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Athena SWAN Silver Department awards recognise that in addition to university-wide policies the department is working to promote gender equality and to address challenges particular to the discipline.

Not all institutions use the term ‘department’ and there are many equivalent academic groupings with different names, sizes and compositions. The definition of a ‘department’ for SWAN purposes can be found on the Athena SWAN website. If in doubt, contact the Athena SWAN Officer well in advance to check eligibility.

It is essential that the contact person for the application is based in the department.

Sections to be included

At the end of each section state the number of words used. Click here for additional guidance on completing the template.
1. **Letter of endorsement from the head of department: maximum 500 words**

I write to enthusiastically endorse our application for a Silver Athena SWAN award from the Department of Psychology at Durham University, where I have been Head of Department since 2004.

Coming from a dual career family, including two daughters shortly to enter the employment market, I am fully alive to issues of gender and the need for all women to be able to achieve their full potential in their careers. I first became aware of Athena SWAN at a Faculty of Science event in 2010 and it was immediately apparent to me that it would be of benefit to our department, scientific endeavour and society.

The Durham Department promotes the scientific method in the teaching and research of psychology. We further recognise that scientific enterprise reflects the values of its practitioners. It is therefore crucial that women are fully represented for the benefit of both science and society. As I hope this application will testify, building a Department which promotes equality and transparency has been a priority throughout the 10 years I have been Head of Department. To achieve a culture and organisation where everyone can contribute and fulfil their potential has been a shared goal, particularly the aim of addressing gender inequalities that thwart it. Mindful of my interest in such matters, the Faculty Pro-Vice Chancellor asked me to serve as Faculty representative on the University Diversity and Equality Advisory Group in 2010 and this I was happy to do. I was equally happy to sit on the Department’s self-assessment team for the current application. While other members of the team have certainly led on this, I was keen to show my support and add value where I could.

As a Department we have consciously prioritised attracting excellent staff near the beginning of their careers and implementing policies and practices which sustain a flexible and supportive approach to work. Over the last 10 years, the gender distribution of academic staff in the department has risen from 33% female to, currently, 50% female. At the same time the Department has climbed more than a dozen positions in national league tables to be firmly in the top 10 of UK Psychology Departments, suggesting clear benefits of seeking talented individuals and nurturing their careers regardless of gender.

The process of data gathering and discussion during preparation of our application has been useful to the department. Perhaps, most importantly, it has garnered considerable support across the Department. This shared interest and concerted action will be invaluable in addressing gender inequalities which will doubtless be of benefit to all. To ensure that no momentum is lost, we have plans in place. Responsibility for actions pertinent to our plan will be taken by appropriate committees across the department, an Athena SWAN Champion has been appointed to oversee these and Athena SWAN will be a standing item in our annual Departmental Plan which sets targets and commitments for the academic year. I am confident of, and greatly look forward to, great success in achieving our goals. *(500 words)*

Charles Heywood.

Head of Department.
2. The self-assessment process:

a) A description of the self-assessment team:

The departmental self-assessment team consisted of:

- Ms Kamar Ameen-Ali: Kam is currently a doctoral student in the department. She has previously completed her undergraduate and masters degrees in the Durham Psychology department and so has broad experience as a student within the department.
- Dr Mike Burt: Mike is a lecturer with one child who currently attends the university nursery. He comes from a dual career family.
- Dr Cristiana Cavina-Pratesi: Christiana is a research fellow with experience in laboratories in European, North American and UK universities. She comes from a dual career family.
- Mrs Janet Cooper: Janet is the departmental administrator. She works flexible hours in order to accommodate caring responsibilities. She has 3 children, now all at university.
- Professor Madeline Eacott: Chair of the self-assessment team. Madeline has two children both now at university and comes from a dual career family.
- Dr Emma Flynn: Emma is a senior lecturer with three school-age children and comes from a dual career family. Her children attended the university nursery.
- Prof Charles Heywood: Charles is Head of the Department of Psychology and the Science Faculty representative on the Diversity and Equality Action Group of Durham University. He has two children both now at university and comes from a dual career family.
- Dr Alison Lane: Alison is currently a lecturer and has previously been an undergraduate, masters and doctoral student in the department and so has experience of each stage in Durham. She comes from a dual career family.
- Mr Simon Lee: Simon is the Diversity Officer at Durham University. He has 2 children and comes from a dual career family.

