

## **Exemplar Report**

# **Review of good practice in place and its impact in the Department of Science in the University of Poppleton**

Based on the Good Practice Checklist completed in January 2015

Based on the Pre-May 2015 Athena SWAN Guidance and Criteria

Date: May 2015

**In Confidence**

**Notes on this exemplar report:**

For this exemplar report the text responses used has been drawn from a number of good practice checklists completed by departments with which ORP has and is working. At the time the departments completed the checklist only one or two held SWAN award and the majority were not close to making an application.

Where possible the 'best' examples of evidence is used. In some cases this was not possible without identifying the department. Each of the sections include text from two or more departments.

The weak scores for sections 11 and 12 reflect the fact that most of the departments were not close to making a SWAN application at the time.

In a department working on a SWAN application in the next 6/9 months a higher score for sections 11 and 12 would be expected.

However, on the basis of the responses in sections 1 to 10, the 'exemplar' department as created for the report is highly likely to achieve a bronze award (always assuming that its self-assessment process, data and action plan did not let it down).

## Contents

Contents	3
Introduction	4
Report Structure	4
Scoring and Rating	5
The Scoring of Good Practice and its Impact	5
Using the Report	6
1 Recruitment and Appointment	7
2 Promotion Criteria and Processes	9
3 Early Career Development, PhD Students, Post Docs and Early Career Staff (ECRs)	11
4 Appraisal	13
5 Career Development Activities	15
6 Organisation and Management	17
7 Workload Allocation	19
8 Workplace Culture	20
9 Flexibility	22
10 Career Breaks and Returning	24
11 Organisation for Action	26
12 Evidence for Action	28

## Introduction

The report aims to assess the good practice in place. The good practice has been scored on the basis of the information provided in the Good Practice Checklist completed by the department in XXXX 2015.

The report identifies gaps, strengths and weaknesses.

In each section the bulleted points are what has been identified as the good practice that is in place, and observations are in italics and may relate to good practice in place and the good practice that is being planned.

The metrics which are included in the report have not been scored. It is suggested that, when the department has read the report, it should then discuss and score its metrics. This would provide the department with a baseline against which to measure its future progress.

## Report Structure

The 12 sections used in the report map onto the ORP Good Practice Checklist and the pre-May 2015 bronze and silver SWAN application forms as follows.

Section No.	Report Section	Checklist Action Area	Pre-May 2015 SWAN application form section
1	Recruitment and appointment	2A Appointment and Promotion Processes 2B Levelling Appointment & Promotion Playing Fields	3 & 4
2	Promotion criteria & processes	2A Appointment and Promotion Processes 2B Levelling Appointment & Promotion Playing Fields	3 & 4
3	Early career development	3A Career Development Provision 3B Developmental Activities	3 & 4
4	Appraisal	3A Career Development Provision	3 & 4
5	Career development activities	3B Developmental Activities	3 & 4
6	Organisation and management	4A.Effective management	3 & 4
7	Workload allocation	4A Effective management	3 & 4
8	Workplace culture	4B.Workplace management	3 & 4
9	Flexibility	5A Flexibility	3 & 4
10	Career breaks and returning	5B Career breaks and interrupted careers	3 & 4
11	Organisation for action	1A Organisation for action	2
12	Evidence for action	1B Evidence for action	3

## Scoring and Rating

The good practice in place is reported in twelve sections. The maximum score for each section is 15 (overall 180).

**Overall Score: 104 Overall Rating: Fair**

### Objective Measures Rating:

Section	Report Section	Good Practice in place	
		Score	Rating
1	Recruitment and appointment	8	Fair
2	Promotion	11	Good
3	Early career development PhDs, post docs and ECRs	9	Fair
4	Appraisal	12	Good
5	Developmental activities	11	Good
6	Organisation and management	9	Fair
7	Workload allocation	5	Weak
8	Workplace culture	10	Good
9	Flexibility	10	Good
10	Career breaks and returning	9	Fair
11	Organisation for action	6	Weak
12	Evidence for action	4	Weak
<b>Totals</b>		<b>104</b>	<b>Fair</b>

Measures Rated Excellent	0
Measures Rated Good	5
Measures Rated Fair	4
Measures Rated Weak	3
Measures Rated Poor	0
No information	0

## The Scoring of Good Practice and its Impact

### Scoring system

The scoring system that is used is based on systems used in other related work.

### Scores

0	No information identified
1	Limited information identified
2	Some/clear information identified
3	Adequate information identified
4	Convincing information identified
5	Comprehensive information provided

### Ratings

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Score</u>
Poor	0 - 3
Weak	4 - 6
Fair	7 - 9
Good	10 - 12
Excellent	13 - 15

## Using the Report

It is suggested that this report should be used to identify the good practice already in place, which should be included in a SWAN application, and to identify gaps which can be filled either before making a SWAN application or which could be included in a SWAN action plan.

Start with the italicised comments on each measure.

The metrics also provide useful pointers. They may:

- Enable you to spot things that are in place but which have not been included in the your completed checklist;
- Suggest good practices and processes and/or measures of impact which you could adopt/adapt;
- Help you to spot similar/related activities/practices that you can easily evidence and/or incorporate in your action plan.

Individual scores should not be used in isolation. Departments approach their SWAN work differently/link/describe their activities, practices and approaches differently. The overall scores for each of the twelve measures are reasonably robust.

For bronze SWAN application the emphasis should be on identifying key areas for action. You also need to have in place the resources and organisation to collect and monitor staff and student data, and to carry out a thorough and honest self-assessment with a view to identifying the good practice in place and the gaps that need to be filled either before making a submission or for inclusion in the action plan. It is anticipated that a first SWAN silver submission, while evidencing a substantial range of good practice in place, might be short on impact measures. Culture change is slow, changes to key processes take time to make a difference, however departments looking to renew a silver application should want to demonstrate that their staff recognise the difference.

Do not attempt to fill all the gaps. Pick things you can easily fix, which in many cases will be what you are already doing/information you already have, but which you did not include in the Checklist. You may identify other gaps and actions that are a better fit for your department.

To move things forward:

- Put together information on any factual gaps which you can do by looking at the italicised comments and the metrics. This is particularly important in the areas where no information was identified;
- You may decide to use the metrics as an additional checklist - if you do then ensure that when you put together your submission the text reflects what is in place/is done;
- Include in the text of your submission any additional 'evidence' from staff surveys that shows that what the department says it does is done, does work, and is recognised as valuable by staff. Doing this will give a clear story of your journey;
- Check that any actions that have already been taken and are now 'established' are included in the main text of the submission as well as in the progress report on any previous action plan;
- Ensure that it is clear who has responsibility for overseeing specific processes and procedures and how checks are made that what is supposed to happen does happen and who makes those checks.

