

Report on the BalanseHub Project 2024–26 at the Department of Teacher Education, NTNU  
Forum for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity at the Department of Teacher Education -  
Opportunities for a Diverse Teacher Education

*Tone Pernille Østern and Sevil Sümer*



Title: "Selfportrait as more disabled (red) 2009" (2025)

Artist: Ihra Lill Scharning

Photo: Alexander Rosenkranz

5 June 2026

Forum for Equity, Inclusion and Diversity

Department for Teacher Education, NTNU

The BalanseHub project at ILU was supported by the Research Council of Norway  
(project nr. 2720724)

*This report was translated from Norwegian to English by the authors with the assistance of Microsoft Copilot. The translation was proofread by Eir-Anne Edgar.*

## Abstract

The BalanseHub project “Forum for Equity, Inclusion and Diversity at the Department of Teacher Education, NTNU – Opportunities for a Diverse Teacher Education” was a large, leadership-supported organizational development project that took place from 2024 to 2026. The project was supported by the Research Council of Norway. It addressed the following research questions:

*What are the most central diversity and equality challenges at the Department of Teacher Education, NTNU, which is Norway’s largest teacher education environment?*

*How can a leadership-anchored Forum place these challenges on the agenda and contribute to organizational change?*

The project consisted of three main components (sub-goals):

1. Development of diversity leadership: Two workshops for all leaders, conducted in collaboration with the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud (LDO) (<https://ldo.no/>).
2. Development of diversity competence among staff in collaboration with Dembra: A total of 33 workshops carried out in academic sections, the administration, centers, and committees. 12 of the workshops led by Dembra, the rest by leaders of sections, units and committees. Dembra offers supervision, courses and web resources for school and teacher education aimed at strengthening democratic resilience on the field of education (<https://www.dembra.no/no>).
3. Accompanying research with three components: Individual interviews with section leaders; focus group discussions with staff members of international background; and a survey.

This project report presents an analysis of the documentation from the workshops with staff about the department’s diversity challenges. The project has been a learning process for all parties involved and documents that ILU has many strengths, substantial resources for diversity and inclusion work, and a high level of awareness in parts of the organization. However, there is still a need for more structured efforts, greater openness, and clear leadership anchoring to develop a truly inclusive organizational culture. The project report specifies 11 areas for further development, including issues related to arenas for sharing, support for international staff, language, hierarchies, ableism, recruitment, research priorities, racism and democracy. Taken together, these point to the need for more structured and long-term efforts to develop both a more inclusive workplace (the department) and an inclusive and sustainable teacher education that enables diversity.

The project has also generated knowledge about how the Forum for Equity, Inclusion and Diversity as a leader supported forum, through facilitating the project, has succeeded in placing diversity-related issues on the agenda and contributing to organizational learning and change. A key finding is the Forum’s role as a link between different levels of the department, such as department leadership, academic section leadership, study program leadership, research leadership, and staff. One of the Forum’s strengths is underlining that these challenges should not be individualized, but understood as organizational and structural, and therefore as issues that can be addressed through organizational development.

## Iktedimmie

BalanseHub-prosjekte "Forum for likeverd, inkludering og mangfold ved Institutt for lærerutdanning (ILU), NTNU - muligheter for en mangfoldig lærerutdanning" lij akte stoerre åvtehedårjoen organisasjovneevtiedimmieprojekte mij jaepien 2024 raejeste 2026 raajan ryöki. Prosjekten dåeriesmoeretjoelmh:

*Mah leah dah vihkielommes gellievoeten- jìh mìrrestallemehaestemh Lohkehtæjjaööhpehtimmien Instituhtesne, NTNU:sne, mij lea Nöörjen stööremes lohkehtæjjaööhpehtimmiebyjrese?*

*Guktie åvtehestuvreme Forume maakta dejtie haestiemidie biejjieöörnegasse biejedh jìh organisasjovnejarkelimmine viehkiehtidh?*

Prosjekte golme åejjiekomponenth utni (bielieulmieh):

1. Gellievoetestuvrieh evtiedidh: Göökte barkoeboelkhk gaajhkide åvtehkidie, laavenjostosne Mìrrestalleme- jìh sìerredimmietjirkijinie LDO (<https://ldo.no/>)
2. Barkijie gellievoetemahtoem evtiedidh ektine Dembra: Àllesth 33 barkoeboelkhk tjìrrehtamme faageseksjovnine, reeremisnie, jarngine jìh moenehtsinie. 12 dejstie barkoeboelhkijste Dembra stuvri, doh jeatjah åvtekhk faageseksjovnijste, jarngijste, reeremistie jìh moenehtsistie stuvrin. Dembra bìhkedimmie, kuvsjh jìh vierhkiesijjeh nedtesne faalehte skuvlide jìh lohkehtæjjaööhpehtimide, dejnie ulmine skuvlen barkoem eevtjedh demokrateles riejrivesvoetine (<https://www.dembra.no/no>)
3. Dotkeme golme bielie: Persovneles goerehtimmieh sektovreåvtehkine; Fokusedåehkiesoptsestalleme barkijigujmie internasjonale duekine, jìh gihtjemegoerehtimmine.

Prosjekten illedahke lea analysh vihtesjimmijste barkijie barkoeboelhkijste, institusjovnen gellievoetehaestemi bijre hammosne daate prosjektereehtetse. Prosjekte lierehtimmieprosesse orreme gaajhkide guejmide, jìh vihtesjadteme ILU:n gellie nænnoes bielie, jìjnjh vierhtieh gellievoete- jìh feerhmelesvoetebarkose, jìh jolle voerkesvoete såemies bielie årganisasjovne, mohte annje daerpies vielie struktureereme barkoe, stuerebe ræhpasvoete jìh tjìelke åvtehestuvreme juktie tjìelke feerhmeles årganisasjovnekultuvrem evtiedidh. Prosjektereehtetse 11 evtiedimmiesuerkieh dåajvohte dan vijriesåbpoe barkose, gaskem jeatjah juakadimmiesijjeh, dåarjoe gaskenasjovnaale barkijidie, gïele, hierarkijh, funksjovnenormativitehte, dåarrehtimmie, dotkeme, tjìertedibleme, demokratije jìh vierhtieåtnoe. Dah vuesiehtieh daerpies vielie struktureereme jìh guhkiebasse barkojne juktie dovne aktem vielie feerhmeles barkoesijjiem (instituhthen) jìh aktem feerhmeles jìh monnehke lohkehtæjjaööhpehtimmie evtiedidh, gusnie sijjie gååvnese gellievoetese.

Prosjekte aaj mahtoem vadteme guktie Forume mìrrestallemasse, feerhmemasse jìh gellievoetese goh åvtehedårjoen forume gosse prosjekte tseegkesovveme, lea buektiehtamme gellievoetegyhtjelassh biejjieöörnegasse biejedh, jìh viehkiehtidh guktie organisasjovnh lierieh jìh jarkelie. Akte vihkeles gaavneme lea forumen råålla goh ektiedimmiegievlie dej ovnessie njeiptjie gaskem organisasjovnesne, goh institusjovnestuvrije, faageseksjovnestuvrije, studijesoejkesjestuvrije, dotkemestuvrije jìh barkijh. Forumen vieksiesvoete lea våajnoes darjodh haestemh eah byörh aktegsalmetji, men guarkedh goh öörnedimmien jìh struktuvren gaavhtan, jìh dan åvteste gåarede maam akt dejnie darjodh organisasjovneevtiedimmine.

## Sammenheng

BalanseHub-prosjektet "Forum for likeverd, inkludering og mangfold ved Institutt for lærerutdanning (ILU), NTNU - muligheter for en mangfoldig lærerutdanning" var et stort lederstøttet organisasjonsutviklingsprosjekt som foregikk i 2024-26. Prosjektet var støttet av Norges Forskningsråd. Det hadde følgende problemstillinger:

*Hva er de mest sentrale mangfolds- og likestillingsutfordringene ved Institutt for lærerutdanning, NTNU, som er Norges største lærerutdanningsmiljø?*

*Hvordan kan et lederforankret Forum sette disse utfordringene på dagsorden og bidra til organisasjonsendring?*

Prosjektet besto av tre hovedkomponenter (delmål):

1. Utvikling av mangfoldsledelse: To workshoper for alle ledere, i samarbeid med Likestillings- og diskrimineringsombudet LDO (<https://ldo.no/>)
2. Utvikling av mangfoldskompetanse blant ansatte i samarbeid med Dembra: Totalt 33 workshoper gjennomført i fagseksjoner, administrasjonen, sentre og utvalg. 12 av workshopene ledet av Dembra, resten av ledere av fagseksjoner, sentere, administrasjon og utvalg. Dembra tilbyr veiledning, kurs og nettbaserte ressurser for skole og lærerutdanning, med mål om å styrke skolens arbeid med demokratisk beredskap (<https://www.dembra.no/no>)
3. Følgforskning med tre komponenter: Personlige intervjuer med seksjonsledere; Fokusgruppesamtaler med ansatte med internasjonal bakgrunn, og spørreundersøkelse.

Denne prosjektrapporten presenterer analyser av dokumentasjon fra workshopene blant ansatte om instituttets mangfoldsutfordringer. Prosjektet har vært en læringsprosess for alle involverte parter og har dokumentert at ILU har mange sterke sider, mange ressurser for mangfolds- og inkluderingsarbeid og høy bevissthet i deler av organisasjonen, men at det fortsatt trengs mer strukturert arbeid, større åpenhet, og klar ledelsesforankring for å utvikle en virkelig inkluderende organisasjonskultur. Prosjektrapporten munner ut i 11 utviklingsområder for videre arbeid, blant annet knyttet til delingsarenaer, støtte til internasjonalt ansatte, språk, hierarkier, funksjonsnormativitet, rekruttering, forskning, rasisme, demokrati og ressursbruk. Disse peker samlet mot behovet for et mer strukturert og langsiktig arbeid for å utvikle både en mer inkluderende arbeidsplass (instituttet) og en inkluderende og bærekraftig lærerutdanning med rom for mangfold.

Prosjektet har også gitt kunnskap om hvordan Forum for likeverd, inkludering og mangfold som lederstøttet forum gjennom fasilitering av prosjektet har klart å sette mangfoldsrelaterte tema på dagsorden og bidra til organisasjonslæring og -endring. Et sentralt funn er forumets rolle som bindeledd mellom ulike nivåer i organisasjonen, som instituttledelse, fagseksjonsledelse, studieprogramledelse, forskningsledelse og ansatte. Forumets styrke er å synliggjøre at utfordringene ikke bør individualiseres, men forstås som organisatoriske og strukturelle og dermed mulige å gjøre noe med gjennom organisasjonsutvikling.

## List of content

*Abstract*

*Iktedimmi*

*Sammendrag*

<i>1. Background and Objectives</i> .....	<i>1</i>
<i>2. Conceptual Discussion</i> .....	<i>2</i>
<i>3. Implementation of the Project</i> .....	<i>4</i>
3.1 Management and Facilitation of the Project.....	4
3.2 Workshops for Diversity Leadership with LDO.....	6
3.3 Workshops for diversity competence among staff with Dembra.....	7
<i>4. Analytical method: problem descriptions and proposed measures from the different units</i> .....	<i>9</i>
4.1. A critical perspective on the documentation.....	11
4.2. Participant validation (member checking).....	11
<i>5. Problem descriptions and proposed measures across all sections/units in relation to grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</i> .....	<i>12</i>
5.1. The Social Sciences section.....	12
5.2. The Natural Sciences section.....	14
5.3. The Arts, Physical Education and Sports section.....	16
5.4. The English and Foreign Languages section.....	18
5.5. The Norwegian Centre for Writing Education and Research (The Writing Centre).....	20
5.6. The Administration.....	22
5.7. The Mathematics Section.....	26
5.8. The Norwegian Centre for Mathematics Education.....	28
5.9. The Norwegian Section.....	31
5.10. The Pedagogy Section.....	34
5.11. Vocational Education, School Development and Educational Leadership (FYSU).....	38
5.12. The Education Committee.....	41
5.13. The Research Committee.....	42
<i>6. Discussion</i> .....	<i>44</i>
<i>7. Recommendations</i> .....	<i>46</i>
11 areas for development.....	46

*Attachment 1 Follow-up Research: Participant evaluation of the workshop series*

## 1. Background and Objectives

The Department of Teacher Education (ILU) at NTNU participated during the period 2024–26 in the Research Council of Norway–funded competence network BalanseHub (<https://balansehub.nifu.no>). BalanseHub is a further development of the Research Council’s earlier program *BALANSE: Gender Balance in Senior Positions and Research Management*, which was established in 2012 as a ten-year initiative. Launched in 2023, *BalanseHub* represents the Research Council’s new initiative aimed at strengthening gender balance, diversity, and inclusion in Norwegian research and in the Norwegian higher education sector.

ILU’s strategic and action plans state that the institute is to work actively with diversity and inclusion. Teacher education carries a substantial societal responsibility. A key societal goal is to contribute to a diverse teacher education in which both students and teacher educators contribute to and add value to schools and to Norwegian society as it exists today. The field of education is an arena where significant power and influence are exercised and is therefore a crucial site for counteracting discrimination and exclusion in order to achieve national and local goals related to equality, inclusion, and diversity. Diversity is not something the higher education sector can opt out of, cf. the Universities and University Colleges Act § 7-1, which states:

Universities and university colleges shall work actively, purposefully, and systematically to promote gender equality, other forms of equality, and to prevent discrimination, cf. the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Act § 26.

The university also has a duty to take active measures and promote equality in the public sector, as well as an obligation to carry out a situational analysis. The work carried out by ILU through the BalanseHub project and this report is a contribution to the institute’s situational analysis and thus helps fulfil this obligation. This does not mean that the work is complete or exhaustive, but rather a contribution. The work for equity, diversity, and inclusion must continue even after the BalanseHub project is concluded.

When the Research Council announced the call for funding, ILU applied for and was awarded NOK 938,000 for its intervention project “Forum for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity at the Department of Teacher Education, NTNU - Opportunities for a Diverse Teacher Education Program.” Several initiatives aimed at increasing the focus on equity, inclusion, and diversity (EID) at the institute preceded the application and led to the decision to apply for funding through the BalanseHub initiative:

- EID has received increasing attention in action plans, strategic plans, and within the institute board following the merger of two teacher education institutes in 2017.
- In spring 2021, the institute board decided that a leadership-supported forum should be established at the institute.
- The Forum for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity was established as a pilot project on 12 August 2022 by the then Head of Department (<https://www.ntnu.no/ilu/forum-for-likeverd-inkluderings-og-mangfold>). It became a permanent forum in December

2023, following a pilot project report (see the forum's webpage) and a leadership assessment.

- A staff survey was conducted in 2023 with support from NTNU's Committee for Gender Equality, Inclusion and Diversity (Sümer et al., 2023).
- The conference "The Teacher for the Future" was held in spring 2024 with support from NTNU's Committee for Gender Equality, Inclusion and Diversity. The Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud (LDO), Dembra (Democratic Preparedness against Racism and Antisemitism), 'Rosa kompetanse', and the Anti-Racist Centre were invited as keynote speakers.
- A student survey was conducted in autumn 2024 with support from NTNU's Committee for Gender Equality, Inclusion and Diversity. The survey resulted in a report, a master's thesis, and a peer-reviewed journal article currently under review (Sümer & Løvlien, 2025; Ruud Tvedt, 2025).

The staff survey (Sümer et al., 2023) showed that a substantial proportion of employees have experienced discrimination at work (based on various factors such as gender, caregiving responsibilities, language, age, and disability), with a statistically significant difference between employees with and without Norwegian as their first language. Foreign-born staff reported a higher degree of exclusion. The survey also revealed some degree of polarization among staff regarding attitudes toward diversity and the need to place the concept of "diversity" more clearly on the agenda. The survey has served as an important background document in the design of the BalanseHub project at ILU as a large-scale organizational development initiative owned by the Head of Department.