Each member of the team played a role. Madeline initially convened and chaired the group and wrote the first draft of the application. Janet, Simon and Cristiana all gathered data for the process. Emma facilitated a consultation meeting of staff members while Alison and Kam facilitated a similar meeting of postgraduate students. All members of the group attended meetings, discussing the data as it was gathered, suggested avenues to be explored and actions to be taken and commented on drafts of the application. Charles took the finalised draft application to the Diversity and Equality Action Group of the University for discussion. (367 words)

b) An account of the self-assessment process:

Following the university’s receipt of an Athena SWAN bronze award in 2012, the Head of Department immediately included applying for departmental Athena SWAN recognition in the Departmental Plan of that year. The Departmental Plan is the official planning document, written by the Head of Department annually for discussion with the Faculty ProViceChancellor, setting out the department’s priorities for the coming year. Prof Eacott was invited to lead the process and immediately began to prepare, reading relevant documentation and identifying and speaking to potential members of the self-assessment team (SAT) based on their varied experience of relevant issues and interest. All willingly agreed to join the SAT. The self-assessment team first met formally in October 2012 and held meetings in October, November (twice), December and February. Additional meetings
of subgroups of the SAT to consider specific issues were also held. The SAT first discussed their strategy. It was agreed to gather the initial data required by the application for consideration by the SAT to identify key issues. This data was considered at a meeting in early November. As a result of consideration of these data, the SAT decided to consult more widely on issues we had identified and to discuss whether there were any additional issues not yet identified. Dr Flynn facilitated an open meeting of all academic and research staff while Dr Lane and Ms Ameen-Ali facilitated a meeting of postgraduate students within the department, both with lunch provided to encourage participation. Notes of these meetings were fed into the process (e.g. see Action Points 1 & 2). Professor Eacott also attended an Athena SWAN workshop (Going for Silver, Dec 17th 2012) to further understand the process of preparation and application. Following circulation of the first draft of the application, the SAT met again in February. Once agreed by the SAT, a draft of the application was sent for comment to all members of the department in March and an open meeting of all staff (with lunch provided to encourage participation) was held to discuss it and its implications on our practice. The final draft was also considered by the Diversity and Equality Action Group of Durham University (chaired by the ProVice Chancellor with responsibility for diversity issues) in April. (369 words)

c) Plans for the future of the self-assessment team

It is the belief of the department that this application represents more than a time-limited project, rather the activities and thinking behind them should be mainstreamed into everything the department does. For this reason, each action point from the current action plan will be allocated to the relevant existing departmental committee (e.g. Education subcommittee) or role holder (e.g. seminar organiser) and monitored by our existing departmental procedures for monitoring all key departmental activities (primarily Board of Studies and Departmental Annual Review). Even when the current action points are completed, Athena SWAN activities will remain a standing item at Departmental Annual Review to ensure that relevant data is considered regularly and any emerging issues considered at an early stage. In addition, Athena SWAN activities will be a standing item on the annual Departmental Plan, the official document which sets departmental priorities and targets for the coming year. A new role of Athena SWAN champion (initially Professor Eacott) has been created to take responsibility for coordinating and overseeing the various strands of Athena SWAN activity and reporting to the Head of Department. Nonetheless, working towards gender equality will remain the responsibility of every member of the department in all their activities. The SAT will be reconvened as necessary at a future point for the specific activity of any future application or renewal. (220 words)

[Section 2: total 954 words]
3. A picture of the department:

a) A pen picture of the department

The Department of Psychology is spread over two campuses, Durham City and Queen’s Campus, within a collegiate university. It offers two single-honours undergraduate courses: Psychology at Durham City and Psychology(Applied) at Queens Campus. The department also contributes to a number of joint programmes (e.g. Philosophy & Psychology). The department offers a number of interlinked taught postgraduate courses and postgraduate research degrees. Undergraduate intake is around 145 students p.a., with an intake of approximately 40 Masters students and around 5 new postgraduate research students each year. There are 33 members of university-funded academic staff. Each has an individual office at one campus and access to a shared “hot-office” at the other site. Most staff teach across both sites and there is a free inter-campus bus service for staff and students.