## 1 Recruitment and Appointment

The action taken to increase the candidate pool, to attract potential female candidates to apply, and to ensure that short listing, selection processes and criteria are fair open and transparent and are women and men equally likely to be successful:

<b>Good practice in place</b>	<b>Observations/Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
1.1. Action on candidate pool	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This issue will be on the department action plan for consideration and implementation to ensure that all adverts appeal to both genders. Adverts already include information on the Athena SWAN award, as well as the university's family friendly policies.</li> <li>One group actively identifies candidates "permanent jobs". Less is done by the other groups and for fixed-term positions (including post doc appointments).</li> </ul> <p><i>Build on what is being done, publicise it, consider asking an academic who has done this to champion it across the department and monitor this as part of action plan.</i></p> <p><i>When was department recruitment material last reviewed is it family friendly.</i></p> <p><i>Obtain feedback/ask for suggestions from recently appointed staff.</i></p> <p><i>Clarify who is responsible for monitoring/reporting on this.</i></p>	2
1.2. Appointment processes & criteria	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff are required to submit formal short-listing and decision grids for all appointments to ensure fairness and equality. These processes are monitored by departmental administrator and university HR.</li> <li>Most appointment short-lists are encouraged to include a woman, but sometimes this is not possible as the applicants are not sufficiently qualified/ don't have the right specialisms. Current HoD has not experienced any shortlists which do not contain a proportion of women representative of those who applied (but in some areas there are frequently no female applicants for posts).</li> </ul> <p><i>Are criteria and processes reviewed/by whom (e.g. to ensure that applicants with career break/who have worked part time are not disadvantaged?)</i></p>	2
1.3. Decision takers /their training	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The appointment panel for staff always includes a female member of staff.</li> <li>Appointment panels for postdocs are organised by the PI and are normally conducted via interview where at least 2 academic members of staff are present. Women have sat on recent panels for postdoc appointments.</li> <li>All who participate on panels (recruitment and promotion) required to attend training which includes E &amp; D. Anyone chairing a selection panel must have attended training from HR to ensure that they are aware of the dangers of unintended bias.</li> <li>It was felt that in the past some panels had been unconsciously biased. However the HoD had tried to clarify instructions to panels.</li> <li>The department plans to hold an "Unconscious Bias" in-house training session.</li> <li>All academics are encouraged to contribute to the selection process (e.g. making comments on candidate CVs, participating in a post-presentation discussion).</li> </ul> <p><i>Useful to provide data on uptake and perceptions of training.</i></p> <p><i>May be worth explaining how department ensures this does not overburden women.</i></p> <p><i>Firm up action on in house training – when, for whom, who will tackle issues that may arise from session and who will monitor/report future activity?</i></p>	4
<b>Score</b>		<b>8</b>

<b>Metrics</b>		<i>Score</i>
Recruitment pool	- Steps taken have broadened the pool of women applicants.	
Processes & criteria	- All research staff appointment decisions made by panels.	
Decision takers /their training	E&D, Unconscious bias training provided for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Panel members.</li> <li>- Chairs.</li> </ul> - Steps taken to ensure those involved are reasonably representative of department staff profile.	
Monitoring evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gender of applicants monitored.</li> <li>- Short-listed candidates' gender is monitored.</li> <li>- Offers made /accepted monitored.</li> </ul>	
Feedback	Feedback obtained/perceptions from successful candidates/staff involved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On information provided for candidates and panels.</li> <li>- The process and its fairness.</li> <li>- The criteria and its fairness.</li> </ul>	
Data availability	- Time series data are available?	
<i>Score</i>		<b>0</b>

**Overall score 8**

**Overall Rating: Fair**

**Strengths to build on:**

Appointment panels and how they work

**Gaps and weaknesses to address:**

No significant weakness. However; there needs to be more supporting information on who does what, who is involved what is done, how it works and whether staff experiences/perception add to/provide evidence that all works as planned.

## 2 Promotion Criteria and Processes

The action taken to ensure that processes and criteria are clear and open (and information on it is communicated effectively and in a timely manner), that criteria take account of teaching, research, administration, pastoral, outreach, other responsibilities, and that processes, including decision making, ensure that women and men are equally likely to be put forward and to be successful?

<b>In Place</b>	<b>Observations/Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
2.1. Criteria take account of all contributions	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are clear criteria for promotions – although the survey from last year suggests that not all staff are aware of these.</li> <li>• To gain promotion it is necessary to show that these have been achieved to the required level, so this type of advice is really built in to the process.</li> <li>• How well an individual meets the criteria for promotion is discussed during their annual review.</li> </ul> <p><i>Indicate e.g. whether workload, roles and responsibilities undertaken, caring responsibilities taken into account.</i></p> <p><i>Indicate who is responsible for this/oversees this.</i></p> <p><i>Are promotion criteria covered at induction, appraisal, and or in promotion training sessions?</i></p> <p><i>Indicate whether survey results showed F/M differences and what use is being made of survey findings.</i></p>	2
2.2. Process communication information and decision making	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All staff are notified of the promotions round and the timetable.</li> <li>• The promotion process is very transparent – an internal committee assesses all proposals and this includes a number of senior female staff.</li> <li>• The gender breakdown of promotions is monitored - department has been successful in promoting women in the last 3 years as a result.</li> <li>• Women are encouraged to apply in all emails giving information on promotions. The last 4 promotions to Professor were for female staff.</li> <li>• Candidates can self-nominate and this has happened in the past (with departmental support).</li> <li>• All academics are reviewed at the time of setting up appraisal lists and before the promotions cycles, to ensure that they receive the right support before the promotion and during the cycle if they are putting a case forward. This is usually by a senior academic staff member who has experience of the promotions process.</li> <li>• As part of the process any training or opportunity “needs” can be formally noted, and followed up on during the next review.</li> <li>• Department gives feedback for successful &amp; unsuccessful candidates - done by HOD and is extensive. University feedback given by Dean who encourages staff to discuss this with him and their HOD.</li> <li>• University feedback for research promotions is insufficiently complete, but University is currently reviewing its promotion process.</li> </ul> <p><i>Consider discussion group with recently promoted staff to check experiences and get suggestions for further improvements.</i></p> <p><i>Consider comparing F/M success rates with cognate departments/university/external.</i></p>	5

2.3. Promotion support and encouragement	<p><i>Refs identified to</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff are encouraged to apply for promotion and discussions take place between the Head of department or other senior academic and anyone who has not applied for promotion or been successful in recent years to urge them to take advantage of the opportunity.</li> <li>• The department promotions committee allocates an academic member of staff with experience of promotions to shadow the candidate in the writing up of their case for promotion. They help with the preparation of these cases, discuss them with the candidates and others who may have useful suggestions (provided the candidates are happy with this).</li> <li>• Candidates are given advice on filling gaps and they are encouraged to discuss the promotions criteria during yearly appraisals to decide on how these weaknesses can be addressed.</li> <li>• The HoD is pro-active in ensuring that help is sought / offered. Workshops are run at university level.</li> <li>• Staff who have helped with a promotion case will usually follow up unsuccessful cases with discussions on ways in which the candidate could improve their chances and encourage the candidate to take action accordingly.</li> </ul> <p><i>Include information on availability F/M take up of support / training offered by university/faculty.</i></p>	4
Score		11