The project's sub-goals were:

1. Development of diversity leadership
2. Development of diversity competence among staff
3. Follow-up research

The project's research questions were:

*What are the most central diversity and equality challenges at the Department of Teacher Education, NTNU, which is Norway's largest teacher education environment?*

*How can a leadership-anchored Forum bring these challenges onto the agenda and contribute to organizational change?*

## 2. Conceptual Discussion

Diversity is a complex and debated concept with multiple layers of meaning. The forum takes as its point of departure the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Act, which aims to "promote equality and prevent discrimination on the basis of gender, pregnancy, leave in connection

with childbirth or adoption, care responsibilities, ethnicity, religion, belief, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age or other significant characteristics of a person.” The Act further states: “Equality” means equal status, equal opportunities and equal rights. Equality presupposes accessibility and accommodation (Equality and Anti-Discrimination Act, 2017).

When diversity is placed on the agenda, discussions often arise about which background variables should be included and prioritized (Sümer & Løvlien, 2025). The Forum adopts a broad approach that seeks to give attention to all grounds of discrimination mentioned in the law. Our theoretical perspective is primarily *intersectional*, in which inequality is understood as the result of a complex interaction between categories/variables. This perspective challenges the idea that social categories can be analyzed independently of one another, and highlights how different axes of inequality operate together and create specific forms of power and marginalization (Gressgård, 2013).

While equality was previously primarily associated with gender, today’s understanding of diversity encompasses a broader range of factors, including ethnicity, social class, sexuality, and disability. This development reflects a desire to include more groups in the work for justice and equality and has led to policies and measures increasingly being directed toward a more comprehensive approach to diversity (Thun & Onsrud, 2023). The discussion of diversity in Norway—particularly in the education system—is characterized by a tension between harmonizing, inclusion-oriented understandings and power-critical, structural approaches. Previous research shows that the concept often embodies good intentions, but at the same time can obscure the power relations and inequalities it claims to address (e.g. Westrheim & Hagatun, 2015; Thun & Onsrud, 2023). In our approach, we seek to direct attention toward structural factors, institutional practices, and power relations. A recurring finding in the literature is a tendency to associate diversity solely with individual differences, without critical reflection on the power relations linked to institutional structures and cultures, which leads to a ‘blindness’ to inequality at the systemic level (Thun & Onsrud 2023; Lund 2018).

We define diversity competence as the academic and relational competence to value differences, knowledge about discrimination and stereotypes, and a willingness to analyze individual incidents in light of power relations, inequalities, and privileges at the societal level.

Diversity exists in the complex interplay between factors such as gender, ethnicity, age, disability, socioeconomic status, and sexual orientation, and critical diversity competence requires an awareness of how one’s own attitudes can contribute to exclusion.

An example of such competence is the ability to recognize microaggressions, which refers to small, often unintentional actions or statements that over time have an excluding and burdensome effect (Wollscheid et al., 2022). Diversity competence also involves the ability to counteract microaggressions through ‘micro-affirmations’ which is defined, by Branlat et

al. (2026, p. 1), as "ethical encounters that enhance our capacity to act and connect to others in our academic environments" and as "moments where we respond, affirm, attend to a vulnerability, or aim to share a moment of joy with another person" (ibid.).

Diversity leadership in this context is understood as a leadership practice that actively develops processes that promote equity and respect and counteract exclusionary practices within the organization. This implies that diversity is not understood as a challenge to be managed, but as an organizational resource for achieving an inclusive work environment (Drange, 2014). Diversity leadership also involves relational competence that provides the confidence to handle conflicts and disagreements.

Teacher education has a statutory mandate to promote inclusion and counteract discrimination. Our understanding of diversity involves an awareness that this is a collaborative effort requiring the development of a shared language and common practices. This understanding has led to the development and implementation of the BalanseHub project.

### 3. Implementation of the Project

Through ILU's BalanseHub project, leadership training and competence development focusing on equity, inclusion, and diversity have been offered to all employees. The project has been designed as follows:

1. Development of diversity leadership: Two workshops for the leader team in collaboration with the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud (LDO), one in spring 2025 and one in spring 2026.
2. Development of diversity competence among staff: Twelve workshops in 2025 conducted by Dembra—one in each academic section, in the administration, at the Writing Centre, the Mathematics Centre, within the Research Committee, and within the Education Committee. In addition, each section/unit (with the exception of the committees) held a pre-workshop and a follow-up workshop. Each section/unit therefore participated in a series of three workshops (Total: 33 workshops)
3. Follow-up research (Responsible: Sevil Sümer): The follow-up research consisted of three components: individual interviews with section leaders; focus group discussions with staff members with an international background; and a larger evaluation survey (via Nettskjema) sent to all participants after the workshops (See Appendix 1).

#### 3.1 Management and Facilitation of the Project

The project took place from 01 April 2024 to 31 March 2026, with 2024 serving as the preparation phase, 2025 as the implementation phase, and 2026 as the closing and reporting phase.

Former Head of the Department, Ingfrid Thowsen, initiated the application process in cooperation with the Forum for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity and started up the project under her leadership until 2024. Ruth Gruters took over responsibility for the project as the acting head of department until Mari Nygård took over in august 2025 and completed the project. Forum for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity facilitated the project throughout the project period.

The composition of the forum during the project period is shown in figure 1.

**Figure 1**

*Members of the Forum for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity in the BalanseHub project period.*

Tone Pernille Østern	Head of the Forum, Professor, Arts, Physical Education and Sports
Katrine Dalbu Alterhaug	Assistant Professor, Head of Internationalization at ILU
Sikunder Ali	Associate Professor, Mathematics
Ingvild Håkestad	Senior executive officer, Administration
Steven Holland	Associate Professor, Arts, Physical Education and Sports
Sevil Sümer	Professor, Social Studies
Eir-Anne Edgar	Associate Professor, English and Foreign Languages
Libe Garcia Zarranz	Professor, English and Foreign Languages
Lars Unstad	Associate Professor, Social Studies
Stine H. Bang Svendsen	Professor, Pedagogy
Sunniva Skjøstad Hovde	Associate Professor, Arts, Physical Education and Sports
Helena Bichao	Associate Professor, Natural Sciences
Festo Kayima	Associate Professor, Natural Sciences
Wafa Pathan	PhD candidate, English and Foreign Languages
Maria Azucena G. Gonzalez	Project manager for urban development and culture, Trondheim Municipality
Oddrun Walstad Maaø	Senior Advisor, Research, Innovation and External Relations
Synne Bråthen	Student representative
Elise Liseth Lundem	Student representative

The project had a recruiting effect on the forum, resulting in three new members (included in Figure 1) joining along the way.

Head of the Forum, Tone Pernille Østern, was the project manager for the implementation and was present to support the execution at all pre-workshops and Dembra workshops. The members of the forum were present and supported the implementation within their respective sections.

The post-workshops were conducted independently by the respective section/unit leaders, with support from the Forum members from their sections.

The role of the project manager was important in keeping the project together, acting as host and dialogue partner with LDO and Dembra, serving as a dialogue and support partner

for the leaders of the various sections and units, providing context and legitimacy to the implementation, ensuring continuity and coherence in the project, and communicating the project both internally and externally. Participation of the forum members in their respective sections' workshops was equally important at the section level.

### 3.2 Workshops for Diversity Leadership with LDO

The Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud (LDO) (<https://ldo.no/>) was partner in the part of the project concerning the development of diversity leadership. As a partner, they conducted two workshops with the leadership, focusing on the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Act, as well as the employer's duty to take action and report.

The institute's leadership team held the first workshop with LDO, represented by Christopher Gambert og Lars C. Kolberg, on 13. 01. 2025 (3 hours). Both Gambert and Kolberg held introductions on ensuring equal education for all at ILU and the employer's duty to take action and report. The leaders were given a preparatory task (Figure 2) for the workshop, and their responses were also discussed as part of the workshop.

#### Figure 2

*Preparatory task for the leaders before the workshop on diversity leadership with LDO.*

##### **Area A – Risk of discrimination and barriers to equality in personnel policy**

Section 26 of the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Act requires all employers to work actively, systematically, and purposefully towards employees and job applicants to promote equality and prevent discrimination on the grounds listed in the provision. For an employer such as NTNU, this means following a specific working method outlined in the law. This preparatory work will help you delve deeper into this legally mandated work. Conduct an overall 'scan' of the risk of discrimination and barriers to equality in the personnel policy at ILU, with particular attention to your own section if relevant. How does the personnel policy at ILU work for individuals from each of the groups listed below? Describe what you believe may constitute risks of discrimination and barriers to equality for all groups, as outlined in Section 6 of the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Act.

##### **Area B – Risk of discrimination and barriers to equal access to education**

Section 24 of the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Act requires all universities to work actively, systematically, and purposefully to promote equality and prevent discrimination throughout all their activities based on the grounds listed in the law. This includes teaching, dissemination, and research, as well as the university's role as a public meeting place and a societal actor. As part of this obligation, the institute is required to carry out a situational analysis that provides insight into the risks of discrimination and barriers to equality that different student groups may experience when interacting with the institute and its offerings. This preparatory work will help you delve deeper into this legally mandated work. Conduct an overall 'scan' of the risk of discrimination and barriers to equality in interactions with the institute and the institute's offerings. How does our educational provision function for students from each of the groups listed below? Describe the risks of discrimination and barriers to equality for students from all groups, based on Section 6 of the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Act.

The intention was for the two workshops to be interconnected. This was made difficult by a leadership change from 1 August 2025, when a new head of institute and many new heads of sections took over. As a result, the second leadership workshop was designed to combine a keynote from LDO with reflections on the project from different voices and perspectives.

The institute's new leadership team held the second workshop with LDO, represented by Christopher Gambert, on 9. 03. 2026 (3 hours). 14 leaders, the project leader, follow-up researcher and ILU employee Juliette Boks-Vlemmix from ERASMUS+-project: "Ed-Ted - Equity and Diversity in Teacher Education" participated in the workshop.

### Figure 3

*Program for the concluding workshop with LDO.*

#### **CONCLUDING WORKSHOP FOR LEADERSHIP IN THE BALANSEHUBPROJECT**

**Monday 9. march 2026 12.30-15.30**

12.30-12.40 Welcome and short introduction on the program (Mari Nygård, Head of Department)

12.40 -13.25 Keynote by Christopher Gambert from Likestillings- og diskrimineringsombudet (LDO).

13.30-14.00 Presentation and reflections from two section heads on the Dembra workshops in their sections:

Leiv Inge Aa (Norwegian) / Gro Hellesnes (Pedagogy)

14.15-14.30 On the follow-up research of the BalanseHub project by Sevil Sümer

14.30 - 15 Presentation of the project report with proposed measures (Tone P. Østern, project leader)

15-15.20 Juliette Boks-Vlemmix offers a different perspective on BalanseHub project with insights from the ERASMUS+-project Ed-Ted - Equity and Diversity in Teacher Education

15.20-15.30 Head of Department concludes the project and charts the way forward (Mari Nygård)

### 3.3 Workshops for diversity competence among staff with Dembra

A total of 33 workshops were conducted in 2025 to develop diversity competence among staff; 12 of them were led by Dembra, while the others were led by the heads of the respective sections/units.

#### **Cluster 1, 11–13 February**

Section of Social Sciences; Section of Natural Sciences; Arts, Physical Education and Sports

#### **Cluster 2, 2–4 April**

Section of English and Foreign Languages; Writing Centre; Administration

#### **Cluster 3, 1–3 October**

Section of Mathematics; Mathematics Centre; Section of Norwegian

#### **Cluster 4, 29–31 October**

Section of Education + Vocational Education, School Development and Educational Leadership; Research Committee; Education Committee

Dembra was an important partner in the project. Dembra provides guidance, courses, and online resources for schools and teacher education, with the aim of strengthening schools' work on democratic preparedness (<https://www.dembra.no/no>). Those who worked on the

Dembra workshops at ILU were professor Claudia Lenz, leader for Dembra teacher education, Peder Brende Jenssen, coordinator for Dembra teacher education and Sara Blikstad Nyegaard, coordinator at Dembra.

The work of conducting workshops across all sections, units, and two committees was an extensive task for Dembra, and likewise an ambitious project for ILU that required close collaboration. After the first workshop, it became clear that it was important to contextualize the project in more detail so that all participants understood that they were part of a large, leader-supported development initiative at ILU; this was subsequently incorporated as an element in the workshops.

From the outset, Dembra developed a well-functioning programme that initiated dialogue among staff but adjusted the approach along the way in response to the different sections and units. They also proposed a structure for pre-workshops and follow-up workshops to ensure coherence across the workshop series. The vast majority of sections/units followed this proposal.

#### **Figure 4**

*Dembras design for the pre-workshops, workshops and follow-up workshops.*

##### **Pre-workshop (2 hours)**

*Individual (15 minutes):* All staff are given time to reflect on:

- How does diversity manifest itself in different aspects of your daily work?
- What types of diversity do you engage with in your role?
- In which parts of your work does diversity become relevant?

*In groups (45 minutes):* Staff sit together and contribute to a Padlet based on the following questions:

- How does diversity manifest itself in these different aspects of your daily work?
- What needs does this give rise to?
- To what extent are these needs currently being met?

Summary in plenary (45 minutes). The section head or another participant records input in Padlet.

##### **Dembra workshop (4 hours)**

- Introduction with information about the workshop
- Summary of the preparatory work you have completed
- Presentation: Diversity competence and selected perspectives to bring into the World Café
- World Café
- Summary, evaluation, and closing remarks

##### **Follow-up workshop (2 hours)**

Present a summary from our side or from Padlet and provide a brief recap of the process so far for those who did not attend the workshop. Divide staff into groups of four. Each group is given access to the Padlet from the workshop. The measures are then sorted into the following categories:

- Can be implemented by staff
- Requires leadership support

Arrange the measures in order of priority. Then decide who will be responsible for follow-up. Preferably also set a timeline and schedule a follow-up meeting.

The pre-workshop and the Dembra workshop resulted in problem descriptions and proposed measures documented in section-/unit-specific Padlets. Dembra compiled a

summary of these and sent it to each section/unit. The follow-up workshop resulted in documentation in the form of a document containing notes, with some variation in format across sections/units.

#### 4. Analytical method: problem descriptions and proposed measures from the different units

The analysis in this report is based on documentation from the workshops. The overall documentation is presented in Figure 5.

**Figure 5**

*Documentation from the workshops with staff.*

<b>Section/unit</b>	<b>Padlet pre-workshop (PDF)</b>	<b>Padlet world café Dembra workshop (PDF)</b>	<b>Summary from Dembra on proposed measures</b>	<b>Documentation from post-workshop</b>
Social sciences	Yes (4 pages)	Yes (6 pages)	Yes (1 page)	Minutes (1 page)
Natural sciences	Yes (4 pages)	Yes (4 pages)	Yes (1 page)	Yes (2 pages)
Arts, physical education and sport	Yes (7 pages)	Yes (5 pages)	Yes (1 page)	No
English and foreign languages	Yes (6 pages)	Yes (3 pages)	Yes (1 page)	Yes (2 pages)
The Norwegian Centre for Writing Education and Research	Yes (4 pages)	Yes (3 pages)	Yes (2 pages)	Yes (7 pages)
Administration	Yes (8 pages)	Yes (6 pages)	Yes (2 pages)	Yes (4 pages)
Mathematics section	Yes (2 pages)	Yes (3 pages)	Yes (3 pages)	Yes (½ page)
Norwegian Centre for Mathematics Education	Yes (5 pages)	Yes (4 pages)	Yes (2 pages)	Yes (2 pages)
Norwegian section	Yes (2 pages)	Yes (3 pages)	Yes (2 pages)	Yes (4 pages)
Education (Pedagogy)	Yes (4 pages)	Yes (5 pages)	Yes (3 pages)	Yes (4 pages)
Vocational education, school development and educational leadership	Yes (3 pages)	Yes (2 pages)	Yes (2 pages)	Yes (5 pages)
Education Committee	No	Yes (3 pages)	Yes (2 pages)	No
Research Committee	No	Yes (2 pages)	Yes (2 pages)	No

In the **documentation from the pre-workshops**, many (though not all) sections highlight existing resources for working with equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI). These have been listed at the beginning of the chapter for each respective section/unit in Chapter 5. Primarily, however, the documentation brings forward problem descriptions. These refer to issues related to equity, diversity, and inclusion that are identified and may apply both at the section level and the departmental level.

In our analysis, we have chosen to relate these problem descriptions to grounds of discrimination, in order to clarify what a given identified problem or proposed measure addresses. We take as our starting point the grounds for discrimination outlined in the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Act, but we adopt an exploratory approach and include all factors mentioned in the material that are relevant.