The Head of Department chairs the key decision-making committee of the department, Board of Studies (BoS). Membership of BoS includes all departmental members of teaching staff as well as representatives of the student body at all levels, postdoctoral researchers and support staff. Although BoS is the official decision-making body, many activities are delegated to sub-committees which make recommendations to BoS. Key subcommittees include Research subcommittee (which has representation from the leaders of each research group), UG Education subcommittee, PG Education subcommittee and Resources & IT subcommittee.

Recent departmental policy has been to appoint promising junior staff and therefore there is currently a relatively high proportion of lecturing staff. Nonetheless there are many examples of staff initially appointed at lecturer level who currently have senior roles within the department. For example, of six staff currently at chair or reader level, four (2 male, 2 female) were initially appointed at lecturer level while two (1 male, 1 female) were originally appointed at SL. We are proud of our current level of inclusivity but aware of the need to reflect and improve. (308 words)

b) Data for the last 3 years

Student data

(i) Numbers of males and females on access or foundation courses. Not applicable

(ii) Undergraduate male and female numbers:
**Figure 1**: The percentage of females at undergraduate (UG), taught postgraduate (PGT) and research postgraduate (PGR) level.

n.b. Numbers on lines indicate the total number of students contributing to the percentage. UG and PGT numbers are intake per year. PGR numbers are headcount.

![Graph showing percentage of females at each level]

Figure 1 shows that approximately 80% of our undergraduate intake each year is female which is in line with national figures for Psychology (source [http://www.heidi.ac.uk/](http://www.heidi.ac.uk/)). The vast majority of our students are full time and part-time study is only considered when existing students encounter situations (e.g. medical) that make continuing full-time study difficult. Thus p/t figures are extremely small and not presented. As females are in the strong majority at undergraduate level, we do not consider action is needed. *(79 words)*

(iii) **Postgraduate male and female numbers completing taught courses**:

Figure 1 also shows the intake to our masters programmes (PGT) each year. Over 80% of the intake is female, slightly above our undergraduate proportions. All are full-time. As females are in the strong majority at masters level, and at a level slightly above the undergraduate pool from which they are drawn, we do not consider action is needed. *(59 words)*

(iv) **Postgraduate male and female numbers on research degrees**:

Figure 1 also shows the proportions of female students on our doctoral programme (PGR) which is rising and females are now in the majority. Nonetheless, comparison with the proportions of females on our undergraduate and masters programmes suggests that there are fewer than expected female doctoral students. In addition, examination of national comparison data (source [http://www.heidi.ac.uk/](http://www.heidi.ac.uk/)) also suggests there are fewer female doctoral students than might be expected.

Consequently, a meeting of current masters and doctoral students (see section 2b for details) was held, facilitated by those members of the SAT who had experience of being both masters and doctoral students in this department. They explored why there was “leakage” of female students between masters and doctoral level. From this meeting we learned that those who had gone onto doctoral level study had often been inspired by their supervisor at undergraduate or masters level and so the role of positive role models...
Amongst negative perceptions reported were that academia was viewed as an unstable career necessitating geographical moves early in career. In the past the department had organised a one-off workshop for postgraduate students on managing a career in science as a woman led by two promoted female members of the department and this was reported to have been highly valued. Therefore we propose making this workshop an annual event, led by female role models, aimed at inspiring students to consider a career in academic psychology and to offset the negative perceptions of a career in science as a woman. In addition, the department this year ran for the first time a workshop on “The reviewing process in publication” for postgraduate students. These and related initiatives will be fostered and grown with the aim of developing our postgraduate community, more fully immersing our postgraduate students within the academic community to encourage a more positive view of a career in science. (311 words)