<b>Metrics</b>		<b>Score</b>
Promotion criteria	Do promotion criteria include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teaching?</li> <li>- Research?</li> <li>- Administration?</li> <li>- Pastoral work?</li> <li>- Outreach work?</li> <li>- Other duties?</li> </ul>	
Promotion processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All eligible staff informed at the beginning of each promotion round.</li> <li>- Staff involved in the promotion process trained in unconscious bias.</li> </ul>	
support and encouragement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is there a department positive review of all staff before/at beginning of the promotion 'round'?</li> <li>- Are the criteria for promotion criteria (related to individuals' progress) covered at appraisal?</li> <li>- Training provided for promotion preparation/confidence boosting.</li> </ul>	
Monitoring F/M understanding	Is there monitoring of F/M staff awareness/understanding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promotion criteria?</li> <li>- Promotion process?</li> </ul>	
Monitoring F/M experiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are F/M staff views checked on?</li> <li>- Is this covered by a regular staff survey</li> </ul>	
F/M monitoring stages and outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are outcomes (and interim stages) monitored and discussed by senior management committee</li> </ul>	
<i>Score</i>		0

**Overall score: 11**

**Overall Rating: Good**

**Strengths to build on:**

Generally a strong section

**Gaps and weaknesses to address**

Lack of detail on criteria needs to be addressed but the major weakness is the absence of evidence from staff that the system is working as intended/delivering fairly. Workshops or focus groups with staff with recent experience of promotion and with the more senior staff who support candidates and 'run' the system are easy ways to obtain evidence and to identify individuals to drive any changes that may be decided upon.

### 3 Early Career Development, PhD Students, Post Docs and Early Career Staff (ECRs)

The support and encouragement that is provided for female post graduate students and ECRs to enable them to make informed decisions on the transition to researcher and/or the transition into a sustainable academic career, and or other career of choice.

<b>In Place</b>	<b>Observations/Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
3.1. Support for PhD students	<p><i>Refs identified to</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PhD students have second supervisors.</li> <li>• For PhD students there is institutional guidance and regulations for supervisor/student relations.</li> <li>• If a PhD student asks for a change of supervisor, this will be arranged as soon as possible as we are keen for staff and students to succeed. This happens most exceptionally.</li> </ul> <p><i>Are they encouraged to participate in professional society activities, offered skills training, mentoring and or networking opportunities, encouraged to publish, attend professional conferences?</i></p>	2
3.2. Support for post docs	<p><i>Refs identified to</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New post-docs are allocated a "buddy" which enables them to get to meet others in the department.</li> <li>• Career guidance is given either by the PI, or Staff Development Reviewer during the appraisal, or else by an independent Mentor, and career guidance is also available through the university's Centre for Staff Training and Development.</li> <li>• Department has a mechanism to encourage researchers to become involved in different activities which will broaden their careers and are asked to complete a research staff development prompter form). This is discussed during the appraisal process and staff are encouraged to contribute widely to the departmental activities.</li> <li>• Opportunities to teach or supervise students are readily taken up by post-docs and there are a number of outreach or Knowledge Exchange opportunities available to staff who seek to become involved in this.</li> <li>• Post docs are encouraged to join the department research staff forum where issues career development is discussed. Presentations to the forum enable them to understand where they can get support for particular areas, e.g. applying for fellowships.</li> <li>• Post docs have access to the university mentoring scheme.</li> </ul> <p><i>It would be useful to indicate uptake F/M of above and if not currently monitored to include in action plan.</i></p> <p><i>Useful to indicate feedback from post docs on value of provision/or hold discussion group to establish.</i></p>	5
3.3. Support for new lecturers	<p><i>Refs identified to</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Newly appointed academics receive a reduced load in the first two years of appointment in line with University policy. The balance of teaching and research is monitored in the workload allocation model</li> <li>• Staff on probation have mentors and probationary supervisors who are different from their line managers and not Head of their group.</li> </ul> <p><i>Indicate whether any of provisions for post docs are available for newly appointed lecturers.</i></p> <p><i>Consider support e.g. for grant application writing and publication.</i></p> <p><i>Are start-up packages provided?</i></p> <p><i>Consider discussion group with recently appointed staff to get their perceptions/suggestions on improvements.</i></p>	2
Score		9

<b>Metrics</b>		<b>Score</b>
PhD students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are PhD student provided with: Mentoring? Seminars? Pastoral support?</li> <li>- Do PhD students have the right to request a female personal tutor?</li> </ul>	
Post docs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are F/M post doc staff views checked on: Provision/quality/availability of career support? Developmental activities? Opportunities to participate in national conferences? International conferences?</li> <li>Is there a member of department staff with specific responsibility for ECRs/their development/career opportunities?</li> </ul>	
New lecturers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduced teaching load initially.</li> <li>- Support/training in writing grant applications and publications.</li> <li>- Set up grants are provided.</li> <li>- Mentoring.</li> <li>- Mentoring outside the probationary mentoring arrangements.</li> </ul>	
F/M experience/perceptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are F/M perceptions checked/monitored on the availability of unbiased careers advice?</li> </ul>	
F/M Training uptake, experience/ perception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is ECR take up of monitored for training on: Research grant applications? Research team leadership? People management and supervisory skills? Communication skills?</li> <li>If 'yes' indicate F/M (N= &amp; %) take up and (if known) F/M satisfaction rates</li> </ul>	
Informed choices/destination on leaving-	Is there any F/M monitoring of exit destinations of post docs?	
<i>Score</i>		<b>0</b>

**Overall score: 9**

**Overall Rating: Fair**

**Strengths to build on:**

The support for post docs.

**Gaps and weaknesses to address**

The absence of equally compelling evidence on PhD students and recently appointed lecturers. It may be that in reality they all benefit from what is available. It might be that a network that embraces the group as a whole might be useful. Also identifying a member of staff with specific responsibilities for ECRs might be for the action plan - plus the support and budget needed to sustain an effective programme.

## 4 Appraisal

Arrangements that ensure appraisal is effective, well regarded and appropriate for the different levels of staff, that appraisal covers all contributions (including women and science activities) and promotion criteria, and that appraisal take ups/satisfaction levels and outcomes are monitored and reported.

<b>In Place</b>	<b>Observations/Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
4.1. Appraisal arrangements	<p><i>Refs identified to</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All staff are appraised annually except in particular circumstances, which would be reported to and agreed by the HOD.</li> <li>Annual appraisals take place a few months before the promotion round. Career strategy and potential for promotion are discussed.</li> <li>Development needs are noted and returned to the Staff Development Office; all training events are ranked for usefulness at the subsequent appraisal.</li> <li>For most staff their reviewer will be their head of research group, but staff can request an alternative reviewer if they wish.</li> <li>Training is given for all appraisers.</li> <li>Participation is monitored and reported to management team. There was 100% participation last year (the first year of the current HoD's tenure).</li> <li>The HoD sees all appraisal documentation once it is signed off by the reviewer and reviewee, but there is no systematic review.</li> </ul> <p><i>Consider training for appraisers and checking staff experiences/perceptions.</i></p>	5
4.2. Covers promotion	<p><i>Refs identified to</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The annual review process for all academic staff is the main way in which candidates for promotion are selected, and there is provision for self-nomination.</li> <li>Annual reviewers will proactively suggest that anyone who appears to meet the promotion criteria is put forward for promotion.</li> <li>Part of the review process is also to suggest how someone can best work towards meeting the promotion criteria.</li> <li>Candidates have the opportunity to discuss activities etc. needed for promotion with the HOD or through the appraisal process. Appropriate action is taken although extensive checks are not done to ensure that this happens.</li> </ul> <p><i>Consider survey covering the perceptions of appraisers and appraisees including post docs.</i></p>	4
4.3. Covers contributions	<p><i>Refs identified to</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An individual's performance in teaching, research (and other aspects of their job such as administration or knowledge exchange) are appraised during annual review</li> </ul> <p><i>Make clear whether appraisal specifically covers women and science, external professional contributions.</i></p> <p><i>Might be useful to clarify perceptions of appraisers/appraisees on the reality.</i></p>	3
<b>Score</b>		<b>12</b>