Some grounds that we interpret as relevant in an academic context have therefore been included as grounds of discrimination. One example is employment category, which frequently appears in the documentation in connection with mechanisms of exclusion from different institutional arenas. While not all aspects fall within the legal definition of discrimination, they nevertheless represent factors that can lead to differential treatment and experiences of exclusion and are therefore relevant areas for institutional development.

For each section/unit, we have created tables that present all identified problem descriptions and relate these to grounds of discrimination or other relevant aspects. Some sections take an explicitly system-critical approach in their problem descriptions and often point not only to grounds of discrimination, but also to mechanisms of discrimination. We have therefore included both grounds and mechanisms in the tables. In cases where sections do not themselves identify discriminatory mechanisms, this has been done as part of our analysis.

The **documentation from the world café sessions** in the Dembra workshops primarily presents proposed measures. These indicate how the problem descriptions from the pre-workshops may be addressed. Additional problem descriptions may also emerge, and these have been incorporated into the tables. For the proposed measures, we have developed tables that link each measure to the grounds and mechanisms of discrimination it seeks to counteract.

The **documentation from the post-workshops** presents the central problem descriptions and proposed measures that participants converge around. Each section/unit documents this in slightly different ways. In our analysis, we have compiled these into tables that link problem descriptions and proposed measures to grounds and mechanisms of discrimination. These tables highlight the central themes within each section/unit, while some problem descriptions and proposed measures from earlier workshops may not be retained at this stage.

Following what can be described as a “raw analysis” of the documentation from the three workshops within each section, we are left with three tables per section. Each of these tables is relatively extensive. As a next step, these have been compressed into a single table per section, presenting problem descriptions, proposed measures, and the corresponding grounds and mechanisms of discrimination that the measures address.

These tables show—in a condensed format—all problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination raised within each section/unit across the three workshops. The tables do not distinguish between more or less prominent issues in the material but include all formulations and proposals in a compressed form linked to grounds and mechanisms of discrimination.

The qualitative work of reviewing all documentation and compiling problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination has been carried out manually. The final compressed table from each section/unit was then shared with Copilot, with instructions to remove duplication, shorten, and streamline the language. Following this, each compressed table was reviewed and checked against the manual analysis.

#### 4.1. A critical perspective on the documentation

It is important to emphasise that the documentation from the BalanseHub project does not provide a complete overview of problem descriptions and proposed measures across the sections/units. The analysis should be understood as a snapshot of themes related to equity, diversity, and inclusion that were negotiated by those present at each workshop, within the specific working climate that was produced in each session.

Attendance across the different sections ranged between 50–70% for each workshop, with the highest participation in the administration, the Mathematics Centre, and the Writing Centre, where attendance approached 100%. The reasons for non-attendance are not known, but it is reasonable to assume that this is due both to scheduling conflicts with other responsibilities and to possible resistance to the project or limited interest in the topic. It is therefore reasonable to assume that higher attendance might have generated a broader range of critical perspectives.

The working climate within each workshop also influenced which perspectives participants chose to share or withhold. The workshops were largely discussion-based, and the contributions recorded in the Padlets—which form the empirical basis of this analysis—represent compromises reached through collective discussion.

A further critical perspective on the documentation concerns the composition of the participant group. Although a range of diverse backgrounds are represented among the staff who participated, the staff group as a whole can be considered relatively homogeneous. This may introduce certain biases, as some forms of inequality or exclusion may not be experienced directly. This can limit the extent to which different grounds of discrimination are “felt” from an insider perspective and may contribute to more positive perceptions of the institution than might emerge within a more diverse staff group.

#### 4.2. Participant validation (member checking)

A first draft of the report was completed for the final leadership workshop on 9 March 2026, where it was presented. It was subsequently circulated for feedback to the Head of Department, Deputy Heads, Section Heads, Centre Directors, Administrative Managers, all members of the Forum for Equity, Inclusion and Diversity, Juliette Boks-Vlemmix (ED-TED),

Christopher Gambert (LDO), and Claudia Lenz, Peder Brende Jenssen, and Sara Blikstad Nyegaard (Dembra).

In total, 32 individuals received the report for member checking. The deadline for feedback was three weeks, and the invitation to provide input was distributed in both Norwegian and English, welcoming all forms of response.

Feedback was received from nine individuals, varying in nature from language corrections to substantive comments on the theoretical framework, the discussion, and the identified development areas. All feedback underlined the overall value of the report for ILU. Most of the input was incorporated. A small number of comments focused on discussing potential actions following the report, and these could not be included without introducing proposed measures or interpretations not grounded in the documented material.

## 5. Problem descriptions and proposed measures across all sections/units in relation to grounds and mechanisms of discrimination

In this chapter, we present the results of the analysis (see Chapter 4) for all sections/units, in the order in which they completed the series of workshops.

### 5.1. The Social Sciences section

The Social Sciences section conducted the series of three workshops as part of Cluster 1. Fourteen staff members participated in the pre-workshop, sixteen in the Dembra workshop (11 February 2025), and fourteen in the post-workshop. Section Head Gunnar Grut hosted each workshop and led both the pre- and post-workshops.

The Social Sciences section was the first to carry out this workshop series. The workshops took place at an early stage in the collaboration with DEMBRA, before the workshop format had been fully developed. The experiences from this implementation therefore informed the further development of the workshop design.

The Social Sciences section highlights strengths and resources that are already in place within the section. These include:

- Diversity of perspectives is a theme in most courses. The section emphasises diversity of perspectives as central to democracy and citizenship.
- Teaching on diversity is well established within the section and is delivered by academic staff in subjects such as KRLE (Christianity, religion, life views and ethics), RLE (religion, life views and ethics) in the PEL (pedagogy and pupil knowledge) subject, social sciences, history, and geography.
- Both the selection of research topics and collaboration within the section engage extensively with issues of diversity.
- Diversity constitutes a research focus in several research groups, for example in religion, economics, and urban studies.
- Colleagues from different cultural backgrounds are supported and included in Norwegian language, culture, and academic practices.

**Figure 6**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / Social Sciences section.*

<b>Problem description</b>	<b>Proposed measures</b>	<b>Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</b> * indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
Language barriers for staff without Norwegian as a first language. Staff without Norwegian as first language are rarely involved in practicum visits. Writing academic texts in Norwegian can be challenging. Language becomes 'the elephant in the room'.	Strengthened Norwegian language training and support systems for staff and students. Avoid unclear abbreviations. Improved mentoring schemes. Cross-sectional discussion and sharing arenas. Increased awareness of institutional culture (implicit norms).	Grounds: Language, ethnicity, *international staff. Mechanisms: Linguistic double standards, exclusion, organisation of institutional work.
Dilemma: Norwegian as an academic language vs. international recruitment.	Strengthened Norwegian language training and flexible language support. More arenas where multilingualism is valued. Clear language policy addressing the double standard.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity, *international staff. Mechanisms: Linguistic double standards, structural linguistic marginalisation.
Universal design and accommodation are insufficient; staff have limited knowledge. Inadequate support structures, particularly for students with dyslexia.	Increased awareness of universal design (UD), including within Canvas. Administrative systems and leadership that support varied forms of assessment. Reward sections that excel in universal design.	Grounds: Disability including dyslexia, broad. Mechanisms: Insufficient accommodation, ableism.
Increasing academisation makes studies more demanding for students without an academic background.	More varied assessment and teaching methods across disciplines. Administrative systems that support varied assessment forms, anchored in leadership.	Grounds: *class. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, exclusion.
Teaching favours female students?	Variation in teaching and assessment methods. Increased awareness of institutional culture.	Grounds: Gender. Mechanisms: Framing as 'reverse discrimination'.
Academic correctness; difficult to express dissenting views. Diversity of perspectives is needed.	Foster cultures of disagreement and generosity as norms. Develop arenas for discussion. Increased awareness of (implicit) institutional culture.	Grounds: *academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, disciplinary norm pressure.
Lack of diversity of perspectives within research groups. Strategic prioritisation narrows methods and perspectives.	Strengthen research networks with diversity competence. Reward multidisciplinary diversity research. Resource allocation that supports diversity. Anchor	Grounds: *research culture, *academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, monoculture.

	resources at section level to ensure diversity of perspectives.	
Lack of arenas for sharing diversity as a research theme.	Leadership-anchored interdisciplinary research forum as platform for sharing diversity research at institutional level. Section and programme meetings linking disciplines for research on/with diversity.	Grounds: *academic discourse, *research culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, monoculture, leadership for diversity.
Decolonisation is experienced as challenging. Concerns about 'gatekeepers' in certain research fields.	Shared arenas and interdisciplinary research.	Grounds: Ethnicity, *academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Epistemic privilege defence, epistemic resistance to decolonial perspectives.
Limited knowledge of and reuse of previous diversity work at ILU. Perceived as offensive to train those who are already experts in diversity through BalanseHub.	Leadership listens and formulates measures based on workshop input in the BalanseHub project. Anchor and make visible previous diversity work at the institution.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Devaluation of expertise, organisation of institutional work.
Homogeneous staff and student body. Difficult to recruit broadly. Low recruitment from second-generation immigrant groups.	Strategic and targeted broad student recruitment. Make diversity visible in recruitment materials. Outreach to cultural and leisure arenas and to parents. Build diversity within teaching staff. Public-facing, socially engaged leadership communication on the value of teacher education.	Grounds: Ethnicity, *class, broad. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture, exclusion, leadership for diversity.
Diversity work requires time and resources.	Allocate dedicated resources and time. Support applications for external funding for re-search groups contributing to diversity. Actively support de-velopment of R&D outputs from MA-level diversity work.	Grounds: *Resources, *research culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, monoculture, epistemic hegemony.
Strengthening interdisciplinary diversity in teaching, as disciplines equip students differently in relation to diversity.	Coordinated meetings across disciplines and sections. Varied teaching methods that reach the widest possible group. Sharing arenas for learning from each other's disciplines and teaching practices.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, organisation of institutional work.

## 5.2. The Natural Sciences section

The Natural Sciences section conducted the series of three workshops as part of Cluster 1. Thirteen staff members participated in the pre-workshop, twelve in the Dembra workshop (12 February 2025), and twenty-four in the post-workshop. Section Head Bodil Svendsen

hosted each workshop and led both the pre- and post-workshops. The Natural Sciences section does not explicitly highlight strengths and resources already in place within the section.

**Figure 7**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / Natural Sciences section.*

<b>Problem description</b>	<b>Proposed measures</b>	<b>Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</b> * indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
Different natural sciences display different gender balances, and the history of the natural sciences appears as white, Western, and patriarchal.	Make diversity visible in the history and practices of the natural sciences. Integrate multiple perspectives in teaching and assessment.	Grounds: Gender, ethnicity, *academic discourse. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, monoculture.
Teaching competence leads to emphasis on technique / technology that may appeal less to certain groups.	Increase variation in teaching and assessment methods. Professional development for teaching staff.	Grounds: Gender. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, monoculture, lack of accommodation.
Lack of accommodation for compulsory physical and practical activities.	Increase competence in universal design. Provide practical accommodation through alternative solutions.	Grounds: Ethnicity, disability. Mechanisms: Ableism, exclusion.
Limited focus on Indigenous peoples and minorities in teaching.	Training in Indigenous topics. Develop curricula with Sámi/Indigenous perspectives.	Grounds: Ethnicity. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, monoculture, system-preserving structures.
Exclusion of marginalised research and closed research groups.	Promote an open culture of sharing. Section conferences and lunchtime presentations. More inclusive research groups.	Grounds: *Research culture, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, system-preserving structures.
Different backgrounds and career paths result in unequal access to support.	Mentoring schemes. Clearer guidelines for new staff. Stronger links between teaching and research.	Grounds: *Employment category. Mechanisms: Hierarchy, organisation of institutional work.
Risk of marginalisation of minorities within collegial communities.	Create arenas for inclusion. Raise awareness of language and cultural references.	Grounds: Ethnicity. Mechanisms: Exclusion, organisation of institutional work.
Religious and belief-based practices may conflict with the epistemology of the natural sciences.	Dialogue on beliefs in professional practice and engagement with philosophy of science.	Grounds: Religion/belief. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, system-preserving structures.

Lack of gender-neutral facilities and limited LGBTQ+ inclusion.	Gender-neutral toilets; increased visibility of LGBTQ+ initiatives.	Grounds: Gender, sexual orientation. Mechanisms: Heteronormativity.
International staff and PhD candidates are insufficiently included socially and academically.	More language resources. Increased use of English. Better information about NTNU services.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity, *international staff. Mechanisms: Structural linguistic marginalisation, exclusion, organisation of institutional work.
English-language presentations and discussions may be challenging for Norwegian-speaking staff.	Language adaptation. Written support for oral tasks. Flexible language use.	Grounds: Language. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation, linguistic double standards.
Hierarchies between employment categories lead to unequal inclusion.	Improved organisation of work tasks. Shared responsibility for research and teaching.	Grounds: *employment category. Mechanisms: Hierarchy, organisation of institutional work.
Written assessments dominate and may be discriminatory.	Diversify forms of assessment and provide clear guidelines.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity, disability. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, system-preserving structures.
Campus and digital solutions may be inaccessible.	Universal design of the learning environment and digital tools.	Grounds: Disability. Mechanisms: Ableism, lack of accommodation.
Recruitment to permanent positions has been homogeneous.	Diversity-conscious recruitment and mentoring schemes.	Grounds: Ethnicity. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture.
Limited sharing of research competence and weak links between teaching and research.	Section conferences and lunchtime presentations. Include lecturers in research projects.	Grounds: *research culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, individualisation.

### 5.3. The Arts, Physical Education and Sports section

The Section for the Arts, Physical Education and Sports conducted the pre-workshop and the Dembra workshop as part of Cluster 1. The section did not carry out the post-workshop due to difficulties in identifying a suitable time. Eighteen staff members participated in the pre-workshop, and thirteen in the Dembra workshop (13 February 2025). Section Head Øyvind Johan Eiksund hosted both workshops. The Section for the Arts, Physical Education and Sport does not explicitly highlight strengths and resources already in place within the section.

**Figure 8**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / Arts, Physical Education and Sports section.*

<b>Problem description</b>	<b>Proposed measures</b>	<b>Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</b> * indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
Structural monoculture and system-preserving practices that flatten diversity and reward the established.	Establish arenas for sharing. Leadership should raise the topic regularly. System for time and resources for diversity work. Flexible regulations for individual follow-up. Work with micro-affirmations in everyday practice.	Grounds: Ethnicity, language, sexual orientation, disability. Mechanisms: Monoculture, majority dominance, system-preserving structures.
Lack of representation among staff and students. Students with minority backgrounds choose other academic environments at ILU over KKI.	Develop employment criteria that value lived minority experience and alternative educational trajectories. Head of Dep initiates broader student recruitment and processes to develop diversity in academic sections and study programmes.	Grounds: Ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, *class. Mechanisms: Monoculture, majority dominance, system-preserving structures.
Norwegian as a language norm excludes English-speaking staff in meetings. Lack of linguistic support hinders performance.	More flexible regulations for individual follow-up. Develop more open forms of assessment. Language awareness across all arenas. Leadership must actively raise the issue.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity, *international staff. Mechanisms: Language norm, structural linguistic marginalisation.
Normative academic discourse and epistemology with limited room for diverse teaching and research approaches. Too little experimentation. Weak interdisciplinary understanding.	Peer guidance on teaching. Both trust and challenge professional competencies. Actively seek other academic environments. Establish a research leader at the section level.	Grounds: *academic discourse, *research culture. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, monoculture, system-preserving structures.
Minority discourses are ignored and assimilation pressure exists. It is demanding to resist dominant majority discourse.	Sharing arenas where lived experiences can be activated. Micro-affirmations in everyday practice. Leadership must counteract diffusion of responsibility.	Grounds: Ethnicity, sexual orientation. Mechanisms: Monoculture, majority dominance.
Limited space for neurodivergence and insufficient visibility of rights related to disability.	Workshop with individuals with lived experience of disability.	Grounds: Disability including neurodivergence. Mechanisms: Ableism, lack of accommodation.
Unequal research time allocation is difficult to understand (30% for associate lecturers, 47% for associate professors).	Rethink allocation of research time.	Grounds: *Employment category. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, hierarchy.