**ACTION POINT 1**

We will also target our undergraduate populations. The department currently runs an “Employability Retreat” for its undergraduates to encourage them to think about careers and employability towards the end of their second year of study. We will incorporate into this retreat a session on postgraduate study to encourage a positive view of postgraduate study and a career within science. (59 words)

**ACTION POINT 2**

(v) **Ratio of course applications to offers and acceptances by gender for undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research degrees –**

**Figure 2:** a) The percentage of female applicants and entrants at undergraduate level. b) the ratio of entrants to applicants for each gender (expressed as a percentage).

The proportion of female undergraduate entrants closely mirrors the proportion of applications received (figure 2a). Moreover the ratio of entrants to applicants (i.e. the likelihood of receiving and accepting an offer) shows no significant difference between male and female applicants (figure 2b), although female applicants may, on average, be slightly more likely to receive and accept an offer. We see no necessity for action here. (65 words)
Figure 3: a) The percentage of taught postgraduate applications, offers and acceptances which are female. b) the ratio of entrants to applicants for each gender over 3 years (as a percentage)

The department receives many more applications for postgraduate taught (PGT) places from females than males (82% female over 3 years). This mirrors the national proportion of females in the undergraduate pool from which they are drawn (source http://www.heidi.ac.uk/). However, females are fractionally more successful in receiving an offer for the programme and also slightly more likely to accept the offer (figure 3a). Thus over the 3 years summed (because of low numbers each year), the likelihood of a female applicant receiving and accepting an offer (figure 3b) is slightly higher than that of a male applicant. We see no necessity for action here. (103 words)

Figure 4: a) The percentage of research postgraduate applications, offers and acceptances which are female. b) the ratio of entrants to applicants 2010-2012 (as a percentage)

However, despite a similar preponderance of female applicants for postgraduate research (PGR) degrees, in 2010 and 2011, the percentage of offers made to females did not match the percentage of applicants (figure 4a), suggesting a possible small bias in favour of male
applicants. This is reflected in figure 4b which shows that over the 3 years, males had a slightly higher likelihood of receiving and accepting an offer. In 2012, however, we adopted a new selection process aimed at being more rigorous and transparent. This was not a direct result of Athena SWAN processes as its initiation predated it, but was a result of our continued process of review and improvement of processes which we believe that this application reflects. Nonetheless, there was a clear change in the gender balance of offers in 2012 which may result from this change (see Action Point 3 below).

However, many applications are speculative and without funding most applicants will not be able to take up their offer so offers themselves are not necessarily informative. Funding can come from the university or externally. Externally funded applications (e.g. ESRC) would normally be developed with, and supported by, department staff. Therefore we also examined sources of funding for our doctoral students over the period to examine whether there were gender biases in support at this level. (220 words)

Table 1: New PGR Entrants: funding sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2010-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham University funded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externally funded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self funded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio (funded places/applications)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows number of applicants who successfully secured doctoral funding. This suggests that there is no gender bias in the allocation of funded doctoral places with approximately 14-15% of both male and female applicants gaining funded places over the 3 years. However, in 2012, unlike previous years, all funded entrants were female. The new selection procedure introduced in 2012 (see above) had already been judged successful and formally adopted for future cycles before the SAT identified its possible effect on gender ratios on offers (figure 4) and funding (table 1). However, the numbers involved are very small so currently we have too little data to judge whether these gender effects are significant but the new selection process will be monitored over future cycles. (124 words)