<b>Metrics</b>		<b>Score</b>
Appraisal arrangements	Is regular appraisal required/compulsory: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For academic staff?</li> <li>- For post docs?</li> <li>- Are appraisers trained?</li> <li>- Are appraisees trained?</li> <li>- Are F/M views on usefulness of training monitored?</li> <li>- Are different arrangements/systems/forms of appraisal in place for post docs?</li> </ul>	
Covers promotion	Is promotion/promotion readiness explicitly covered?	
Covers contributions	Are the following 'contributions' covered at appraisal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teaching?</li> <li>- Research?</li> <li>- Administration?</li> <li>- Pastoral?</li> <li>- Outreach?</li> <li>- Contribution to women in science?</li> </ul>	
Appraisal take up	- Is F/M take up (by grade) monitored?	
Follow up systems	- Is there a system for following through on training needs?	
F/M experiences/perceptions check/monitor/report/acted on	Are F/M perceptions of usefulness of appraisal checked: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- With appraisers?</li> <li>- With appraisees?</li> </ul>	
<i>Score</i>		<b>0</b>

**Overall score: 12                      Overall Rating: Good**

**Strengths to build on:**

Generally strong and examples of what is done are provided.

**Gaps and weaknesses to address:**

The lack of evidence that the system is well regarded/seen as useful by both appraisers and appraisees.

## 5 Career Development Activities

The support and encouragement provided for women's participation in programmes/activities (departmental, university and external) that contribute to their career/professional/personal development, and raise their profile

In Place	Observations/Comments	Score
5.1. Mentoring	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentoring is listed as an explicit item in the requirements of senior staff and for promotion.</li> <li>• There is an university mentoring scheme focused on ECR and mid-career staff. More experienced staff are able to access advice/support from other departmental staff.</li> <li>• A department mentoring programme provides a number of senior female role models.</li> </ul> <p><i>Lacks supporting information on e.g. take up, number of senior staff who act as mentors and perceptions of mentors and mentees on utility of provision. Would be useful to describe who in department is responsible for mentoring and what is done to support and encourage mentoring.</i></p>	2
5.2. Networking and role models	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Networking is encouraged. The department has dedicated travel funds each year to which all academics have access to.</li> <li>• One group requires Networking for accreditation purposes.</li> <li>• Emails are circulated about the University's Women's Network.</li> <li>• Women are prominent at Open Days (for potential undergraduates and potential graduate students) and as lecturers to large first and second year undergraduate audiences. The department also is keen to invite eminent women to give seminars and colloquium talks.</li> <li>• Academics use their personal contacts strongly for the department's benefit particularly visitors and seminar speakers.</li> </ul> <p><i>Some individual examples would be useful, and give some specifics on 'encouragement' at department/faculty/university/professional society levels. Would be useful to indicate who in the department drives this activity.</i></p>	4
5.3. Developmental activities internal and external	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Head of department encourages training for staff by sending out an email asking all line managers to allow time off for staff to attend training.</li> <li>• The department has an annual budget for training needs.</li> <li>• Heads of Sections are sent an annual return of all staff training that has happened over the course of the year.</li> <li>• Feedback from recent Athena Swan activities showed that transferable skills courses are useful.</li> <li>• The department does not monitor individual's take up on university provided courses.</li> <li>• Staff are actively encouraged to take up roles outside the department to increase their profile. This is often done through appraisal.</li> </ul> <p><i>Does annual return provide F/M breakdown? It would be useful to obtain staff views on their experience/perception of the training the university provides. Identify who in department takes the lead on this.</i></p>	4
Score		11

<b>Metrics</b>		<b>Score</b>
Mentoring	Is training provided for: - Mentors? - Mentees? - Are staff supported/encouraged to participate in mentoring scheme? - Is the uptake of mentoring monitored? - Is participation as mentors monitored?	
Networking and role models	- Are staff encouraged to act as role models? - Are role model activities showcased? - Are staff supported and encouraged to contribute to department/ university/ regional/professional society/special interest networks?	
Developmental activities internal and external	- Are staff encouraged to participate in training and development provided by university and/or to participate in professional society activities?	
Participation in internal developmental activities monitored	Does department monitor: - University provided staff training? F/M uptake? Its usefulness? - Management training - Uptake? Usefulness? - Project planning and financial management skills development? Uptake? Usefulness? - Research team leadership, supervisory and people management skills uptake? Usefulness? - Grant application skills? Uptake? Usefulness? - Professional training and development? Uptake? Usefulness? - Training for mentors? Mentees? Uptake? Usefulness?	
F/M perceptions/ experiences of internal role model activities	Does department monitor F/M staff perceptions on the value/usefulness of: - Mentoring? - Networking activities? - Role model activities?	
F/M perceptions/ experiences/take up of external activities	- Does department monitor F/M staff perceptions on the value/usefulness of participation in professional societies/their activities mentoring?	
<b>Score</b>		<b>0</b>

**Overall score: 11**

**Overall Rating: Good**

**Strengths to build on:**

Networking and development activities.

**Gaps and weaknesses to address:**

The absence of information on mentoring at department level – if it's organised at university/faculty level then focus on the number/proportion of F/M senior staff who act as mentors internally and externally and same for mentees. The department may wish to consider the benefits for the department (of all the above activities) as a whole (in addition to the benefits for individuals).

## 6 Organisation and Management

The organisational systems/structures that ensure the fairness, openness, and clearness of department management arrangements (accountability, reporting, communications, resource allocation, including office and laboratory space, research technical support and access to equipment funding and studentships), systems to identify/nominate/select/elect members/chairs and into management roles