Difficult to orient oneself at NTNU as a newcomer or external.	Effective mentoring schemes. Collegial support. Sharing arenas.	Grounds: Language, *international staff. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, distancing.
Lack of belief that diversity contributes. Disagreement about whether lack of equity, inclusion, and diversity is a problem.	Raise awareness that diversity work requires active effort. Leadership should address the issue systematically.	Grounds: Broad. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, epistemic hegemony, monoculture, leadership for diversity.
Sexual orientation marks staff as different. Traditional family norms dominate.	Microaffirmations. Sharing arenas where experiences can be activated.	Grounds: Sexual orientation, *family life. Mechanisms: Heteronormativity.

#### 5.4. The English and Foreign Languages section

The Section for English and Foreign Languages conducted the series of three workshops as part of Cluster 2. Thirteen staff members participated in the pre-workshop, twelve in the Dembra workshop (2 April 2025), and nine in the post-workshop. Section Head Eivind Nessa Torgersen hosted each workshop and led both the pre- and post-workshops.

The English and Foreign Languages section highlights strengths and resources already in place within the section. These include:

- Students show strong interest in issues of diversity in their future classrooms. They demonstrate considerable engagement with intercultural communication and multilingualism.
- In practice periods, student teachers encounter more diverse and multicultural environments than on campus, providing opportunities for learning and development.
- The section has strong competence in Sámi perspectives and actively integrates Sámi perspectives into teaching and research, organises seminars, courses, and modules, and contributes to the development of Sámi perspectives at NTNU as an institution.
- Staff work consciously and explicitly with the development of diversity and inclusion in the preparation and delivery of teaching, as well as in the selection of curricula and texts.
- Staff seek to model diversity as a resource for representation in the classroom and raise awareness of how questions related to identity and social justice are important for teachers to engage with.
- Through actions, language use, and professional attitudes, staff seek to model inclusive classrooms and to highlight that this is an ongoing practice of learning and unlearning.
- Staff actively conduct research on gender diversity and emphasise equity in and through their research.
- Staff actively engage with feminist approaches to children's literature and film in order to challenge stereotypical representations of gender.

- Staff from diverse cultural backgrounds and disciplinary fields demonstrate how technologies and artificial intelligence can be integrated into education in different ways.

**Figure 9**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / English and Foreign Languages Section.*

<b>Problem description</b>	<b>Proposed measures</b>	<b>Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</b> * indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
Students with diverse needs and disabilities, including neurodivergence, do not receive sufficient support for equitable assessment.	Develop varied forms of assessment and examination, including more creative approaches, and ensure flexibility to provide genuine opportunities to perform.	Grounds: Disability including neurodivergence. Mechanisms: Ableism, system-preserving structures.
Too few arenas for sharing.	Strengthen a culture of sharing: observe each other's teaching, learn from each other, share teaching philosophies and research interests. Section meetings as research arenas and more informal social meeting spaces.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *research culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, individualisation, distancing.
Distancing language in the dominant academic discourse.	Develop more inviting and inclusive vocabulary.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Distancing, hierarchy.
Job advertisements that favour Norwegian school backgrounds and thereby reduce diversity.	Develop inclusive recruitment practices, with broad representation in hiring committees and language in advertisements that signals a commitment to diversity.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity, *international staff. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture.
Multilingualism is undervalued. International staff receive insufficient support for learning Norwegian.	Support for Norwegian language learning. Social language arenas. Make multilingualism visible as a resource.	Grounds: Language, *international staff. Mechanisms: Language norm, structural linguistic marginalisation.
Opaque and inaccessible participation processes make it easier for dominant discourses to exert influence.	Ensure accessible and inclusive opportunities for input in period and action plans.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *workplace culture. Mechanisms: Exclusion, majority dominance, organisation of institutional work.
Low proportion of non-white student teachers and weak breadth in recruitment.	Creative recruitment campaigns for broader recruitment. Portraits of former students. Establish	Grounds: Ethnicity, broad. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures,

	structures that support students with minority identities.	monoculture, majority dominance.
Limited support upon return after long-term sick leave.	Supportive structures for staff returning after long-term sick leave.	Grounds: *Sick leave. Mechanisms: Exclusion, lack of accommodation.
Minority students receive insufficient support and may experience discrimination in practicum schools.	Prevent discrimination in practicum schools, strengthen language support and other support structures throughout the programme.	Grounds: Ethnicity, language, broad. Mechanisms: Discrimination, lack of accommodation.
Sámi and other minority perspectives need to be further integrated into teaching and research.	Expand curricula, involve guest lecturers and researchers, apply for funding to support this.	Grounds: *Epistemology, ethnicity, *academic discourse. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, system-preserving structures, monoculture.
Diversity is weak in research at ILU, and there is a hierarchy between knowledge from the Global North and South.	Support research in marginalised knowledge traditions and methods. Adopt more flexible approaches.	Grounds: *Epistemology, *academic discourse. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, system-preserving structures, monoculture.
Institutional culture allows limited space for different ways of being. Minority identities are easily othered.	Counteract assimilation. Recognise diverse ways of being. Guest lecturers as role models.	Grounds: Broad. Mechanisms: Majority dominance, monoculture.
Low diversity in leadership roles at both department and faculty level.	Practise inclusive approaches also in the selection of leaders.	Grounds: Ethnicity, language, broad. Mechanisms: Majority dominance, system-preserving structures.

### 5.5. The Norwegian Centre for Writing Education and Research (The Writing Centre)

The Norwegian Centre for Writing Education and Research (The Writing Centre) conducted the series of three workshops as part of Cluster 2. Nineteen staff members participated in the pre-workshop, thirteen in the Dembra workshop (3 April 2025), and eleven in the post-workshop. Section Head Arne Johannes Aasen hosted each workshop and led both the pre- and post-workshops.

The Writing Centre highlights strengths and resources related to equity, diversity, and inclusion that are already in place within the unit. These include:

- The centre collaborates with international researchers in its research activities.
- The centre has research projects on second language pedagogy addressing issues related to diversity.

- The centre maintains a strong practice-oriented approach in its research and is committed to ensuring that its research is meaningful and inclusive for diverse groups of pupils and teachers.
- The centre provides workplace accommodations for staff with diverse needs, enabling them to sustain their employment.
- The centre organises social initiatives for all staff, such as physical activity during working hours.
- The centre has a certain degree of age diversity among its staff.
- Several staff members work specifically with inclusion through the Competence Development Initiative (*Kompetanseløftet*).
- The centre has strong collaboration with NAV on inclusive working life.

**Figure 10**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / The Norwegian Centre for Writing Education and Research (The Writing Centre).*

<b>Problem description</b>	<b>Proposed measures</b>	<b>Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</b> * indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
Need for better arenas for sharing and learning from each other.	Academic forum for sharing and testing teaching practices. Teams resource bank on inclusive practices. Safeguard academic and social meeting spaces.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, individualisation, distancing.
Thematic focus on diversity and multilingualism can be improved in research and practice.	Establish a research group on diversity, inclusion, and multilingualism. Clarify the distinction between diversity work as a research topic and as a working environment issue.	Grounds: Language, *workplace culture, *research culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, language norm.
We need competence development in multilingualism.	Collaborate with multilingual teachers or mother tongue teachers to gain knowledge about working with multilingual pupils.	Grounds: Ethnicity, language, *academic discourse, broad. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture, language norm.
Too little focus on varied school cultures, particularly in urban areas. Need to understand and address diversity in the school sector.	Develop resources on identity, multilingualism, inclusion, diversity, and tolerance. Seek support from external actors to develop resources on racism.	Grounds: Ethnicity, language, *academic discourse, broad. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, racism.
Research competence is valued more highly than development work.	Create forums that elevate development work alongside research. Develop a strategy for	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *employment category, *research culture. Mechanisms: Hierarchy,

	recruitment and participation in the centre's research.	organisation of institutional work.
Universal design and adapted education are not sufficiently ensured.	Increase knowledge and practice in universal design. Integrate adapted education at all levels, including reading and writing difficulties, learning difficulties, and Sámi as a first language.	Grounds: Disability, language, ethnicity, broad. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation, ableism.
We are a linguistically and culturally homogeneous group.	Targeted job advertisements for broader recruitment. Include diversity recruitment in the strategic plan. Continue and further develop collaboration with NAV on inclusive working life.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity, disability. Mechanisms: Monoculture, system-preserving structures, language norm.
Need for more English-language competence.	Competence development in English.	Grounds: Language. Mechanisms: Monoculture, language norm.
Gender imbalance in leadership roles. Majority women overall, men in key leadership positions.	Leadership awareness and clear recruitment principles for leadership roles.	Grounds: Gender. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures.
Lack of recognition of our work. Experience of exclusion within the institute.	Leadership awareness and sharing arenas across the institute.	Grounds: *academic discourse. Mechanisms: Hierarchy, organisation of institutional work.
Insufficient practice of openly inviting all staff into research projects or groups.	Develop a strategy for recruitment to and participation in the centre's research.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *research culture. Mechanisms: Exclusion, individualisation.

## 5.6. The Administration

The Administration conducted the series of three workshops as part of Cluster 2. Thirty staff members participated in the pre-workshop, thirty-eight in the Dembra workshop (4 April 2025), and thirty-one in the post-workshop. Head of Office Hans-Kristian Øyan hosted each workshop and led both the pre- and post-workshops. The post-workshop was co-led with Head of Administration Bergljot Utstrand. The Administration highlights strengths and resources related to equity, diversity, and inclusion that are already in place within the unit. These include:

- Students who contact the administration with needs for accommodation are met with information, assistance, and support.
- The administration has strong knowledge of legislation and students' rights, which is essential for providing appropriate support.
- Staff take time to listen and provide clear information about opportunities and rights.

- Staff provide guidance, set realistic expectations, and support students in experiencing a sense of achievement.
- In the practicum field, there is limited formal regulation, which has led the practicum section to develop its own guidelines for the exercise of professional judgement.
- Accommodation of practicum placements in the form of geographically adapted placements is well established.
- Many students require adapted practicum placements. The administration responds by listening and coordinating with schools to ensure that students are placed in contexts that enable positive practicum experiences.
- Human Resources' understanding of diversity is important.
- Administration is also a field of expertise; it is not in opposition to academic staff.

**Figure 11**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / The Administration.*

<b>Problem description</b>	<b>Proposed measures</b>	<b>Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</b> * indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
Everyone has the right to information, but this may be a challenge due to disability or language.	All must use a microphone; this should not be left to the individual lecturer.	Grounds: Language, disability. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation, ableism.
Not all course descriptions are available in English. Show understanding when a colleague does not speak Norwegian well.	Use English.	Grounds: Language. Mechanisms: Language norm, structural linguistic marginalisation.
Master's students requiring accommodation may be rejected by the accommodation service due to limited capacity.	Leadership should have strong competence in possibilities for accommodation. Improve universal design of facilities.	Grounds: Disability, broad. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation, ableism.
It is challenging to determine how far accommodations should extend before they affect students' academic standards and the practice of the profession.	Leadership must contribute to the development and adjustment of existing practices in relation to regulatory frameworks that may allow greater flexibility.	Grounds: Disability, language, broad. Mechanisms: Professional norm-setting structures, suitability.
Diversity and relationships between students are more visible in practicum than in the classroom. We lack clear guidelines for accommodating practicum studies beyond geographical adjustments. We also lack guidelines for	Strengthen collaboration between the practicum field and ILU regarding the delineation of accommodation within the boundaries of what is academically justifiable in relation to achieved learning outcomes. Leadership must contribute.	Grounds: *Illness, care responsibilities. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation, professional norm-setting structures, suitability.

accommodation at the practicum site.		
There are challenges related to multiple buildings and to moving between buildings for both staff and students.	Improve universal design of websites and physical facilities.	Grounds: Disability, broad. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation, ableism.
There is a desire to recruit students with minority backgrounds, but there is not a sufficiently robust system in place to support them.	Establish a unit similar to OsloMet that provides support and follow-up for students in relation to language, culture, system understanding, and mentoring schemes.	Grounds: Ethnicity, language. Mechanisms: Monoculture, system-preserving structures.
The group has low diversity, with a large majority of women.	Recognise diversity within the group and get to know each other better.	Grounds: Gender. Mechanisms: Monoculture, system-preserving structures.
Menopause-related challenges linked to build-ings, temperature, and possi-bilities for accommodation.	Improve universal design of physical facilities.	Grounds: Gender. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation.
The administration enforces regulations and may sometimes be perceived as "difficult."	Improve coordination and dialogue between the administration, academic staff, and students. Develop routines for exercising professional judgement within regulatory frameworks.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *position. Mechanisms: Hierarchy, fragmentation.
How can diversity in councils and committees be achieved when there is low diversity in the group from which members are selected?	It is important not to be rigid when appointing committees and councils. The law must be followed, but considerations must also be made so that the same individual representing an underrepresented group is not repeatedly required to serve.	Grounds: Gender, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, monoculture.
Several councils/committees have policies stating that the meeting language is Norwegian, and many consider there to be strong arguments for this. Others experience this as discrimination.	Show understanding. Use English.	Grounds: Language. Mechanisms: Majority dominance, language norm, lack of accommodation, structural linguistic marginalisation.
There is a need for more quality-assured English-language information for external examiners, as well as more guidance regarding registration and systems.	Provide English-language courses.	Grounds: Language. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation, language norm.
Lack of resources reduces the level of service, making it more difficult to accommodate diversity.	Leadership has a responsibility to carefully assess the use of resources.	Grounds: Broad. Mechanisms: Prioritisation.

We follow legislation, and this sets limitations. We must be willing to critically examine our solutions and, if necessary, reconsider them.	Leadership must contribute to the development and adjustment of existing practices in relation to regulatory frameworks that may allow for greater flexibility.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Professional norm-setting, system-preserving structures.
There is a need for more shared arenas and informal meeting spaces. Everyone has a responsibility to create meeting spaces.	Improve collaboration across the organisation. All networks should be organised across units. Create a forum for sharing knowledge, learning from colleagues, and discussing issues collectively.	Grounds: *Workplace culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, individualisation, distancing.
Is there a real need to establish a committee, or is a minority identifying a problem affecting a small group? The committee then becomes majority-represented by minorities.	We must operate within the institutional frameworks that already exist, for the benefit of all.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Majority dominance, privilege defence, system-preserving structures.
Not all student contact concerns accommodation, but rather achieving better alignment and understanding of what students need and want.	There is a need for greater interaction between student organisations and the administration.	Grounds: Broad. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work.
Avoid abbreviations in written communication.	Stop using abbreviations in written communication.	Grounds: Language, broad. Mechanisms: Distancing, exclusion.
It is not the responsibility of a single diversity representative to safeguard diversity in boards or committees.	Make boards and committees aware of their role in complying with legislation and ensuring inclusion. Consider establishing an independent role for equality assessment in recruitment processes.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *workplace culture. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture.
We must be aware of how we communicate with regard to cultural differences and norms of politeness.	Be aware of adapting language to different conventions and cultural contexts in communication with international institutions.	Grounds: Ethnicity, language. Mechanisms: Intercultural norm-setting.
The perspective of difference must be maintained—difference creates momentum.	Leadership must facilitate conditions that promote safety and trust.	Grounds: Broad. Mechanisms: Monoculture, leadership for diversity.
Language becomes a barrier.	Buddy schemes, language cafés, and social groups for language learning, involving both international and Norwegian staff.	Grounds: Language, *international staff. Mechanisms: Language norm, structural linguistic marginalisation, monoculture.
Preconceptions.	Take initiative and avoid being biased with regard to language, gender, or sexual orientation.	Grounds: Language, gender, sexual orientation. Mechanisms: Language norm, monoculture, heteronormativity.

It is a problem that we have advanced digital administrative systems.	Can we make greater use of AI?	Grounds: *Digital cultural capital. Mechanisms: Technological system-preserving structures.
Leadership must ensure that student contact takes place in multiple ways, not only by waiting for students to initiate contact.	Invest in systems that benefit students.	Grounds: Broad. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation, organisation of institutional work.
The administration is often assigned the role of secretary in groups, rather than being included as an active participant and contributor.	Improve collaboration across the organisation. All networks should be organised across units.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, hierarchy.