ACTION POINT 3

(vi) Degree classification by gender –
Figure 5: Percentage of females and males gaining each degree class (2010-2012)

n.b. numbers on bars are number of students contributing to percentage

Figure 5 shows that over the last 3 years 12% of females on the course gained 1st class honours while only 6% of males do so. This has remained stable over the 3 years (females 1st class ranges between 12-13%, males 5-6%). Equally, the data suggest that a greater proportion of females gained good degrees (i.e. 1st and upper seconds combined) than males (ranges over 3 years: females 80-86%; males 58-68%). While this suggests that females achieve well on our programmes, the relative underachievement by male students is an issue that will be investigated further. (94 words)

ACTION POINT 4

(vii) Female:male ratio of academic staff and research staff

Figure 6: Percentage of academic and research staff which are female at each grade.

n.b. Numbers on bars are total number of staff at that grade.
Figure 6 shows that there has been a past tendency for the proportion of female academic staff to decrease with increasing grade (2009 and 2010, except professorial staff) but since 2011 there has been progress, with all grades now approximately 50% female (allowing for the very small numbers of Readers). Overall in 2012, 49% of all academic staff are female while 48% of promoted staff (i.e. SL or above) are female. Figure 7 compares these figures with those from comparator Psychology Departments (based on information given on their websites). (89 words)

**Figure 7: Percentage of all academic staff who are female compared with percentage of promoted staff (SL and above) who are female.**

![Bar Chart]

*n.b. Numbers on bars are total number of staff contributing to percentage*

This suggests that Durham Psychology has both a higher percentage of female staff overall than its competitor departments, but is also unusual in maintaining its percentage of females in its promoted staff (competitor departments are small/medium-sized departments from research-intensive universities identified by Durham University as our competitor departments for purposes of Departmental Annual Review). We believe that this balance has been brought about by subtle but sustainable means, such as an inclusive culture (e.g. see later section on culture), equitable expectations, good mentoring (e.g. see section on Turnover and Case studies) and good opportunities for all to play a role within the department regardless of gender (e.g. see later figures 12 and 13 on committee chairs and membership). Nonetheless, we are aware that the percentage of female staff still does not reflect the psychology undergraduate population and so is further evidence of a leaky pipeline earlier in the process (e.g. see action points 1 & 2). The department is aware of, and still considering, the debate as to whether our target should be 50% female staff at all levels or whether it should reflect the 80% female undergraduate population. (189 words)

(viii) **Turnover by grade and gender** –

In the last 3 years, 6 academic members of staff have left the department (5 male, one female). Given the departmental gender balance, this might suggest a propensity for male departures. However, 2 males (one Reader and one p/t Professor) retired and this probably
reflects historic gender effects. For the purposes of this application, the sole departing female was asked about her experience in the department. She wrote “I joined the department in 2005 to take my first lectureship, and left in 2011 for a post at the University of Oxford. I had a very positive experience of Durham Psychology Department, and was well supported in developing my career. In particular, I benefitted from a well-structured mentoring system, a promotion system that was based on clearly articulated criteria that were blind to age and gender (which saw me promoted to SL in 2009), and opportunities to represent the department at Faculty and University level. I felt my views were listened to, and that it was possible for me to influence departmental policies.” (172 words)

[Section 3: total 1943 words]

4. Supporting and advancing women’s careers:

   Key career transition points

   a)

   (i) Job application and success rates by gender and grade:

   Figure 8: Percentage of female applicants, interviewees and appointments (2009-2012)

   In the last 3 years there have been 6 academic staff appointed over 3 appointment rounds, each advertised at lecturer/SL level. Three males and 2 females were appointed at lecturer level and one male at SL (n.b. applications and interviews are not separated by lecturer/SL level as applicants are often unclear at this stage which they are applying for). As figure 8 shows, there is a relatively low level of female applications (43%) and some evidence of loss of females between application and interview stage and between interview and appointment, although small numbers for interviews and appointments here may suggest cautious interpretation. While departmental staff levels (e.g. figures 6 & 7) suggest no long-term bias towards appointing males, the above data suggests some action may be appropriate (see action points 5-7 below). First, we hope that in future a successful Athena SWAN application can be used to encourage further appropriately qualified female applicants and we are taking action to encourage our own students to consider careers in academia (see action points 1 & 2). Also, recent consideration of our standard wording for advertising posts suggests that it may be insufficiently inclusive. This will be reviewed for future posts and, for example, any successful Athena SWAN application highlighted. Finally, our departmental web pages and the
further information we provide to potential applicants will be reviewed to ensure that it reflects the opportunities available in the department regardless of gender. (238 words)