<i>In Place</i>	<i>Observations/Comments</i>	<i>Score</i>
6.1. Accountabilities, reporting, communications	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The department has a web based information 'Staff Handbook' and New Staff Induction wiki which is regularly updated.</li> <li>New staff meet administrative staff and line managers to discuss their new role, and where they will be working. Staff also register for the University induction and university research staff induction. HoDs receive information on the take-up at the university level. There is also a regular Health and Safety and HR induction which is carried out for new staff once a month, in the faculty. Feedback suggests that some aspects of this are more useful than others.</li> <li>Department management responsibilities are circulated annually to all staff indicating in any change. Management positions have job descriptions allowing new staff to understand the responsibilities of these positions.</li> <li>A recent university staff survey showed communication is poor in the department, in particular between groups. Efforts are being made to understand why this is the case and what can be done to improve this.</li> <li>There is no systematic communication to the post docs.</li> <li>The department has no staff common room, or social space, which hinders this.</li> </ul> <p><i>Information on departmental organisation is available but communication (a two way process) is poor.</i></p> <p><i>Useful to unpick the statement that efforts are being made. Provide detail on who is doing what and when and what worked and what didn't.</i></p> <p><i>May be useful to have department discussion groups to identify staff perceptions and obtain suggestions for improvements.</i></p>	3
6.2. Resources and Funding allocations	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial information is distributed but could be improved.</li> <li>Departmental resources are allocated by the faculty and managed internally by the Finance officer.</li> <li>The financial running of the department is well perceived but it is unclear that the level of understanding is robust.</li> <li>There is a clear procedure for allocating travel expenditure to research groups (for staff travel, and for visitors).</li> <li>Generally the allocation of space/labs is seen as fair, although the department is constrained by being spread over four separate sites.</li> <li>Office space is occasionally an issue because the department has a variety of spaces and they are not reallocated annually.</li> </ul> <p><i>Consider discussion group with staff new to department in say the last three years to get feedback and suggestions.</i></p>	4
6.3. Representative Management	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The representation on each committee is considered by a gender-balanced group, led by the HOD, who made a positive decision to include early career people on committees. The aim is to optimise the potential to influence decision making, personal career development and succession planning within the department.</li> <li>Management roles are rotated where they are not tied to a particular role (e.g. HOD which are permanent appointments so cannot be rotated). Succession planning, is a major area of concern so the opportunity for rotation is limited. Also the allocation of these roles owes more to the need for the department to have someone in place than the needs of the individual, gender balance, etc.</li> <li>Each member of academic &amp; postdoctoral staff belongs to a group which has representation through the department committee structure.</li> </ul> <p><i>Provide information of F/M representation on department committees and in management roles.</i></p> <p><i>Information is needed on whether committee terms of reference /minutes/ papers are available to staff.</i></p> <p><i>Do senior women from the department serve on university committees?</i></p>	2
<i>Score</i>		9

<b>Metrics</b>		<b>Score</b>
Accountabilities, reporting, communications	Departmental systems: - Who does what/how things are done covered in in a departmental induction? - Are minutes of management team/committee accessible by staff?	
Resources and Funding allocations	Does induction cover the department's: - Resource allocation system? - And funding arrangements? - And procedures?	
Representative Management	Department monitors: - F/M representation on department committees. - F/M representation in positions of responsibility. - Its nominations to faculty and university committees. - And measures their results against other STEMM departments.	
F/M understanding department organisation/systems	- Does department's staff induction cover its management systems/reporting arrangements? And where to go for what? - Who does what? Who is responsible for what? How it is funded? Department monitors F/M views on: - Their communications. - Their accountability and reporting arrangements.	
F/M feedback/perceptions of resource allocation	- Department monitors F/M views/understanding of their allocation of resources. How it is funded?	
6F/M feedback/ perceptions of management arrangements	Department monitors F/M views on: - The rotation of appointments to management roles/terms of office. - Their communications. - Their accountability and reporting arrangements. - Their allocation of resources. - The rotation of appointments to management roles/terms of office.	
<i>Score</i>		<b>0</b>

**Overall score: 9**

**Overall Rating: Fair**

**Strengths to build on:**

General appearance of an organised department with strong admin systems and processes.

**Gaps and weaknesses to address**

The problem of communication is one to be unwrapped carefully. Holding discussion groups with staff of all levels may identify issues of which senior management may not be aware.

## 7 Workload Allocation

The systems/arrangements to ensure that: workload allocation is fair, transparent, effective and appropriate, they cover all contributions and responsibilities (pastoral and administrative responsibilities, work on women and science) as well as teaching and research, that workload is taken into account in appraisal and promotion, there is a balance between responsibilities with a heavy workload with those that are good for individuals' career and responsibilities are rotated.

<b><i>In Place</i></b>	<b><i>Observations/Comments</i></b>	<b><i>Score</i></b>
7.1. Workload allocation system	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the most part members of the department seem to trust the internal procedure although there are some concerns mainly on the involvement of the university.</li> <li>The Department has a well-trying workload model which is flexible enough to account for the activities of the range of staff from ECRs to the most senior.</li> </ul> <p><i>Is the workload model covered at induction?</i>  <i>How is information from the model used /shared at group level and with staff?</i>  <i>Is information from model used to inform appraisal discussion?</i></p>	2
7.2. Balancing workload	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teaching committee monitors and documents the teaching workloads of academics annually; the documents are presented to the committee and are accessible to all members of staff.</li> <li>The procedure to select staff members for teaching responsibilities is based on several aspects including their current departmental teaching, their administrative/committee load and their University committees/administrative loads.</li> <li>There is a lack of complete transparency but within groups there is a balance.</li> <li>Probationary lecturers have a lower teaching load and minimal admin.</li> <li>Post docs who want to gain teaching experience are given the opportunity for this but is rarely taken.</li> </ul> <p><i>Are family/caring responsibilities taken into account?</i>  <i>Are changes to allocations discussed in advance with individuals? What action is taken if gets out of balance? What account is taken of change of circumstances?</i></p>	3
7.3. Inclusive system	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul> <p><i>Provide information on whether e.g. outreach, pastoral and women in science, professional activities and activities are included in the workload model in use.</i></p>	0
<b><i>Score</i></b>		<b>5</b>

<b><i>Metrics</i></b>		<b><i>Score</i></b>
Workload allocation system	- Is the departmental workload allocation system covered at induction?	
Balancing workload	- Department monitors workload to check balance. - Are the outcomes of monitoring available to staff? - Are management roles rotated regularly?	
Inclusive system	- Does the workload allocation system cover teaching, administration and management?	
F/M understanding of system	- Are staff F/M perceptions/understanding of department systems checked- for allocating workload?	
F/M experience/ perceptions fairness and openness –	- Are staff F/M perceptions of department systems, its fairness/openness checked- for allocating workload?	
F/M experiences/ perceptions on careers and workload	- Are staff F/M perceptions of the impact of workload on career development success monitored?	
<b><i>Score</i></b>		<b>0</b>

**Overall score: 5**

**Overall Rating: Weak**

### Strengths to build on:

An established system.

### Gaps and weaknesses to address

The system needs to be made fully transparent/accessible to all, use metrics as the 'agenda' for the SWAN committee then follow through with a focus group on any suggested changes.