### 5.7. The Mathematics Section

The Mathematics Section conducted the series of three workshops as part of Cluster 3. Eight staff members participated in the pre-workshop, ten in the Dembra workshop (01 October 2025), and ten in the post-workshop. Section Head Ole Enge hosted each workshop and led both the pre- and post-workshops. The Mathematics Section highlights strengths and resources related to equity, diversity, and inclusion that are already in place within the section. These include:

- For the section, working with diversity means including all students—regardless of their background (for example, socio-economic)—in mathematical work.
- There is agreement that all pupils have different backgrounds but should have equal opportunities to participate in mathematics education.
- Some research groups demonstrate a high level of diversity, including among collaboration partners.
- The section emphasises that curricula and governing documents for teacher education should not be taken for granted but should be understood as objects for research and development from a diversity or democratic perspective.

**Figure 12**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / The Mathematics Section.*

<b>Problem description</b>	<b>Proposed measures</b>	<b>Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</b> * indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
Limited visible diversity among staff and students (particularly ethnicity and disability). Homogeneous student group (predominantly Norwegian, white women).	Recruit staff who can reach a broad spectrum of student groups. Develop strategies to recruit, retain, and provide high-quality teacher education to a diverse student body.	Grounds: Ethnicity, disability, broad. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture.

Staff without Norwegian as a first language are seldom involved in practicum visits.	Mentoring scheme for international staff on the Norwegian school system and research culture.	Grounds: Language, *international staff, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Exclusion, structural linguistic marginalisation.
Diversity in staff backgrounds can lead to tensions that affect democracy within the section.	Develop arenas for sharing, discussion, and collaboration.	Grounds: *Job title, *workplace culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, majority dominance.
Lack of social inclusion of international staff, also outside working hours.	Develop sharing arenas and collegial support.	Grounds: *international staff. Mechanisms: Exclusion, individualisation.
Some students experience racism.	Take experiences of racism seriously and follow them up with routines and support.	Grounds: Ethnicity. Mechanisms: Racism.
There is insufficient competence in universal design and in modelling inclusive mathematics teaching. Too much responsibility for accommodation is placed on the students themselves.	Implement measures for universal design in practice: use microphones, colour-blind-friendly colours, and text descriptions. Use teacher educators with school experience to model inclusive mathematics teaching.	Grounds: Disability. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation, ableism, organisation of institutional work.
There is limited insight into individual student challenges, but perhaps that is the way that should be, due to privacy concerns.	Develop arenas for collegial sharing and collaboration, and give greater consideration to affective aspects of learning mathematics.	Grounds: Disability, *privacy. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation, organisation of institutional work.
There is too weak a connection between diversity and all aspects of mathematics teaching—it easily becomes only content-focused.	Integrate diversity into all mathematics teaching and specify inclusive aspects such as mathematics anxiety, dyscalculia, and low self-efficacy.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Epistemology, system-preserving structures.
There is too little interest in each other's research and a lack of arenas for sharing.	Plan an annual joint research and development day. Develop collaborative working practices within sharing arenas to improve participation. Invite researchers from other fields. Increase collaboration with the Mathematics Center.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Individualisation, distancing, organisation of institutional work.
Hierarchies between employment categories.	Develop arenas for sharing and collaboration within the collegium.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Hierarchy, organisation of institutional work.
Unclear distribution of master's supervision; some receive too many, others too few. This is	Adjust routines for the allocation of supervision.	Grounds: *International staff, language, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Hierarchy,

also linked to diversity within the collegium.		exclusion, structural linguistic marginalisation.
Health-related challenges and invisible challenges among staff receive little attention.	Develop collegial support and universal design also for staff.	Grounds: Disability, *health. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation.
Gender imbalance in parts of research. Predominance of women in some research groups, but difficulty recruiting female mathematics teachers into projects.	Develop arenas for sharing and collaboration.	Grounds: Gender, *academic discourse. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures.
Too few opportunities for students who wish to specialise in accommodation within mathematics teaching. We should clarify that it is possible to research diversity-related topics in master's theses in mathematics.	Explore possibilities for a dedicated course or topic on mathematical difficulties and mathematics anxiety. Include themes of inclusion, diversity, and adapted teaching in the master's catalogue for mathematics programmes.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work.

### 5.8. The Norwegian Centre for Mathematics Education

The Norwegian Centre for Mathematics Education conducted the series of three workshops as part of Cluster 3. Sixteen staff members participated in the pre-workshop, twenty-one in the Dembra workshop (02 October 2025), and twenty in the post-workshop. Section Head Kjersti Wæge hosted each workshop and led both the pre- and post-workshops. The Norwegian Centre for Mathematics Education highlights strengths and resources related to equity, diversity, and inclusion that are already in place within the unit. These include:

- The centre provides continuing professional development for teachers where diversity is valued and there is a positive view of pupils.
- At the November Conference, the centre now explicitly states that it accommodates specific needs. This will make a significant difference for those concerned.
- Collaboration with different institutions, such as Statped, contributes to ongoing development and the identification of effective solutions for diverse needs.
- Many of the centre's research projects emphasise inclusive mathematics teaching. These projects are based on five principles, one of which is equity. This is highlighted in research and publications.
- The centre benefits from diverse backgrounds and experiences among staff, which positively influences discussions.
- There is a high degree of openness to different viewpoints at the Norwegian Centre for Mathematics Education. This creates a strong foundation for shared understanding, and staff work collaboratively towards common directions.
- There is a strong focus on inclusive working life.

- Staff make effective use of each other’s expertise, including both academic and practical strengths.
- New staff members are seen as a positive resource, helping to prevent rigid routines and the reproduction of internal “culture.”
- The centre interacts with a wide range of individuals, including parents, via phone and email, and does so in a professional manner.
- Internal communication is centralised on Teams and accessible to all staff.
- Many staff members are involved in the major initiative *Meaningful Mathematics*.

**Figure 13**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / The Norwegian Centre for Mathematics Education.*

<b>Problem description</b>	<b>Proposed measures</b>	<b>Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</b> * indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
We need greater awareness of universal design of PowerPoint presentations and task texts. Diversity and inclusion must be addressed in teaching materials and online resources.	Courses in universal design, as well as developing guidelines that are easily accessible to all on Teams. Greater attention to whether the material we publish is inclusive. Laws and regulations concerning digital universal design make this work easier.	Grounds: Disability including neurodiversity. Mechanisms: Ableism, lack of accommodation, technological system-preserving structures.
Our production must be openly accessible to everyone with different disabilities, including Deaf users.	We must always take into account that there may be individuals with visible and invisible disabilities.	Grounds: Disability including neurodiversity. Mechanisms: Ableism, lack of accommodation.
Our group work in schools can be challenging for those using wheelchairs or hearing loop systems because we are not sufficiently attentive to their needs.	We must spend time at the start of projects identifying participants’ needs. We should ask about accommodation needs in advance, and everything should be prepared beforehand.	Grounds: Disability including neurodiversity. Mechanisms: Ableism, lack of accommodation.
We need greater diversity in the tasks we develop.	Leadership should ensure greater awareness in the design of mathematics tasks: names, gender, context, etc.	Grounds: Ethnicity, gender, religion/belief, broad. Mechanisms: Monoculture.
Who is responsible for providing accommodation in host schools?	We have responsibility for providing accommodation when we are working in schools.	Grounds: Ethnicity, language, disability including neurodiversity. Mechanisms: Monoculture, ableism, lack of accommodation.
We cannot choose not to use a microphone.	Microphones must be used as a standard, so that those concerned do not need to request it.	Grounds: Disability. Mechanisms: Ableism, lack of accommodation,

		epistemic privilege defence.
There is no shared understanding of what it means to accommodate diversity.	We need to develop a general norm for accommodation.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, disability. Mechanisms: Ableism, lack of accommodation.
We encounter a homogeneous group of teachers, but they work with a highly diverse group of pupils. There is a strong predominance of women among early childhood educators, with more men represented at higher levels.	Bring in resource persons with minority perspectives from outside the centre.	Grounds: Ethnicity, language, gender. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture.
We need better and more arenas for sharing where we can learn new knowledge from each other.	Establish a leadership-initiated and leadership-supported system that improves the sharing of research.	Grounds: *research culture. Mechanisms: Individualisation, distancing, organisation of institutional work.
We have not experienced hierarchy within the Centre, but across sections. There are prejudices across sections and centres.	Leadership must facilitate working conditions that are as equitable as possible across staff groups and provide strong arenas for sharing.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Hierarchy, organisation of institutional work.
Microaggressions exist everywhere, including here.	Improve arenas for sharing, get to know each other, and learn from one another.	Grounds: Broad. Mechanisms: Majority dominance, normative pressure.
We need competence related to classrooms with diverse challenges, and we must develop a stronger knowledge base regarding certain pupil groups.	Organise subject seminars and attend courses.	Grounds: Ethnicity, religion /belief, disability, broad. Mechanisms: Mono-culture, system-preserving structures, lack of accommodation.
The Centre is a homogeneous group with limited ethnic diversity.	Bring in resource persons with minority perspectives from outside the centre.	Grounds: Ethnicity. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, majority dominance.
Different rules for technical and academic staff are perceived as unequal treatment.	Leadership must ensure that working conditions are as equal as possible across employment categories.	Grounds: *Employment category, *workplace culture. Mechanisms: Hierarchy, organisation of institutional work.
There is a need for low-threshold support in difficult situations.	Appoint a person whom staff can approach to raise issues.	Grounds: *Workplace culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work.
The use of technical or academic language can be exclusionary.	Use plain language.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Exclusion.

We must be conscious of the use of gender pronouns.	Use inclusive gender pronouns.	Grounds: Gender. Mechanisms: Heteronormativity.
Too little use of Nynorsk (requirement: 25%).	Use both written standards actively. Distribute newsletters in both language forms.	Grounds: Language. Mechanisms: Language norm, structural linguistic marginalisation.
Too little inclusion of Sámi perspectives.	Engage reference persons who can contribute Sámi perspectives.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Majority dominance, monoculture, epistemic hegemony.
There may be a forced or superficial approach to visually representing diversity.	Maintain a balanced approach in representing a diversity of pupils and teachers in communication and dissemination.	Grounds: Ethnicity, broad. Mechanisms: Majority dominance, system-preserving structures.
Mapping competencies and knowledge gaps related to diversity and inclusion.	Leadership must prioritise diversity and inclusion in vision and strategy and ensure that knowledge gaps are addressed.	Grounds: *academic discourse. Mechanisms: Leadership for diversity, organisation of institutional work.
Some staff are included in projects, while others are not—raising questions of representation.	Improve opportunities for different staff members to participate in research projects and ensure greater transparency in selection processes.	Grounds: *research culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work.
We need greater diversity among schools participating in research projects. When conducting research involving pupils, teachers may filter out certain pupils, which can influence results.	Develop strategies to increase the diversity of schools participating in research projects.	Grounds: *research culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, monoculture, epistemic hegemony.
Administrative staff interact with the whole population (greater diversity), while academic staff mainly interact with teachers.	Improve arenas for sharing, get to know each other, and learn from each other.	Grounds: *employment category. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work.
We must value the work that everyone does.	Regularly rotate working constellations; establish a shared screen/website providing an overview of activities.	Grounds: *workplace culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, distancing, hierarchy.

## 5.9. The Norwegian Section

The Norwegian Section conducted the series of three workshops as part of Cluster 3. Fourteen staff members participated in the pre-workshop, fourteen in the Dembra workshop (3 October 2025), and thirteen in the post-workshop. Section Head Leiv Inge Aa hosted each workshop and led both the pre- and post-workshops. The Norwegian Section does not

identify or highlight strengths and resources related to equity, diversity, and inclusion that are already in place within the section.

**Figure 14**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / The Norwegian Section.*

<b>Problem description</b>	<b>Proposed measures</b>	<b>Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</b> * indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
We need representativity in the selection of literature.	We must work to ensure that students become competent in making deliberate text selections, for example with regard to language, cultural belonging, and authors' gender.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity, gender, broad. Mechanisms: Monoculture, majority dominance.
Too narrow a selection of literature.	We must use literature that addresses cultural diversity - that there are multiple ways of being human.	Grounds: Ethnicity. Mechanisms: Monoculture, majority dominance.
We need texts in both written Norwegian forms.	We must work to ensure that both Norwegian written standards are represented in the selection of curriculum and texts.	Grounds: Language. Mechanisms: Language norm, structural linguistic marginalisation (Nynorsk).
Schools need multilingual teachers, but students with Norwegian as a second language often drop out.	We must adapt the Trønder dialect used in teaching and repeat what other students say in dialect so that students with Norwegian as a second language can understand. This should also be a learning objective for students.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Majority dominance, language norm.
We need more competence regarding what constitutes good accommodation. There is insufficient competence regarding reading and writing difficulties.	We need to develop competence in reading and writing difficulties across the entire section. We must examine the distribution of work between Norwegian didactics and special education.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity, disability. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, lack of accommodation.
The section is a homogeneous group and needs more competence in diversity-related issues.	We need to develop diversity competence across the entire section through, for example, full- or half-day seminars. Review recruitment requirements and competence criteria for employment in the Norwegian Section.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity, broad. Mechanisms: Monoculture, system-preserving structures, majority dominance.
The Norwegian teacher with dyslexia represents a challenging paradox.	We must change the understanding of dyslexia and view it as a relational phenomenon, not only as a deficit. Teachers with dyslexia	Grounds: *Academic discourse, disability including neurodiversity. Mechanisms: System-

	should be seen as teachers with specialised competence.	preserving structures, ableism.
We need more competence in diversity-related issues.	We need a reality orientation regarding who is considered the “normal pupil” and the “normal student.”	Grounds: *Academic discourse, epistemology. Mechanisms: Monoculture, system-preserving structures, normative pressure.
We have too little variation in assessment forms.	We need to develop more varied forms of assessment, including for master’s theses. Reintroduce oral examinations in order to counteract favouring a specific academic learner type.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology, broad. Mechanisms: Monoculture, system-preserving structures, lack of accommodation.
We must strengthen students who require learning support, for example those with Norwegian as a second language.	Resources are needed to support diversity work. For example, each section could receive funding to develop support pathways and diversity initiatives.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, language, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Prioritisation, organisation of institutional work, lack of accommodation.
Teacher education is organised in a way that means no section knows what the others are doing.	Leadership must work to establish more arenas for collaboration and sharing across sections and promote mutual learning.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Individualisation, fragmentation, organisation of institutional work.
There is a gender imbalance among both staff and students, with a majority of female staff and students.	Continue working towards gender balance among the student population.	Grounds: Gender. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture.
We need more multilingual teachers and more Norwegian teachers with minority language backgrounds.	The department must work to increase recruitment of minority-language speakers.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Monoculture, majority dominance, system-preserving structures.
The Norwegian Section’s homogeneous representation influences research. Research on second language is most often conducted from a majority-language perspective.	Recruit minority-language speakers as co-researchers. Establish institutionalised diversity initiatives within research activity.	Grounds: *Research culture, *epistemology, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, majority dominance, system-preserving structures.
The Norwegian subject’s responsibility for language and cultural stewardship can create tensions in relation to diversity perspectives. There is variation in how linguistic and cultural diversity is understood in a Norwegian context.	Awareness that the Norwegian subject is responsible for Norwegian language, literature, and culture, and that it represents a small language and culture globally.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture.

Employment categories are defining and counteract diversity.	Provide better facilitation for combined positions and exchanges between schools and ILU.	Grounds: *Employment category. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, distancing.
Administrative requirements act as barriers to diversity.	We need better structural accommodation and a loosening of administrative barriers.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, language, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation, system-preserving structures, monoculture.
Lack of time and resources for diversity work.	We must dare to prioritise diversity and explicitly follow through on these priorities.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Prioritisation.
Strong forces in society deprioritise diversity thinking.	We must promote diversity perspectives as a clear and valued policy position.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, epistemology. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, monoculture, majority dominance.
Lack of arenas for academic discussion.	We need more academically critical seminars addressing diversity themes relevant to the Norwegian Section.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Monoculture, organisation of institutional work.
Unclear understanding of the relationship between diversity and internationalisation.	We need a principled clarification of the relationship between diversity and internationalisation.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work.
Class is rarely included in understandings of diversity.	Raise awareness of class as a perspective on diversity.	Grounds: *Class. Mechanisms: Monoculture, system-preserving structures.
A consensus culture within the section.	Facilitate a diversity of views and constructive disagreement.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Academic normative pressure.
Too few arenas for getting to know one another.	Establish institutionally anchored initiatives that build a vibrant campus culture.	Grounds: *Workplace culture. Mechanisms: Individualisation, distancing.
The administration must understand discipline-specific dilemmas.	Raise awareness that there are two written standards. Adapt tools such as EpN. Be cautious in the use of translation tools.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: System-preserving cultures, organisation of institutional work.