ACTION POINT 5

Short-listing for academic appointments is undertaken by departmental members of the interview panel which under university policy must include at least one person of each gender. However, review of the membership of the panels from the last 3 departmental appointing rounds (2009-2012) shows only 3 from 16 panel members (19%) were female. In part this reflects the university requirement for the panel chair to be the Science Faculty ProViceChancell or his deputy, a small but currently exclusively male pool. In addition, some membership of panels is dictated by role (e.g. Head of Department, Director of Research) which during this period of 3 years did not rotate and were, by chance, both male. Nonetheless, future appointing rounds will monitor and report to Board of Studies the proportion of females on appointing panels with a view to ensuring a proportion in line with the proportion of female promoted staff in the department.

ACTION POINT 6

In addition, the proportion of female applicants in comparison to those interviewed and appointed will be monitored and reported to Board of Studies. Should appropriate proportions on average not be maintained, further action will be taken to ensure an appropriate balance. (191 words)

ACTION POINT 7

(ii) Applications for promotion and success rates by gender and grade

Potential candidates for promotion are identified after discussions at Annual Staff Review (see below for further details) and/or with the Head of Department. The cases of potential candidates are then considered by a meeting of all those at the promoted level or above. Comments on the strengths of the application are solicited and, based on these, the department either supports the application to the university’s Promotions Committee or advises the applicant on how their application can be strengthened. The university’s Promotions Committee determines the success of the application and gives further feedback if unsuccessful. (94 words)

Figure 9: a) Number of applications and successful applications for promotion by level and gender (2009-2012) b) percentage of successful applications by level and gender (2009-2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Successes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL Reader</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All promotions</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL Reader</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All promotions</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9a suggests that the total number of males and females promoted over the last 3 years are approximately equivalent (3 males vs. 2 females), broadly in line with the gender balance of the department. Nonetheless, males appear much more likely to apply for promotion (10 applications from males vs. 2 from females), are more often unsuccessful (7 vs 0) and thus the male success rate is lower (30% vs 100%; figure 9b) (n.b. the applications from males do not represent 10 different people as some applicants applied on more than one occasion within this period). Informal discussions with other departments suggest that this pattern is commonly seen. It is possible that males apply for promotion at an earlier stage in their career and, despite the lack of success, will consequently receive potentially useful feedback earlier. Nonetheless, the data suggest that this does not necessarily advantage them in gaining subsequent promotion. However, in order to further question whether males may be being promoted at an earlier stage in career, as a rough proxy we examined the average age of males and females each grade. (184 words)

**Figure 10: Average age of male and female staff at each grade.**

![Age of male and female staff at each grade](image)

With the exception of a small difference at Senior Lecturer level, figure 10 shows that females at each grade are slightly younger than the males at that grade, suggesting no gender-related delay in promotion (at least in age terms). Together with the data in figures 6 & 7 above, this suggests no further action is needed. (56 words)

b)

(i) **Recruitment of staff**

See 4ai for discussion of this issue. (7 words)

(ii) **Support for staff at key career transition points**

Development of this application has identified that the key attrition point is between masters and doctoral level and we have plans to address this (see action points 1 & 2). Nonetheless, we
are also aware that there may be other hidden pressure points. For example, the department has recently raised the question of how periods of non-standard working (e.g. maternity leave, part-time working etc.) should be taken into account when assessing achievements in relation to promotion applications in order to ensure fair consideration. This point has already been referred for further university guidance. The department will follow-up on this action to ensure that both those considering applying for promotion and those assessing applications are clear on this issue. (118 words)