## 8 Workplace Culture

The systems/arrangements to ensure high standards of behaviour, and that staff and students, are treated with respect, their contributions are recognised and staff feel they belong / are included in department life academic and social and a working environment that is welcoming friendly, inclusive, supportive and open

<b>In Place</b>	<b>Observations/Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
8.1. Standards of behaviour	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-operative working within academic groups is good and is not competitive.</li> <li>• There is significant respect for high standards of behaviour.</li> <li>• There has never been a problem in this department with poor or intimidating behaviour. This is checked by university staff surveys</li> </ul> <p><i>Lacks detail.</i></p> <p><i>Is there a F/M breakdown of survey results? Are the data provided at department level and if so how are they used?</i></p> <p><i>Are standards and expectations covered in induction?</i></p> <p><i>What training is provided for staff? How many take it up and how useful is it?</i></p>	1
8.2. Contributions recognised	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual staff satisfaction survey provides feedback and is used as a management tool.</li> <li>• External commitments of value to the department, including value realised through increased esteem for the individual, are recognised and treated as part of the workload allocation - as the model will be public a there will be ample opportunity for all staff to ensure that their activities have been noted.</li> <li>• Teaching is recognised in the annual appraisals and/or promotions round. Teaching excellence may be recognised at institutional level by the award of a teaching prize,</li> <li>• Public celebration of achievement also occurs, with congratulatory emails being sent around the department when someone is awarded a grant, wins a prize, teaching award etc.</li> <li>• Rewards can come from prizes (even just being nominated for a prize), promotions, lighter teaching/admin loads.</li> <li>• The department has been active - in 2008, the School had no Fellows of the (appropriate professional institution), it now has 6 Fellows and ECRs have been encouraged to become involved in activities of the professional institutions.</li> <li>• All staff are encouraged to pursue recognition and are helped with applications/nominations. Female staff have been particularly successful, with every female academic staff member nominated for an award within the last 12 months.</li> </ul>	5
8.3. Inclusivity	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A recent survey indicates that the majority of staff, both female and male agree that the Department is a “great” place to work.</li> <li>• Department believes itself to have an open and friendly environment, and that this is the result of the efforts of all staff members. However this is not formally monitored.</li> <li>• The Management Team works hard to ensure a friendly atmosphere by ensuring there are good communications between management, staff and students. For example, the department holds regular Staff Meetings and Student Staff Liaison Meetings in addition to operating Facebook and Twitter accounts.</li> <li>• Department has a Tea Club and Social Area which are open to students and staff, allowing free mixing between staff, postgraduates and undergraduates.</li> <li>• The Department has an ‘open door policy’ and all academic staff attend regular Departmental Board meetings.</li> </ul> <p><i>Would be useful to describe systems in place to make sure the department’s expectations are met in all groups/units and at all staff levels?</i></p>	4
<b>Score</b>		<b>10</b>

<b>Metrics</b>		<b>Score</b>
Standards of behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Department standards of behaviour are covered at induction.</li> <li>- Induction covers what individuals should do if they have concerns about the behaviour of others/the way they are treated.</li> </ul>	
Contributions recognised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Department arrangements/systems ensure staff contributions are recognised.</li> <li>- Do systems cover teaching? Research? Administration? Other internal and external /contributions/successes?</li> </ul>	
Inclusivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Department ensures its sections and research groups and include all staff in their academic and research organisation/activities.</li> <li>- And in their social activities.</li> </ul>	
F/M experience/perception of environment	Department checks staff F/M perceptions of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Their working environment.</li> <li>- Its provision of social space.</li> <li>- Opportunities for socialising.</li> </ul>	
F/M experience/perceptions of Collegiality/support-	Department checks staff F/M perceptions on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Accessibility of senior colleagues/staff.</li> <li>- Their Inclusion in the academic life of the department.</li> </ul> Department checks supportiveness of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Line manager/P.</li> <li>- Senior department staff.</li> <li>- Colleagues/ members of their research group/section.</li> </ul>	
F/M experience/perceptions of value of individual contributions	Department checks staff F/M perceptions of how the department recognises values all their contributions to the department: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teaching.</li> <li>- Research.</li> <li>- Administration.</li> <li>- Other internal.</li> <li>- External contributions/successes.</li> </ul>	
<i>Score</i>		<b>0</b>

**Overall score: 10**

**Overall Rating: Good**

**Strengths to build on:**

Recognition of contributions.

**Gaps and weaknesses to address**

SWAN committee to unpick the statement that the department is 'a great place to work' (metrics maybe useful) and share their findings with staff at various levels.

## 9 Flexibility

The action to ensure that flexible working policies, practices and guidance (on, e.g. core time, the timing of meetings/events, teaching timetabling and managing flexible working) are effective, that department and group/section heads are aware of individual's needs for flexible working, that flexibility is available to all academic staff (including post docs) and that its take up is encouraged and monitored.

<b>In Place</b>	<b>Observations/Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
9.1. Awareness of needs, managing flexibility and long hours working	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The department creates and supports a healthy and efficient working environment, with a caring and rehabilitative approach towards sickness absence management. To this end the department seeks to be supportive and flexible in assisting staff who need time away from work and in supporting their rehabilitation back to work.</li> <li>• Department policy is that those who work part-time should be able to develop their career in parallel with their full-time colleagues. The department aims to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ afford and extend opportunities for part-time working.</li> <li>○ help all employees who want part-time work find it at an appropriate level.</li> <li>○ help retain staff and skills and help prevent loss of investment in experience.</li> <li>○ demonstrate a commitment to long-term career development.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There are a number of role models - staff who have had career breaks.</li> <li>• The department is setting up a website with case studies to show people what is possible / works.</li> <li>• The department has a Parents' Networking Lunch once a month with social activities organised for families.</li> </ul> <p><i>Some practical examples to demonstrate department caring approach would be useful, as would examples of feedback based on staff perceptions/experiences.</i></p>	4
9.2. Timing of meetings events and teaching timetabling	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The department operated SharePoint and department calendar which all have access to. This help with scheduling and ensuring inclusiveness</li> <li>• All meetings are timetabled within core working hours. Many staff travel from long distances and it is unusual for meetings to start before 10.30 a.m.</li> <li>• Dates for departmental meetings are arranged well in advance. Other meetings arranged at shorter notice are often held by a system called which enables staff to join in remotely via the web.</li> <li>• The department administrator contacts all staff at the start of the academic year to request details of flexibility required in terms of timetabling teaching and other activities. Both female and male staff with personal and family circumstances take advantage of these arrangements</li> </ul> <p><i>Would be useful to confirm that this happens across groups. Staff perceptions/experiences would provide useful evidence.</i></p>	3
9.3. Uptake of flexibility/family friendly practices	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The department makes it easy for individuals to request flexible working. Where possible academics are expected to provide reasonable notice so that alternative arrangements can be made.</li> <li>• Many senior members do lead by example. The HoD took full paternity leave and has to make arrangements to fit in with childcare.</li> <li>• It is known that a woman professor works part-time and needs to arrange meetings around childcare arrangements.</li> <li>• The department does discourage long hour's culture/presenteeism, with the HOD leading by example. Senior staff are generally discouraged from sending emails in the evenings and at weekends. However, workloads are high.</li> </ul> <p><i>Can contract hours be changed on flexible basis if the need arises? Is uptake consistent across groups and does flexibility extend to post docs? Is uptake consistent across the school? How is uptake monitored? Does the department obtain staff perceptions on the utility of what is available?</i></p>	3
<b>Score</b>		<b>10</b>