### 5.10. The Pedagogy Section

The Pedagogy Section conducted the series of three workshops as part of Cluster 4. Twelve staff members participated in the pre-workshop, sixteen in the Dembra workshop (31

October 2025), and eleven in the post-workshop. Section Head Gro Hellesnes, together with group leaders Juliette Boks-Vlemmix and Borgny Marianne Knudsen, hosted each workshop and led both the pre- and post-workshops. The Pedagogy Section highlights strengths and resources related to equity, diversity, and inclusion that are already in place within the section. These include:

- Diversity permeates everything the section does.
- Issues related to diversity and minorities are addressed in seminar teaching.
- Diversity is integrated into both research and teaching.
- Diversity is an ongoing process; it is never something that can be fully completed or mastered.
- The section recognises multiple forms of diversity: language, nationality, neurodiversity, race, identity, and experiences. Some of these are relatively fixed (such as race), others are fluid (such as identity), while others are situational (where the same situation may be understood differently depending on perspectives on diversity).

**Figure 15**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / The Pedagogy Section.*

<b>Problem description</b>	<b>Proposed measures</b>	<b>Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</b> * indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
Physical conditions (rooms) shape teaching practices.	We want a greater range of teaching spaces in order to promote variation.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, lack of accommodation.
We need varied working and assessment forms, as well as the possibility to provide accommodations in exams.	Collaboration across sections to promote variation. Use different forms of assessment that capture knowledge in different areas.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, system-preserving structures, lack of accommodation.
We need curriculum that addresses diversity, that is critical, and that is written by a diverse group of authors.	We must use curriculum that does not only focus on the Global North. An overview of curriculum and course descriptions across subjects in MGLU should be developed.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, monoculture, majority dominance.
We must safeguard the diversity of teacher students we have.	We must reflect on what representation we show in images and what names we use. We should use the accommodation equipment available and become fami-	Grounds: Ethnicity, disability, broad. Mechanisms: Monoculture, ableism, majority dominance.

	liar with the opportunities provided by NTNU's support services.	
How do we create space for conversations involving disagreement?	Leadership must facilitate a community of disagreement.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Academic normative pressure, organisation of institutional work, leadership for diversity.
We must practice what we teach. We need to get to know the students and build relationships.	We must work on modelling diversity practices in our teaching. We must build relationships the same way that we teach about the teacher-student relationship.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, distancing.
It is not natural for everyone to use a microphone.	This is a system error. Everyone must use a microphone.	Grounds: Language, disability. Mechanisms: Ableism, lack of accommodation, epistemic privilege defence.
We need methodological diversity.	Allow for methodological diversity in master's theses.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, system-preserving structures.
We need to have conversations about diversity; this is important for our community.	We need time and discussions about diversity, both within and across sections.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, distancing.
We need to develop tools to collaborate effectively. We need to share knowledge about accommodation with colleagues.	We must develop tools that enable discussion within the subject section and about teaching, with mutual acceptance. We must create opportunities for debriefing within the collegium.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Individualisation, fragmentation.
Teacher education needs a more representative student group.	We must develop a strong strategy for broader recruitment.	Grounds: Ethnicity, broad. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture, majority dominance.
We must work towards broader recruitment of teacher educators.	There should be space for diversity in terms of professional experience, culture, and values.	Grounds: Ethnicity, *class, broad. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture, majority dominance.
Branding or rebranding of the teaching profession?	We must broaden the understanding of who and what a teacher can be in a diverse school.	Grounds: *academic discourse. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, majority dominance.

We must distinguish more clearly between what we must do and what we may do. There is too much distance to leadership.	There must be clear expectations at the institutional level.	Grounds: *Workplace culture. Mechanisms: Leadership for diversity, organisation of institutional work.
There is silo thinking at the institute, with very little collaboration between sections.	We need more collaboration across sections, particularly around MGLU. Course descriptions can reflect interdisciplinarity. A pilot with 1–2 cohorts where subjects are viewed across boundaries.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *workplace culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, individualisation, distancing.
Many researchers work on diversity-related topics, but we are not aware of each other.	We need more arenas for sharing research.	Grounds: *Research culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, individualisation, distancing, fragmentation.
We must dare to share. With whom can we lower our guard?	We need spaces for sharing to turn the focus towards ourselves and create an appreciative reflective community. We must assume good intentions in one another.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *research culture. Mechanisms: Individualisation, distancing, competition.
We need to get to know each other better. We need to understand the diversity within the section.	We must also meet in informal contexts. We need a microphone in the staff room. Make visible the international doctoral candidates we have.	Grounds: *Workplace culture, *international staff. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, individualisation, distancing.
Too few attend joint gatherings.	Establish expectations for attendance.	Grounds: *Workplace culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, individualisation, distancing.
How can we work with diversity and inclusion in research where the topic is actually something else?	Develop how we conduct research.	Grounds: *Epistemology, *research culture. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, monoculture.
Can research groups be called research and development groups?	Leadership must require that the research conducted at the institute is relevant for professional education.	Grounds: *Epistemology, *research culture. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, distancing.
We need more voices in public debate.	Leadership must encourage more varied forms of research dissemination, not only academic articles. This also applies to master's theses.	Grounds: *Research culture. Mechanisms: Hierarchy, monoculture, distancing.
It requires surplus energy to enter others' office environments. The distance between the two buildings, Schnitler and Akrinn, is mentally too great.	We need more arenas for sharing and collaboration. People need to be present on campus. It is important to meet physically.	Grounds: *Workplace culture. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, individualisation, distancing, fragmentation.

The interdisciplinary themes developed by programme leaders can function well.	We must make visible the need for interdisciplinary groups and that these benefit the entire institute.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, fragmentation.
We use too much energy resisting other academic environments and sections. There is too much focus on differences.	We need new perspectives and greater generosity. We should focus more on what unites us. We must allow others to participate.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *workplace culture. Mechanisms: Academic normative pressure, fragmentation, distancing.
Students' voices must be heard in the subjects from the very beginning.	Give greater consideration to students as individuals and allow them time to develop as teachers.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Normative pressure, system-preserving structures.
Leadership at all levels should represent diversity.	Leadership should actively support difference.	Grounds: Ethnicity, *academic discourse, broad. Mechanisms: Majority dominance, system-preserving structures.
There is a large gap between cultural diversity in teacher education and in the practicum field.	We must elevate diversity in schools, use more diverse examples, and include more voices in curriculum literature.	Grounds: Ethnicity. Mechanisms: Majority dominance, monoculture, system-preserving structures.
International staff need time to learn Norwegian.	Provide time to learn Norwegian.	Grounds: Language, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Language norm.
Students need knowledge of the Norwegian school system.	Offer dedicated courses for students without experience from the Norwegian school system.	Grounds: Language, *international staff, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Exclusion.

### 5.11. Vocational Education, School Development and Educational Leadership (FYSU)

FYSU conducted the series of three workshops as part of Cluster 4. Four staff members participated in the pre-workshop. In the Dembra workshop, which was conducted jointly with the Pedagogy Section (31 October 2025), four staff members from the section participated, and six staff members took part in the post-workshop. The documentation focuses on vocational education. Section Head Jon Sverre Hårberg hosted each workshop and led both the pre- and post-workshops. FYSU highlights strengths and resources related to equity, diversity, and inclusion that are already in place within the section, particularly within vocational education:

- Approximately half of the country's young people pursue vocational education, and of these, about half are minority students. Diversity competence is therefore an integral part of the overall vocational teacher role, which means that the programme places emphasis on diversity competence in the holistic vocational teacher education.

- In collaboration with the Writing Centre, a seminar has been conducted on *Writing for minority language learners*.
- In the course *The distinctive character of vocational education and sustainable development*, students are challenged to explore the Sustainable Development Goals. Several students have explored the theme of equity.
- An innovation camp on inclusion and social sustainability has been organised.
- Vocational education encompasses a wide range of professional identities, traditions, and histories, which results in a highly diverse group. Teaching recognises students' experiences and competences.
- Several courses include diversity competence and multicultural competence as intended learning outcomes. Ethics and professional ethics are emphasised.
- All individuals on the third floor are invited to join for coffee, including visitors such as cleaning staff and doctoral candidates. This is believed to have a positive impact on the working environment.
- Vocational education is practice-oriented, making it easier to include students and educators in the development of teaching practices, research, and dissemination.
- The academic community demonstrates strong awareness of universal design, equality, gender differences, ethnicity, and diversity among both colleagues and students.

**Figure 16**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / Vocational Education, School Development and Educational Leadership (FYSU).*

<b>Problem description</b>	<b>Proposed measures</b>	<b>Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</b> * indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
Underrepresentation in terms of ethnic diversity in the student group, which corresponds poorly with the diversity in schools. Overly rigid admission structures may be a barrier.	Intended learning outcomes related to diversity and inclusion should be made binding and integrated into all courses and themes. Programme leaders make visible how diversity is embedded in teaching and fostered within academic communities.	Grounds: Ethnicity, broad. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture.
Diversity and inclusion are part of all study programmes, but are emphasised unevenly or treated in isolation rather than integrated across all themes.	Develop resource banks on diversity and inclusion within the section. Improve arenas for sharing, including digital meeting spaces where values and the working environment can be discussed.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Distancing, organisation of institutional work.
There is potential to explore the principle of equity in research on social inequality.	Conduct participatory research with, not on, the field of practice. Promote interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary	Grounds: *Class, broad, *academic discourse. Mechanisms: Exclusion, distancing.

	collaboration at ILU to strengthen diversity and inclusion.	
Individual academic freedom should not be controlled. Research conducted under academic freedom can both include and exclude.	Participatory research.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Epistemic privilege defence, system-preserving structures.
Research groups and project applications may be experienced as both inclusive and exclusive.	Mentoring schemes for early-career researchers. Establish open, transparent practices for participation in research groups & project applications.	Grounds: *Research culture. Mechanisms: Distancing, organisation of institutional work.
Research dissemination requires courage to speak in an increasingly polarised society.	Create arenas for sharing with time allocated for discussing values and the working environment.	Grounds: *Research culture. Mechanisms: Academic normative pressure, organisation of institutional work, individualisation.
There is a need for more interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary collaboration at ILU to strengthen diversity and inclusion.	The deputy head visits sections to build bridges. Establish arenas for sharing and collaboration in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of teaching.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Distancing, individualisation, organisation of institutional work.
There is too little presence on campus.	Establish clear expectations regarding presence. Develop better arenas for sharing and collaboration.	Grounds: *Workplace culture. Mechanisms: Distancing, individualisation, organisation of institutional work.
There is a need for more resources for teaching about diversity and inclusion.	Intended learning outcomes related to diversity and inclusion should be binding and integrated. Programme leaders should clarify that diversity and inclusion are integral components.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, resources. Mechanisms: Prioritisation.
Internal competition and differing research interests create friction and undermine the collective.	Establish arenas for sharing and common meeting places. Introduce mentoring schemes in research.	Grounds: *Research culture. Mechanisms: Fragmentation, competition, individualisation.
There is too weak a culture for sharing and too few arenas for collaboration.	Everyone must take responsibility for including each other academically and socially. Establish a social committee at the institute level. Recognise both small and large contributions to a greater extent.	Grounds: *Workplace culture. Mechanisms: Fragmentation, organisation of institutional work, individualisation.
It is challenging for newly appointed staff and international staff.	Review routines for onboarding and offboarding, as well as the content of new staff courses.	Grounds: *International staff, *new staff. Mechanisms: Lack of accommodation.

## 5.12. The Education Committee

The Education Committee held a workshop with Dembra as part of Cluster 4 (30 October 2025). The workshop lasted two hours and focused primarily on proposed measures. The problem descriptions are therefore only briefly outlined in order to frame the issues that the proposed measures address. Deputy Heads of Education Stine Helene Bang Svendsen and Øyvind Johan Eiksund hosted the workshop. The Education Committee does not identify or highlight strengths and resources related to equity, diversity, and inclusion that are already in place within the committee.

**Figure 17**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / The Education Committee.*

<b>Problem description</b>	<b>Proposed measures</b>	<b>Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination</b> * indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
Course descriptions as communication. Course descriptions contain tacit knowledge that is interpreted differently depending on background.	Course descriptions must communicate effectively with and be meaningful for a diverse student group.	Grounds: *Class, ethnicity, language, broad. Mechanisms: Profession-norming structures, epistemic hegemony, monoculture.
Teaching and assessment forms for diversity.	Develop different master's thesis formats. Assessment formats are crucial for enabling a diverse group of students to complete their studies. Feedback on coursework must be adapted to a diverse student group. Variation in teaching is essential; overly uniform teaching is exclusionary.	Grounds: *Class, ethnicity, language, broad. Mechanisms: Profession-norming structures, epistemic hegemony, monoculture, lack of accommodation.
Student dialogue.	Students should be involved in the development of course descriptions. There must be clarity regarding students' rights.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *workplace culture. Mechanisms: Hierarchy, distancing, organisation of institutional work.
Design of study programmes, breadth of programme portfolio, and recruitment.	Study programmes must be designed so that different students can recognise themselves and be aware of their cultural grounding. The overall programme portfolio should be broad enough to reach a diversity of students and life situations. Different programmes have different profiles. A diverse portfolio is linked to opportunities for diverse recruitment.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Profession-norming structures, epistemic hegemony, monoculture, majority dominance.

Curriculum for diversity.	It is important to have partially elective curriculum. The amount of curriculum should not exceed what can realistically be worked on together in teaching.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, monoculture.
Mapping dropout.	Mapping who drops out will provide knowledge about whom the current study programme is designed for.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Profession-norming structures, monoculture, majority dominance.
Profession-oriented education for diversity.	A profession-oriented approach from the outset supports better inclusion, as it gives students early insight into what it means to be a teacher.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, *epistemology. Mechanisms: Profession-norming structures, monoculture.
Lack of focus on equity, inclusion, and diversity in the Education Committee. These issues have not been discussed to any significant extent in the past three years, and diversity tends to become an add-on.	Competence in equity, diversity, and inclusion must be strengthened and developed for all members of the Education Committee. Increased competence can make it easier for programme leaders to integrate EDI in programme development work.	Grounds: *Academic discourse, epistemology. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, monoculture, majority dominance.
A more diverse group of programme leaders.	Facilitate access to the programme leader role for a more diverse group.	Grounds: Ethnicity, language, *international staff. Mechanisms: Monoculture, majority dominance.
Continuous work on equity, inclusion, and diversity.	EDI development is never completed. Understanding this is in itself a form of diversity competence.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures, prioritisation.

### 5.13. The Research Committee

The Research Committee held a workshop with Dembra as part of Cluster 4 (30 October 2025). The workshop lasted two hours and focused primarily on proposed measures. The problem descriptions are therefore only briefly outlined in order to frame the issues that the proposed measures address. Deputy Head of Research Monika Haga hosted the workshop. The Research Committee does not identify or highlight strengths and resources related to equity, diversity, and inclusion that are already in place within the committee.

