmes? How useful do you think are these programmes for taking forward the agenda of celebrating diversity in the organisation?	
4.6	What are the reporting and accountability mechanisms on Diversity in the organisation? Does the workforce participate in the assessment of, and reporting on, diversity within the organisation?	
4.7	Does the organisation make data on **DIW** public? How is it assessed and reported? Is there an external accountability mechanism that the organisation undertakes for **DiW**?	

5. Organisational POLICIES and PRACTICES on Inclusion

5.1	What do you understand by Inclusion in workplace? Can you give some examples to explain your understanding?	
5.2	Does the organisation have a stated value in inclusion or promotion of inclusion at workplace? What components of inclusion does the value include?	
5.3	Do you think the value stated is appropriate for the organisation? How would you like to change or modify it?	
5.4	How much importance does the organisation gives to the value of	

		inclusivity? Give examples for your opinion.	
5.5		What are the inclusivity initiatives t taken by the organisation? Which of these initiatives you find to be most effective?	
5.6		Have you witnessed instances of exclusion or discrimination or harassment or prejudice in the organisation. Give example. Were these instances reported? What was the outcome when these were reported?	
5.7		Do the training programmes include component of inclusion and processes that promote inclusivity? Have you attended any of these training? How would you rate these training in terms of their effectiveness?	
5.8		Does the organisation have fair promotion and career growth path and processes? Give examples for your opinion.	
5.9		Do you find obstacles or constraints that hinder your participation in organisation decision-making processes? Give example.	
5.10		What do you think the organisation should do to promote inclusion within its processes and as part of organisational culture?	

5.11   Rate the following on a scale of 0 to 5:   0 means **Never** and 5 Means **Always**

Inclusive practices in the organisation		0	1	2	3	4	5
5.11.1	I feel respected and valued for the contribution I make in the organisation						
5.11.2	I feel left out or excluded from important discussions or decision-making processes						
5.11.3	The organisation fosters a sense of belonging to its employees						
5.11.4	The organisation effectively handles all issues of discrimination						
5.11.5	I am comfortable in expressing my opinions and ideas in my workplace						
5.11.6	I can safely express my concerns within the organisation						
5.11.7	The organisation offers equal opportunities for growth						

Inclusive practices in the organisation		0	1	2	3	4	5
5.11.8	People of all cultures and backgrounds are respected and valued						
5.11.9	Communication received from organisation is open and honest						
5.11.10	The organisation takes appropriate cation if an act of harassment or discrimination is reported						
5.11.11	The organisation has career growth opportunities for all regardless of differences						
5.11.12	Decisions related to promotions are made fairly						

6. Organisational POLICIES and PRACTICES on Equity

6.1	What do you understand by equity at workplace? Can you give some examples to explain your understanding?	
6.2	Does the organisation have a stated value in equity or promotion of equal opportunities at workplace? What components of equity does the value include?	
6.3	Do you think the value for equity stated is appropriate for the organisation? How would you like to c modify it?	
6.4	How much importance does the organisation give to the value of equity and equal opportunities? Give examples for your opinion.	
6.5	What are the equity initiatives taken by the organisation? Which of these initiatives you find to be most effective?	
6.6	Have you witnessed instances of favouritism or biases or prejudice in the organisation. Give examples. Were these instances reported? What was the outcome when these were reported?	
6.7	Do the training programmes include component of equity and processes that promote equal opportunities? Have you	

	attended any of these training? How would you rate these training in terms of their effectiveness?	
6.8	Does the organisation have equity in promotion and career growth path and processes? Give examples for your opinion.	
6.9	Do you find obstacles or constraints that hinder equity and establishment of equitable opportunities in the organisation's decision-making processes? Give example.	
6.10	What do you think the organisation should do to promote equity within its processes and as part of organisational culture?	

6.11 Rate the following: 0 means **Never** and **5** means **Always**

Practices Related to Equity in the organisation	0	1	2	3	4	5
6.11.1 The prganisation treats all employees fairly in defining their terms of employment						
6.11.2 There are same opportunities for advancement for all colleagues in the organisation						
6.11.3 There is absence of favouritism in the organisation						
6.11.4 There is equal pay for equal work in the organisation						
6.11.5 There are equal benefits and privileges for all in the organisation						
6.11.6 There is transparency regarding everybody's pay, promotion and opportunities						
6.11.7 The organisation takes measures to enhance the productive potential of employees who have special needs						
6.11.8 The organisation makes investment so that employees from all groups have similar levels of skills and competency						

Interview End Time:_____
Date of Interview:_____
Name of Interviewee (optional):_____
Name of Principal Researcher: _____