<b>Metrics</b>		<b>Score</b>
Awareness of needs, managing flexibility and long hours working	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Department actively discourages long hours working.</li> <li>- Has action been taken to prevent in the last 3 years?</li> <li>- Department has a member of staff trained/experienced in managing flexibility.</li> </ul>	
Timing of meetings events and teaching timetabling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Department main meetings in core time.</li> <li>- Group/section main meetings in core time.</li> <li>- Department aware of which staff require flexibility in teaching timetables.</li> </ul>	
Uptake of flexibility/family friendly practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Department monitors F/M take up of flexibility.</li> <li>- Department monitors requests and approvals of formal flexible working arrangements.</li> <li>- Department monitors uptake of paternity and adoption leave.</li> <li>- Department monitors F/M uptake of carer/dependent leave.</li> </ul>	
F/M experiences/ perceptions of management approach and long hours culture-	<p>Are F/M staff perceptions checked on whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Long hours are discouraged?</li> <li>- Senior staff set an example by making use of flexible working?</li> <li>- Department would support individuals with long-term caring responsibilities?</li> </ul>	
F/M experiences/ perceptions of timing	<p>Are F/M staff perceptions checked on whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meetings are held in core time department?</li> <li>- Timetabling flexibility is available if needed?</li> </ul>	
F/M experiences/ perceptions of uptake of flexibility and availability by grade	<p>Are F/M staff perceptions checked on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Availability of flexibility?</li> <li>- Uptake of flexibility?</li> <li>- Whether senior staff set an example by making use of flexible working?</li> </ul>	
<i>Score</i>		0

**Overall score: 10**

**Overall Rating: Good**

**Strengths to build on:**

Department seems to be well organised have the necessary systems.

**Gaps and weaknesses to address:**

Absence of evidence that department has checked with its staff that things work as intended.

## 10 Career Breaks and Returning

The action taken to ensure that: managers and individuals are aware of what support/facilities are available, that individuals can receive practical advice and information, returners' career needs (the flexibility, practical provisions, personal support, mentoring, training and development opportunities which facilitate a smooth return and getting a career back on track) are recognised and provisions are in place to meet those needs.

<b>In Place</b>	<b>Observations/Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
10.1. Awareness of support and facilities available	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff taking career breaks are given full choice to decide how a career break should be taken. They meet the HOD before and after the break to decide how to work.</li> <li>The university has recently produced a good practice document on maternity returners. Each case is dealt with on an individual basis and all appropriate and realistic allowances are made</li> </ul> <p><i>Is there anyone in the department to whom individuals and managers can go for advice?</i></p> <p><i>How do staff know where to for advice information? Is it covered at induction?</i></p> <p><i>Is support available for staff on long-term absence for other reasons?</i></p> <p><i>Is the support available to all staff (including post docs)?</i></p>	2
10.2. Practicalities before, during, at the end/after a break	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on flexibility after returning is discussed before individuals take a career break. Agreements on work patterns are always discussed before the return.</li> <li>The department receives a budget for cover from the University and uses this to arrange for cover from sessional lecturers either during the maternity leave or for the period just after maternity leave. This would be discussed before the staff leaves.</li> <li>Arrangements for cover for supervision and research management is arranged internally, by other colleagues in advance, and sometimes formal cover is used to relieve these staff members of teaching responsibilities to recognise the additional workload staff covering can be rewarded by lump sum payments.</li> <li>During leave period line manager and the individual are encouraged to keep in reasonable contact with each other. The frequency/mode of communication is agreed between the parties before the leave starts to the commencement of the leave. If the member of staff wishes to be kept updated on certain matters or developments whilst on leave, this again is agreed.</li> <li>Returning staff are encouraged to meet up before their return to discuss this with their line managers as well as the Head of Department. They are invited to take on a mentor and to participate in the School's Parents lunches held once a month. Other staff are made aware of returners.</li> </ul> <p><i>Consider discussion group of staff who have benefitted for suggestions on how to improve and their experiences.</i></p> <p><i>No information on university child care facilities and/or department facilities for mothers and their take up.</i></p>	4
10.3. Returning to career track	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Department operates a phased return to work which is to rehabilitate the member of staff to their full duties and gradually build back up to undertaking their normal working hours within the earliest agreed timescale.</li> <li>During the phased return the Head will meet the member of staff weekly, to assess progress and identify any problems and to discuss future career progression.</li> <li>Department allocates a period equivalent to a term for academic staff to have a reduced workload to encourage them to get back up to speed with their research after the career break.</li> </ul> <p><i>Are individuals able to move from part-time to full-time contracts after return (as a right/normally agreed)?</i></p> <p><i>Again feedback from individuals and their line managers would provide useful evidence</i></p> <p><i>Is there any long-term monitoring of returners career progression?</i></p>	3
<b>Score</b>		<b>9</b>

<b>Metrics</b>		<b>Score</b>
Awareness of support and facilities available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HOD/heads of sections/groups aware of what can be/is provided at university, faculty and department levels.</li> <li>- Does this extend to other unplanned career breaks?</li> <li>- Department staff have access to practical information/guidance on career breaks and returning.</li> <li>- Department monitors staff taking advantage of university scheme to fund cover for leave.</li> </ul>	
Practicalities before, during and at the end of a break	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Department/its groups/sections will, if requested, make the necessary cover arrangements for teaching. Administration/management role. Research.</li> <li>- Department ensures that if staff wish it, they are kept informed of departmental changes, important news.</li> <li>- Department has/makes the necessary facilities available for mothers returning.</li> </ul>	
Returning to the career track	<p>Returners have some 'relief' from their:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teaching.</li> <li>- Administration/management functions.</li> <li>- Flexibility in hours worked on their return.</li> <li>- Can return part time and have the right to move back to full time.</li> <li>- Have career development meetings with line manager shortly after their return.</li> <li>- And meetings some months into their return.</li> </ul>	
F/M experiences/ perception of support, information and facilities-	<p>Department checks F/M perceptions of the support it provides for individuals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Before a career break.</li> <li>- Before taking paternity leave.</li> <li>- Before taking adoption leave.</li> </ul>	
F/M experience/ perception of being on a break-check/monitor/report/act	<p>Department checks F/M staff perceptions of department communication/keeping in touch:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- While they were on a career break?</li> <li>- At the end of the break/when planning their return?</li> </ul>	
F/M experiences/ perception of returning check/monitor/report/act	<p>Department checks F/M staff perceptions of support on return concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Flexibility available.</li> <li>- Facilities available.</li> <li>- The arrangements made to ensure they got their career back on track.</li> <li>- The training and development opportunities they received.</li> <li>- The department monitors the career progression and promotion of staff who have had career breaks.</li> </ul>	
<b>Score</b>		<b>9</b>

**Overall score: 9**

**Overall Rating: Fair**

**Strengths to build on:**

Again systems in place /well organised.

**Gaps and weaknesses to address**

Absence of evidence/feedback on experiences and perceptions.

## 11 Organisation for Action

The well-established and robust management and organisational framework that supports and delivers equality of opportunity and rewards: the leadership of senior managers who are actively engaged, the awareness of staff in general, clarity on accountabilities, the adequacy of the resources available.