**Figure 18**

*Compressed problem descriptions, proposed measures, and grounds and mechanisms of discrimination / The Research Committee.*

Problem description	Proposed measures	Grounds and mechanisms of discrimination
---------------------	-------------------	--

		* indicates categories that are not legally defined grounds but represent relevant aspects
The PhD education as a unifying element.	Establish a shared PhD course for all doctoral candidates. Create meeting arenas for doctoral candidates (ILU PhD forum). Inform supervisors about the available offers so that they can support candidates in allocating time to participate.	Grounds: *Employment category. Mechanisms: Individualisation, fragmentation.
The PhD education, language, and international students.	Requirements for knowledge of the Norwegian school system and the Norwegian language may constitute barriers to recruitment, but may also be necessary due to research topics. Investigate the challenges international students have experienced, even when they have successfully completed the programme.	Grounds: *International staff, language, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Language norm, structural linguistic marginalisation, monoculture.
The PhD education and formal requirements.	Specify more clearly in calls for applications that all documentation must be included, to prevent strong candidates from being excluded due to formal errors in the application.	Grounds: *International staff, broad. Mechanisms: System-preserving structures.
The PhD education and academic sections.	There are significant differences between and within academic sections in how doctoral candidates and postdocs are supported and followed up.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Fragmentation, organisation of institutional work.
Conceptions of knowledge.	Promote acceptance of different forms of knowledge and epistemologies. Reflect on what is recognised as knowledge, who conducts research, and who is researched on/with.	Grounds: *Epistemology. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, system-preserving structures.
Reflection on culture, tradition, equity, diversity, and inclusion.	Approach cultures and traditions with openness. Ensure that research groups and PhD courses reflect on equity, diversity, and inclusion in ongoing research.	Grounds: *Epistemology, *academic discourse, ethnicity. Mechanisms: Epistemic hegemony, monoculture, system-preserving structures.
Organisation of research groups.	Inform newly appointed staff about research groups linked to the academic section. Ensure good information flow regarding funding opportunities. Research groups are, by definition, exclusionary because they focus	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Organisation of institutional work, individualisation, system-preserving structures.

	on specific areas. Consider how competence is built for participation in research groups and whether some individuals are prevented from participating.	
Research and practice/teaching.	Achieve a stronger synthesis between research and practice/teaching.	Grounds: *Academic discourse. Mechanisms: Fragmentation, distancing, hierarchy.

## 6. Discussion

Through the BalanseHub project at the Department of Teacher Education, NTNU, we have examined:

*What are the most significant diversity and equality challenges at the Department of Teacher Education, NTNU, Norway's largest teacher education environment?*

*How can a leadership-anchored forum place these challenges on the agenda and contribute to organizational change?*

The project has resulted in documented, well-developed, and clear answers to these research questions:

This report documents and analyses the diversity and equality challenges, as well as the proposed measures articulated by staff who participated in the project. Chapter 5 demonstrates how staff raise a range of challenges, and how these can be linked to grounds of discrimination that are partly enshrined in law and partly specific to an academic context, yet still important to recognize and address in order to develop the working environment and the quality of academic work.

The report also documents how the Forum for Equity, Inclusion and Diversity has contributed to placing these issues on the agenda and to promoting organisational learning and change by facilitating the leadership-supported project. Based on our analysis, we argue that, through the project, the forum has proven to be a legitimate arena for highlighting and raising challenging issues related to, for example, power, responsibility, and exclusionary practices and barriers within the department.

A key strength of the Forum is its ability to ensure that these challenges are not individualised, but instead understood as organisational and structural, and therefore possible to address through organisational development. Another strength lies in its role as a link and dialogue partner across different levels and arenas (such as department leadership, section leadership, programme leadership, research leadership, and staff), where the forum can help to "translate" challenges between levels.

In this way, the forum can serve as a bridge between knowledge development, capacity building, and decision-making. Its activities can function as collegial spaces for learning and

reflection for both staff and leadership. The forum can thus help keep these issues active, ensure continuity, and provide a structure for long-term organisational learning related to equity, equality, diversity, and inclusion.

The BalanseHub project has been a learning process for all involved parties: stronger anchoring of the workshops within the broader Balanse project, along with clearer conceptual clarification, led to more engaged and less critical participants as the project progressed. However, some resistance to work on equity, inclusion, and diversity remains and is expressed in different ways. It is important to seek to understand the basis of this resistance and to work towards a shared understanding of the challenges facing the institution.

The concept of diversity is complex, and there is still disagreement regarding its definition and which factors should be prioritised within the department. It is important to continue the dialogue, include different perspectives, and allow space for disagreement that is not directly aimed at “stopping” diversity work (i.e. on political or ideological grounds).

It is essential to continue emphasising that diversity should be understood as the interplay of social, cultural, and linguistic differences within a given institutional community, and how these differences influence participation, power, and opportunities.

The project has sought to promote an intersectional perspective: in this context, intersectionality has aimed to highlight how different background variables interact and create varying opportunity structures within the organisation. The work we have carried out is based on the experiences of staff in the respective sections and units. This constitutes an important source of knowledge.

At the same time, there may be blind spots and gaps in understanding how certain situations are experienced if one does not have direct experience of barriers related to specific grounds of discrimination. It is therefore a strength to also gather insights from representatives of affected groups, for example, teacher education students with minority backgrounds.

We emphasise that the insights provided in this report should be understood as a starting point and a snapshot, not as a conclusion or a complete account. The work initiated through the BalanseHub project should be expanded through additional consultations or dialogue with representatives of different grounds of discrimination. This could, for example, involve ILU inviting interest organisations to comment on the report, or carrying out similar work with teacher candidates or others with diverse backgrounds.

The diversity competence we seek to develop should entail an awareness of both structural mechanisms at the macro level and everyday microaggressions that lead to discrimination and/or exclusion. Through such diversity competence, ILU will be better equipped to educate teachers who are trained and conscious in matters of equity, inclusion, and diversity. Teacher educators can apply their diversity competence to ensure that future teachers

develop the necessary preparedness for diversity and strengthen the democratic mandate of schools. The diversity-related challenges documented by the project are complex and multidimensional; they concern structures, attitudes, organisational culture, and language.

Overall, the report shows that ILU has many strengths, substantial resources for diversity and inclusion work, and a high level of awareness in parts of the organisation. However, more structured efforts, greater openness, and clear leadership anchoring are still needed to develop a truly inclusive culture.

Work on diversity and equality should be ongoing and can never be taken for granted.

## 7. Recommendations

Here, we present suggestions for further work to promote equity, diversity, and inclusion at the Department of Teacher Education, NTNU, based on our analysis in this report of the problem descriptions and proposed measures documented through the project. The recommendations are informed by theory (see Chapter 2) and are also consistent with previous findings from studies conducted at the department (Sümer et al., 2023; Sümer & Løvlien, 2025).

We present our recommendations as 11 areas for development, in no particular order of priority.

### 11 areas for development

#### **Develop more and better-functioning arenas for sharing among staff within and across sections and units.**

A lack of arenas for sharing—where staff can collaborate, learn from each other’s research and teaching, get to know each other better professionally, and learn from one another—is highlighted by all sections and units. Staff have insufficient knowledge of each other’s research, teaching approaches, and educational philosophies. Participation in existing sharing arenas is too low, and there is limited interest in colleagues’ research, development work, and teaching. As a result, staff learn too little from one another. Fragmentation, individualisation, and distancing are identified as operative mechanisms. There is significant potential to develop better and more effective sharing arenas at ILU, with greater depth and engagement. Such arenas could address a range of challenges raised by staff, including limited knowledge of each other’s work, language-related challenges in interactions between staff with and without Norwegian/Scandinavian as a first language, perceived hierarchies between staff in different position categories, and social exclusion among international staff. Successful and safe sharing arenas that foster a constructive climate for open expression require leadership for diversity, as well as the

institution's ability to address precisely those factors that make such arenas difficult to establish and sustain.

### **Equity-promoting measures for international staff without Norwegian/Scandinavian as a first language**

That not having Norwegian or a Scandinavian language as a first language can lead to exclusion, hierarchy, and marginalisation is highlighted by the vast majority of sections and units. Norwegian language norms and the structural marginalisation of second-language speakers are identified as key mechanisms. Exclusionary language practices manifest in different ways across sections/units. Examples include that staff without Norwegian as a first language are not assigned to school placement visits, are given fewer master's theses to supervise, and are less frequently included as co-authors of Norwegian academic texts. Some sections also point out how international staff experience not only academic but also social exclusion, including outside working hours. ILU has considerable potential to develop equity-promoting measures for international staff by introducing additional support measures and raising awareness, rather than accepting ongoing exclusion from work tasks, that could also serve as arenas for language development (such as school placements, master's supervision, and co-authorship in Norwegian). ILU also has strong potential to celebrate multilingualism and highlight all first languages among staff, for example through academic days and seminars, or at all-staff meetings and in social settings. Mentorship schemes, language cafés, and social groups involving both international and Norwegian staff are proposed by several sections and units. Although Norwegian is the primary working language, English should also be used to support communication, facilitate Norwegian language learning, and promote equity among colleagues who collaborate.

### **Promote discussion and use of Nynorsk**

Only the Writing Centre, the Centre for Mathematics Education, and the Norwegian section address Nynorsk. No instances of discrimination related to a lack of Nynorsk were reported in the available documentation; however, the Norwegian section and the Writing Centre emphasise the importance of both written standards, and the Mathematics Centre acknowledges that it does not meet the requirement of 25% Nynorsk usage. That the rest of the department does not address Nynorsk is, in itself, a finding. It indicates a low level of awareness regarding the use of written language forms. There is considerable potential for the department to engage in discussions on Nynorsk, raise awareness of the Norwegian language situation, and develop a language policy aligned with the Language Act. The analysis of the BalanseHub documentation points to the need for broader language policy awareness, of which the limited use of Nynorsk at the department serves as an example.

## **Balance hierarchies between position categories and units, and between the valuation of research, teaching, and technical-administrative competence**

All sections and units point to hierarchies between staff in different position categories and units that create exclusion and marginalisation. Hierarchy, distancing, and fragmentation are identified as operative mechanisms. This applies across several dimensions: there is a hierarchy between position categories, where the associate professor/professor track holds higher status than the assistant professor (teaching track)/docent (teaching track) pathway. There is also a hierarchy between types of competence, where research competence holds the highest status, followed by teaching competence, with technical-administrative competence ranked lowest. Research competence tends to be given greater weight than teaching competence and has more influence on the department's practices. Technical-administrative competence struggles to be recognised as a professional field in its own right and is often utilised more in a secretarial capacity than as an equal source of expertise in development processes. Position category thus functions as a structural divide that influences access to tasks and voices heard in key decision-making processes. University lecturers are less frequently invited into research projects, while professors and associate professors are encouraged to take greater responsibility for fostering inclusive competence development across position categories. There is also a hierarchy between units, where academic sections are attributed higher status than the administration, the Writing Centre, and the Mathematics Centre. These centres are more often associated with teaching and dissemination than with research, which is ascribed a lower status than research competence. ILU has significant potential to develop structures and practices that actively counter hierarchisation and promote greater equity between different types of academic and professional competence. Several leadership-supported sharing arenas that cut across position categories and sectional affiliations are proposed. A more equitable culture would not only reduce exclusion and marginalisation but also strengthen the department's overall quality by highlighting the breadth of competences within professional education.

## **Counteract ableism in all aspects of the department's activities**

A lack of universal design (UD), knowledge about UD and accommodations, and a shared understanding of what constitutes appropriate accommodation are highlighted across all sections and units. Disability, including neurodiversity, is a ground for discrimination that all sections and units acknowledge they have insufficient knowledge about, and express a desire to improve and learn more. Many sections and units emphasise the importance of anticipating accommodations in a systematic and department-anchored way, so that those affected do not have to

request them themselves. Staff point to insufficient inclusion and accommodation across all aspects of the department's activities: in physical spaces, in movement between buildings, in the standard use of microphones, in the design of PowerPoint presentations and assignments in line with universal design principles, in the adaptation of digital resources (which appears to be better due to legislation and clear guidelines), in the variation of teaching and assessment methods, in exam arrangements, in the facilitation of practical activities across subjects, in placements, in the centres' activities in schools, and in support for administrative tasks (such as the use of digital systems). It is important to emphasise that these physical, digital, social, and organisational barriers should not be understood as isolated issues, but as mutually reinforcing elements of an ableist culture within the department. Taken together, they constitute significant barriers to learning and work for students and staff with disabilities. Although the documentation contains many problem descriptions and proposed measures to counter the ableism that characterises the department, there are relatively few insights and proposals grounded in critical disability studies. Such research is oriented towards equity and frames disability as a resource rather than a deficit. One of the few examples of this perspective is when the Norwegian section proposes viewing a teacher with dyslexia as an expert needed in schools as a role model.

### **Challenge majority-normative structures and strengthen marginalised perspectives in the department's work, based on value-based commitments**

Across different parts of the documentation, problem descriptions highlight how Norwegian-majority dominance, monoculture, and normative pressure function as mechanisms shaping both academic and social practices. Several sections and units emphasise that teacher education must be connected to and better representative of today's diverse society. The department itself needs to become more diverse and inclusive and be able to demonstrate a range of staff identities in order to attract a broader student base. For example, several contributors call for more Sami perspectives to be brought in from outside, while also pointing out the challenges of incorporating minority perspectives under less favourable conditions (e.g., through temporary hourly positions rather than permanent appointments). The documentation also reveals gendered normative pressures among staff, where the traditional family model with children functions as an implicit standard. Few staff live alone, without children, or otherwise deviate from this norm. Another aspect is the need to relieve minority staff of the expectation to carry or represent diversity work alone, for example in committees and boards, and instead establish diversity as a shared quality criterion to which all contribute. There is a need to move minority perspectives from the margins to an equal footing within position structures, academic development, and decision-making arenas. This area for development does

not concern placing all perspectives on an equal footing within a normative vacuum. On the contrary, work on equity, equality, diversity, and inclusion requires clear value-based commitments. It involves prioritising perspectives that have historically, epistemologically, and institutionally been marginalised (e.g., Sami knowledge and traditions), while also challenging practices in which majority understandings and experiences are treated as neutral.

### **Prioritise an institutionally anchored strategy and efforts to recruit teacher education students with minority backgrounds and to retain them throughout their studies**

Across sections and units, staff point out that teacher education does not reflect the diversity found in schools. There is a significant gap between the diversity student teachers encounter on campus and what they experience during placements. The documentation primarily highlights a lack of ethnic diversity among student teachers, rather than other identity markers such as gender. The underrepresentation of students with minority backgrounds, combined with attrition among those who are enrolled, indicates that current practices—recruitment, teaching, assessment, and placements—do not provide equal conditions. The barriers are structural. For example, FYSU points to “rigid admission structures.” Majority norms related to language, teaching methods, and cultural codes can create both academic and social exclusion for students. The department has considerable potential to establish a comprehensive, institutionally anchored strategy to recruit students with minority backgrounds and support them throughout their studies. Many contributors highlight the need for more varied, interdisciplinary teaching and assessment methods that do not favour a particular type of academic learner. Practicum placements are particularly important to address, including the development of clear guidelines and effective structures, as students may require additional support and accommodations in these contexts (cf. Sümer & Løvlien, 2025). The practicum section and the administration hold valuable knowledge in this area, which could be better utilised at the institutional level. Curricula and examples that extend beyond a Global North perspective, along with a staff body that reflects greater ethnic diversity, would strengthen the learning environment for student teachers with minority backgrounds and could contribute to broader recruitment.

### **Develop an institutionalised focus on diversity within research activities at ILU**

A lack of diversity and inclusion in research is reported across all sections and units, though in ways that point to different levels of research activity. Most prominent in the documentation are problem descriptions and proposed measures related to the organisation of research practices at ILU. Exclusion from being invited into research projects and/or research groups is the most frequently highlighted issue. This is

linked to position categories such as university lecturer or the assistant professor/docent (teaching track) pathway. The system of research groups is frequently problematised, without yielding a clear, unified conclusion. Research groups can be both inclusive and exclusionary, and many contributors call for better opportunities to participate in research projects and groups. Less prominent, but still addressed in several groups, are critiques of epistemic hegemony and proposals to emphasise marginalised knowledge perspectives and traditions, as well as curricula that include strong representation of authors from the Global South. This reflects a desire to recognise different forms of academic knowledge and diverse research practices. The Research Committee focuses in particular on doctoral education, proposing that it should be strengthened to counteract individualisation and fragmentation. The importance of recognising diverse epistemologies is also emphasised in this context. The PhD programme is not mentioned by other sections and units, which is noteworthy and may indicate that the connection between researcher training and the broader research culture at the department is too weak. However, several contributors highlight the need to better support and make visible international doctoral candidates. ILU has significant potential to discuss how equity, diversity, and inclusion can be understood and advanced across multiple levels of research activity at the department: organisational, epistemic, and relational.

### **Address and discuss racism at ILU**

It is striking that the concept of racism is mentioned only three times in the entire documentation from the BalanceHub project: once in reference to the university structure as racist (in the arts, physical education, and sports), once in a problem description noting that students have experienced racism (Mathematics section), and once in a proposal to bring in external contributors to develop resources addressing racism due to a lack of ethnic diversity within the unit itself (Writing Centre). Race is mentioned twice as a diversity marker (Pedagogy section). In the documentation, other terms such as discrimination are often used where it might be more precise to employ the concept of racism. Racism is also notably absent in the 2024 staff survey (Sümer et al., 2023). However, we know from the student survey (Sümer & Løvlien, 2025) that some students experience racism at ILU. This suggests that the institution may avoid addressing racism and thereby appear colour-blind. White normativity operates as a structuring mechanism (cf. Yael & Riese, 2023). There may be a discomfort associated with acknowledging that race, racialisation, and racism can exist within our own institution, which in turn makes these issues difficult to address explicitly. The continued taboo surrounding the concept of racism in Norway is well documented in research literature and is referred to as Nordic exceptionalism (cf. Bangstad, 2015). ILU has clear potential for development in naming, documenting, and addressing racism as an institutional issue, rather than framing it solely as

general “discrimination.” Such an approach would support changes in language, practices, and systems in line with research on Nordic exceptionalism and white normativity and would better protect and support students and staff who may be at risk of experiencing racism.

### **Raise awareness of the relationship between work on equity, inclusion, and diversity and work on democracy and freedom of expression—where the latter depends on the former**

This area for development is based on the premise that work on equity, inclusion, and diversity must be understood as a prerequisite for genuine democracy and a safe space for freedom of expression within the department. The documentation reveals certain tensions, where some voices express scepticism towards diversity and inclusion efforts, arguing that “everyone” is part of diversity, or that democracy and freedom of expression must remain unrestricted. The inclusive frameworks and anticipatory systemic changes or accommodations called for in the documentation include, for example, universal design, varied forms of teaching and assessment, strengthened social and academic inclusion through more structured and facilitated sharing arenas, and the visibility of minority perspectives. The democracy and freedom of expression highlighted in the documentation include, for example, constructive disagreement and pluralistic dialogue, recognition of normative pressure and consensus culture as barriers, and the need for safe, leadership-supported frameworks for dialogue across differences. Tensions arise when inclusion efforts are perceived as limiting free expression, rather than as the framework that enables disagreement and participation for a wider range of voices. ILU has untapped potential to emphasise that this is not a matter of choosing between “inclusion” and “democracy/freedom of expression,” but that the former (inclusion) underpins the latter (democracy/freedom of expression).

### **Reallocate and free up resources to work on diversity, and view this as a long-term investment in sustainable teacher education**

Across sections and units, lack of time, resources, and arenas for collaboration is described as one of the main barriers to developing inclusive practices that structurally transform the ways in which work is carried out and pave the way for diversity. Work related to broad student recruitment, internal equity-building among staff, universal design, accommodation, varied forms of teaching and assessment, dialogue and relationship-building with students, collaboration across sections and centres, and the development of curricula and assignments that reflect diversity all require collaboration, time, and sustained effort over time. This work is never complete and must be understood as a shared responsibility. Several sections point out that the lack of resources lead to lower quality in teaching, student follow-up,

and collaboration in the field of practice, and that this negatively affects diversity, accommodation, and inclusion. The administration describes how limited resources weaken the level of service, particularly when facilitating placements in schools. The Pedagogy section emphasises that work on dialogue culture and constructive disagreement requires time and continuity. Other sections highlight that accommodation and universal design must be anticipatory and systematic, rather than something individual students have to request. The department has the potential to view diversity work as a long-term investment in the quality of teacher education, which can be realised if time is freed up and resources are prioritised accordingly. Continued investment in the Forum for Equity, Inclusion and Diversity as a leadership-supported forum can be seen as such a long-term priority, providing continuity and contributing to learning and reflection spaces for both staff and leadership. Several sections explicitly emphasise that diversity work must be anchored in leadership and given space in annual plans, strategies, and resource allocation in order to become genuinely effective and sustainable.

In conclusion, we wish to emphasise that the BalanseHub project has contributed to increased focus on and awareness of diversity-related challenges at the department. The project has created opportunities for discussions among colleagues and has brought to light both tensions and resources. It has provided empirical material for accompanying research and, in the longer term, for peer-reviewed knowledge on work related to equity, inclusion, and diversity. For the Forum for Equity, Inclusion and Diversity, facilitating the project has provided concrete experience with equality work within a teacher education institution. Through the project, the forum has strengthened its role as a link between different academic sections and levels of leadership and has demonstrated its legitimacy. This report serves as an analysis and documentation of the discussions initiated by the BalanseHub project during the period 2024–2026 and provides insights into the discrimination grounds and mechanisms related to equity, inclusion, and diversity that operate at different levels within the department. The report also offers suggestions for how these challenges can be addressed. We hope that the report will contribute to ongoing dialogue, engagement, and sustained efforts to promote equity, inclusion, and diversity at the Department of Teacher Education, NTNU, and beyond.

#### **References:**

Bangstad, S. (.2015). The racism that dares not speak its name: Rethinking neo-nationalism and neo-racism in Norway. *Intersections. East European Journal of Society and Politics*. 1, 1 (Feb. 2015). <https://doi.org/10.17356/ieejsp.v1i1.26>.

- Branlat, J., Heimann, K., & Sørensen, S.Ø. (2026). What is it like to be affirmed? Micro-affirmations as a practice of academic generosity. *Organization*, 1-17.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/135050842614253>
- Drange, I. (2014) *Mangfoldsledelse: en kunnskapsoversikt*, Oslo, AFI-report 3: 2014.
- Gressgård, R. (2013). Interseksjonalitet. *Tidsskrift for kjønnsforskning*, 37(1), 64-67.
- Likestillings- og diskrimineringsloven. (2017). *Lov om likestilling og forbud mot diskriminering*. <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2017-06-16-51>
- Lund, A. B. (2018). En studie av læreres forståelse av mangfoldsbegrepet. *Nordisk tidsskrift for pedagogikk og kritikk*, 4, 87–102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.23865/ntpk.v4.608>.
- Sümer, S., Holland, S., & Utvær, B.K. (2023). *A survey on inclusion and diversity at ILU. Report*. Department of Teacher Education, NTNU. <https://www.ntnu.no/ilu/forum-for-likeverd-inkludering-og-mangfold>
- Sümer, S., & Løvlien, E. D. (2025) *Rapport fra en undersøkelse om mangfold og inkludering blant lærerstudenter*, Institutt for Lærerutdanning, NTNU.
- Thun, C., & Onsrud, L. M. (2023). Mangfold som honnørord eller maktkritikk? Forståelser av mangfold i barnehagelærerutdanningen. *Uniped: Tidsskrift for universitets- og høgskolepedagogikk*, 46(4), 289-299. <https://doi.org/10.18261/uniped.46.4.7>
- Westrheim, K., & Hagatun, K. (2015). Hva betyr "kompetanse for mangfold" i utdanningssystemet? Et kritisk perspektiv på mangfoldsdiskursen. *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift*, 99(3-4), 168-180.
- Wollscheid, S., Lynnebakke, B., Kindt, M. T., Karlstrøm, H., & Fossum, L. W. (2022). *Konsekvenser av rasisme og diskriminering for integrering innen utdanning; En kunnskapsoversikt*. Nordisk institutt for studier av innovasjon, forskning og utdanning (NIFU). Rapport 2022:22.
- Yael, H., & Riese, H. (2023). Race talk and white normativity: classroom discourse and narratives in Norwegian higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(8), 1886-1902. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.1940925>

## Attachment 1

### Follow-up Research: Participant evaluation of the workshop series

Professor Sevil Sümer from Social Studies Section has led and conducted the follow-up research within the BalanseHub project, which consisted of three components: individual interviews with section heads; focus group discussions with international staff; and participant evaluation of Dembra workshops (via Nettskjema).

The interviews with section heads addressed their experiences with the BalanseHub project, as well as their reflections on diversity-related challenges at ILU. A total of six interviews were conducted, each lasting between 30 minutes and one hour. In addition, two focus-group discussions were carried out with international staff. These discussions focused on their experiences of ILU as a workplace, language training, and social conditions. The analysis of both the leadership interviews and the focus group discussions is ongoing.

This appendix presents the results and a preliminary analysis of the participant evaluation of the Dembra workshops conducted in academic sections and centres. The aim of the workshops was to contribute to a shared understanding of needs and opportunities related to diversity at ILU, and to develop concrete proposals for measures collaboratively.

The participant evaluation was carried out using a questionnaire (via Nettskjema). Staff who had participated received an email with the following invitation shortly after their section had completed the workshops:

“Many thanks for your participation in one or more sessions in connection with the BalanseHub project: Opportunities for a diverse teacher education. You are now invited to evaluate and share your experiences here: (Link to Nettskjema) The questionnaire is part of the follow-up research of the larger project which is included in the [Balansehub](#)-network, financed by the Research Council of Norway. Our aim is to evaluate the subproject which focused on diversity competence through workshops organized in collaboration with Dembra. Many thanks for your time and contribution!”

The questionnaire combined open-ended and closed-ended questions about participants' experiences with and reflections on the Dembra workshops.

The evaluation questionnaire comprised the following 10 questions:

**Figure A1: Questions in the evaluation form**

- 1) Hvilken fagseksjon/enhet jobber du ved ILU? / Which section/unit do you work at ILU?
- 2) Hvilke(n) samlinger har du deltatt i? / Which workshops did you participate in?
- 3) Hvordan opplevde du presentasjonen av Dembra om mangfoldskompetanse? / How did you experience the presentation by Dembra on competence for diversity?
- 4) Hvordan var din opplevelse av verdens kafé? / How was your experience of the world café?
- 5) Hvor nyttig har du opplevd BalanseHubsamlingene om mangfoldskompetanse i sin helhet? / How useful did you find the BalanseHub sessions on diversity competence overall?
- 6) Tror du at ideene og tiltakene som ble frembrakt i workshopene vil bli fulgt opp? / Do you think that the ideas and measures developed in the workshops will be followed up?
- 7) Hva tror du trengs for å omsette de foreslåtte tiltakene som kan bidra til økt mangfold og inkludering? / What do you think is needed to implement the proposed measures that can contribute to increased diversity and inclusion?
- 8) Hva har du opplevd som mest interessant ved workshopene? / What was the most interesting part of the workshops for you?
- 9) Hvis du kunne fremheve én mangfoldsutfordring som den viktigste ved ILU, hva ville det være? / If you can highlight one diversity challenge as the most important at ILU, what would that be?
- 10) Er det noe du ønsker å legge til i denne evalueringen? Forslag, kritikk og refleksjoner er tatt imot med takk! / Is there anything you would like to add to this evaluation? Suggestions, critique and reflections are welcome!

We received a total of 54 responses during the period 16 June 2025–26 February 2026 (the response rate varied across sections, with an average of approximately 33%).

The responses were distributed as follows: 14 from the Administration; 11 from the Mathematics Centre; 6 from the Writing Centre; 5 from Norwegian; 3 from Social Studies; 3 from Natural Sciences; 3 from Arts, Physical Education and Sports; 2 from English and Foreign Languages; 2 from Mathematics; 2 from Pedagogy; 1 from FYSU; and 2 anonymous.

The evaluation questionnaire started with three questions addressing participants' experiences of different parts of the workshops. Question 5 focused on participants' overall experience of the sessions:

**How useful did you find the BalanseHub sessions on diversity competence overall?  
(Number of responses: 54)**

**Figure A2: Distribution of answers regarding perceived usefulness**

Experience	Number	Percent
Very useful	7	13%
Useful	22	40.7 %
Neither/nor	14	25.9 %
Not very useful	11	20.4 %
Total	54	

The responses indicate a mixed assessment of usefulness: although the majority (approximately 54%) perceived the workshops as useful or very useful, a significant proportion (25.9%) were neutral. At the same time, around 20% considered them to be of limited usefulness.

Question 6 concerned participants' views on follow-up:

**“Do you think that the ideas and measures generated in the workshops will be followed up?”**

The responses to this question indicate moderate optimism regarding follow-up: a clear majority (approximately 65%) believe that the measures will be followed up to a large or some extent. At the same time, a notable proportion (approximately 26%) believe that follow-up will be limited or absent. In addition, 11% are uncertain (responding “do not know”).

Questions 7 to 10 were open-ended and received a varying number of responses. A preliminary analysis of the textual responses is presented below:

**What do you think is needed to implement the proposed measures that could contribute to increased diversity and inclusion? (Number of responses: 40)**

The responses can be grouped into five main categories:

- 1. Leadership and anchoring (most prominent)**  
Many point to the need for clear leadership anchoring; responsibility and follow-up at multiple levels; as well as concrete plans and implementation.
- 2. Specification**  
Several respondents perceive the measures as too vague, insufficiently concrete, and difficult to implement.
- 3. Time, resources, and prioritisation**  
Lack of time, high workloads, and low prioritisation in everyday work are identified as key challenges.
- 4. Awareness-raising**  
Many highlight the need for continuous focus, reflection, dialogue, and work on attitudes.
- 5. Skepticism and dissenting views**  
Some express doubt about the need for diversity measures and feel that diversity is already sufficiently addressed.

Overall, the responses indicate that staff believe the measures will only succeed if they are clearly anchored in leadership, specified through concrete plans and responsibilities, and followed up systematically over time.

**What was the most interesting part of the workshops for you? (Number of responses: 37)**

The most prominent theme in the responses is that participants appreciated discussions with colleagues. Exchanging ideas, perspectives, and experiences was perceived as both interesting and useful. Disagreement and differing viewpoints were seen as enriching.

Several respondents highlight that the workshops contributed to increased awareness of the themes, and many reported an expanded understanding of what diversity entails, beyond stereotypical assumptions.

Many pointed to challenges related to inclusion, noting that not everyone feels seen and heard. It also became clear that there are differing understandings of diversity within the organisation.

**If you could highlight one diversity challenge as the most important at ILU, what would that be? (Number of responses: 33)**

The responses show considerable variation, but clear themes and patterns emerge: Several respondents point to challenges related to the organisational structure at ILU, such as “disciplinary silos” and insufficient collaboration between academic sections. A recurring theme is the tension between Norwegian academic traditions and internationalisation. Many highlight challenges related to awareness of diversity; some staff feel that diversity issues do not concern them and lack motivation to engage with the topic.

**Brief summary of the key diversity challenges highlighted:**

- Disciplinary silos and organisational structures that hinder collaboration
- Linguistic and cultural tensions between Norwegian traditions and internationalisation
- Gender imbalances and unequal career development opportunities
- Attitudes, privilege, and lack of awareness
- Inclusion of international staff

- Diverse recruitment (both staff and students)

Overall, the responses indicate that staff have a solid understanding of the conditions required for successful diversity work. Several respondents emphasize the need for structured and continuous follow-up, including through established forums and clearly defined responsibilities. This reflects an understanding of diversity work as a long-term and integrated process, rather than a series of isolated measures.

The analysis shows that the diversity-related challenges at ILU are complex and multidimensional, encompassing structures, language, recruitment, and attitudes.

The following table summarizes the proposed action points for translating measures into practice.

**Figure A3: Action Points for Translating Measures into Practice**

Main Area	Action Points
<b>1. Leadership anchoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish clear goals for diversity and inclusion at all levels.</li> <li>• Appoint responsible persons in each section for follow-up.</li> <li>• Integrate the topic into annual plans and regular meeting agendas.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Concrete measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise measures to make them specific and time-bound.</li> <li>• Develop an implementation plan with milestones and responsibilities.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Time and resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocate dedicated time in meetings for diversity and inclusion work.</li> <li>• Ensure that staff have the capacity to participate.</li> <li>• Assess resource needs, such as funding, expertise, and support.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Dialogue and reflection</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce structured reflection meetings on practices and attitudes.</li> <li>• Create safe spaces for difficult conversations.</li> <li>• Facilitate the sharing of knowledge and experiences.</li> </ul>
<b>5. Continuity and follow-up</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep the topic visible through seminars and ongoing professional inputs.</li> <li>• Document progress and make developments visible.</li> </ul>
<b>6. Staff involvement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow sections to develop their own sub-goals and initiatives.</li> <li>• Provide capacity-building opportunities in diversity and inclusion.</li> <li>• Establish cross-sectional networks and forums.</li> </ul>
<b>7. Building on existing work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map existing good practices and continue them.</li> <li>• Integrate new measures into established structures.</li> <li>• Ensure alignment with the statutory responsibilities of teacher education.</li> </ul>