<b>In Place</b>	<b>Observations/Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
11.1. Leadership Engagement and awareness	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The department has an Athena SWAN committee which includes staff from all groups. The HOD chairs the committee.</li> <li>• The HOD and management team have attended events, seminars related to good practice. They discuss and implement actions to promote women in the department and will have individual assessment groups to review its action plan and new initiatives.</li> <li>• The newish committee is trying to make other members of the department aware of the issues. Information on programmes and activities are disseminated by email, Twitter, Facebook pages and posters. Personal involvement varies among senior staff.</li> <li>• Athena Swan is now an agenda item in department Board meetings which is attended by all academic staff.</li> </ul> <p><i>Not clear whether all levels includes students and whether post docs attend department board meetings.</i></p> <p><i>Useful to indicate when SWAN committee was established, how frequently it meets, F/M representation on committee.</i></p> <p><i>Is information on the committee on department web site?</i></p> <p><i>Indicate role of committee in e.g. consultation on the department SWAN action plan.</i></p> <p><i>Indicate how it is bringing action plan content together e.g. discussion groups, surveys of staff and raising awareness.</i></p> <p><i>Provide examples of changes they have already made.</i></p>	2
11.2. Accountabilities	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All responsibilities for women and science are formally identified and are usually counted in workload models, though still on an <i>ad hoc</i> basis.</li> <li>• Time is made available for staff to carry out women and science activities.</li> </ul> <p><i>Useful to indicate reporting lines for action on women and science.</i></p> <p><i>Indicate F/M breakdown of staff with substantial SWAN responsibilities.</i></p> <p><i>Useful to indicate the split of SWAN responsibilities between senior Academics, ECRs and administrators.</i></p>	2
11.3. Resources	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Money is provided, as necessary, by the HOD.</li> <li>• There is help from the University and the faculty for the Athena SWAN application.</li> </ul> <p><i>Indicate what administrative support time is allocated in support of academics with substantial SWAN responsibilities and in support of the SWAN action plan.</i></p> <p><i>Indicate any resources provided for activities programmes for ECRs career progression, or other important part of department's activity/SWAN action plan.</i></p> <p><i>Give examples of the practical help received from the university/faculty in support of SWAN at department level.</i></p>	2
<b>Score</b>		<b>6</b>

<b>Metrics</b>		<b>Score</b>
Leadership and engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Senior F &amp; M staff on SWAN committee.</li> <li>- M &amp; F post docs on SWAN committee.</li> <li>- M &amp; F PhD students on SWAN committee.</li> <li>- HoD is a member of SWAN committee.</li> <li>- Gender balance of staff of SWAN committee reflect department's staff gender balance.</li> <li>- SWAN committee well-established.</li> <li>- SWAN committee is part of the department's established committee structure.</li> <li>- At least 3 SWAN committee meetings held a year.</li> </ul>	
Accountabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SWAN responsibilities covered in appraisal.</li> <li>- Senior academics have specific SWAN responsibilities for action.</li> </ul>	
Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SWAN committee has a budget.</li> <li>- Time spent on SWAN activities included in workload assessment.</li> <li>- SWAN activities are fully resourced.</li> </ul>	
F/M feedback perceptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Academic staff aware of SWAN programmes/activities at department level.</li> <li>- Post docs aware of SWAN programmes/activities at department level.</li> <li>- Students aware of SWAN programmes/activities at department level.</li> <li>- Positive F/M feedback obtained on value of SWAN activities at individual level and department level.</li> </ul>	
<i>Score</i>		9

**Overall score: 6**

**Overall Rating: Weak**

**Strengths to build on:**

Work in progress the structure is there

**Gaps and weaknesses to address**

Lacks information on what is happening on the ground – the sort of changes (in terms of the working environment and department systems) that 'ordinary' staff would actually notice/be aware of/feel the benefit of.

## 12 Evidence for Action

The systems and arrangements for the collection, availability, communication and use of quantitative and qualitative data as the basis for planning and taking action, for monitoring progress and measuring success.

<b>In Place</b>	<b>Observations/Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
12.1. Staff data	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data are monitored regularly and reported back to the SWAN committee. Data are not as yet available to staff.</li> <li>• Changes against national data are not yet reported on but next year, the data may be compared to see if there is progress against national benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><i>Useful to indicate action taken to ensure that department has the information it needs for SWAN applications now/in the future.</i></p> <p><i>Consider use of available data as basis for discussion groups with staff groups to identify their experiences and make improvements.</i></p> <p><i>SWAN action plan should include action to share data with staff/make it available on web and to use the data e.g. in developing a SWAN action plan.</i></p> <p><i>Clarify the use SWAN committee makes of the time series data it has e.g. for comparison with national data.</i></p>	1
12.2. Student data	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently only discussed at SWAN meetings for submission purposes – not reported elsewhere. Results not available widely as a matter of course (but are available on request).</li> <li>• Gender data are considered at department and course level. However these data are not used to measure the representation of women and they are not available on the department web.</li> <li>• A recent exercise has measured the progression of women through degree courses and the findings discussed at departmental meetings. The study concluded that the drop identified in the achievements of female students was not due to procedures in the department.</li> <li>• Have not surveyed students to identify F/M differences/similarities, because all surveys are carried out anonymously and include no personal data.</li> </ul> <p><i>Consider use of the student data that are available as basis for discussion groups with students to identify their perceptions and experiences of the department.</i></p> <p><i>Indicate what future use will be made of student data e.g. to inform action planning.</i></p> <p><i>Would be interesting to have included views reached on what had caused the drop.</i></p>	2
12.3. Qualitative data	<p><i>Refs identified to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results of a recent University staff survey results were broken down into schools and supplied to relevant Heads of Department.</li> <li>• The University used the gender breakdown in its SWAN action plan.</li> <li>• Recent project interviewing women influenced department's action plan.</li> </ul> <p><i>Useful to indicate what use the department has made of this data.</i></p> <p><i>Also to indicate what use will be made of surveys and focus groups in developing the department's award submission and action plan.</i></p>	1
<b>Score</b>		<b>4</b>

<b>Metrics</b>		<b>Score</b>
Staff data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Time series F/M staff data easily available within department.</li> <li>- F/M time series data regularly discussed by senior committee.</li> <li>- Time series F/M staff data available on department website.</li> <li>- Department data routinely compared with national/relevant data.</li> </ul>	
Student data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- F/M student data UG and PG are easily available within department.</li> <li>- F/M data are regularly reported to senior committee.</li> <li>- F/M data are regularly discussed by senior committee.</li> <li>- F/M data are available on website.</li> <li>- Department data are routinely compared with national/relevant data.</li> </ul>	
Qualitative data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use made of external reports from e.g. professional institutions.</li> <li>- A regular staff survey is undertaken.</li> <li>- Data from staff surveys are analysed by gender.</li> <li>- F/M data from surveys are routinely reported to/discussed by senior committee.</li> <li>- Findings from surveys are shared with staff generally.</li> <li>- Staff are aware of changes/improvements that result from survey.</li> </ul>	
<i>Score</i>		0

**Overall score: 4**

**Overall Rating: Weak**

**Strengths to build on:**

None clear.

**Gaps and weaknesses to address**

Identified above. The SWAN committee needs to review the observations and to use the metrics. It then needs to make as much progress as possible before its SWAN submission (and include in its action plan things which it had not been able/had time to progress as far as it would have wished).