**ACTION POINT 8**

In addition, consultation with staff who have taken maternity leave has raised issues surrounding the return from maternity leave as a key career transition point. This issue is discussed further below under Maternity Leave (see also action point 13). (39 words)

**Career development**

a)

(i) **Promotion and career development**

All staff undergo Annual Staff Review each year (see also staff comment in 3bviii). Reviewers are promoted members of staff within the department. Reviewers are allocated to reviewees but staff may request a change of reviewer and this has occurred where a reviewer with particular experience was preferred, but is rare. Review is based on a standard university form which asks for individual reflection on progress during the year against priorities agreed in the previous review and the setting of new objectives for the forthcoming year. However, the review also includes the opportunity to identify development needs which are then fulfilled, using a specific budget where needs cannot be met in-house. (111 words)

**Figure 11:** a) Number of development needs identified by academic staff during Annual Staff Review. b) Percentage of development needs identified by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% female</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 11: a) Number of development needs identified by academic staff during Annual Staff Review. b) Percentage of development needs identified by gender.*
Over the last 3 years, 38 development needs have been noted in a total of 26 reviews of academic staff. Needs identified included, for example, Management training, Leading teams and Media Training as well as research specific skills. However, as Figure 11 shows, overall approximately half of all needs are identified by women whether measured by the number of staff identifying needs or the number of needs identified, reflecting the gender balance of staff members. This suggests that both genders feel able and willing to identify needs and ask for development opportunities and that there is no gender bias here in relation to career development.

Annual staff review is also an opportunity to discuss future promotion. The criteria for promotion are available online (e.g. http://www.dur.ac.uk/hr/policies/promotion/senlec/). The criteria include not only Research and Education but also Good Citizenship which is defined as “being generous with your help and support to others and collaborating with your academic colleagues in matters relating to research, learning & teaching, and knowledge transfer, and working for the benefit of your department and the University as a whole.” Therefore, service to the university community such as outreach is recognised. Both the department and the university Promotions Committee also take into account periods of maternity leave etc. For example, during a recent application for promotion the Head of Department was asked for further information on the impact of periods of maternity leave on a member of staff so that an application could be fairly considered. The application was ultimately successful.

(ii) Induction and training

New members of research and academic staff are assigned a mentor in the department who can guide them throughout their probationary period (usually 3 years) in all aspects of their role, including professional and personal development opportunities. For example, mentors and mentees will attend some of each other’s teaching sessions to facilitate discussion of practice. Mentors will also give constructive feedback on drafts of mentee’s grant applications etc. This is in addition to the standard departmental practice of research group review in which the grant applications of all staff members are peer-reviewed by members of their research group before submission to funding bodies. Mentors will also discuss and encourage attendance at appropriate training courses for new staff members. For example, one recent probationary female member of staff attended a Leading Research Programme run by the university which includes aspects of diversity within research leadership. She commented “I learned about twitter and the #womeninscience board as part of the Leading Research Programme. The consultant who ran the last day of the programme was amazing at boosting our confidence and mentoring abilities as academics. I would suggest that female junior academics should do this course! I intend to keep up with the female attendees and I’m curious about the long-term benefits of having done this course.”. However, as well as such formal mechanisms of support to new members of staff, informal situations such as coffee-time will often be used for informal discussion of current tasks. Support and advice is always freely available at such times.

The university also requires completion of the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (see https://www.dur.ac.uk/education/cap/pgcap/structure/) by all new academic staff and teaching fellows who have not previously completed such a programme elsewhere. The Certificate is accredited by the Higher Education Authority in accordance with the UK Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning in
Higher Education and includes discussion of diversity and inclusivity. The Certificate additionally provides a supportive network of new staff members across the university and many new staff value this aspect.

In addition to the support offered to new academics, the university also runs a Postgraduate Teacher Induction for postgraduates and others who have an occasional teaching role but who do not require the full Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice. The curriculum includes an extensive diversity and equality online course which is required to be successfully completed before any teaching can be undertaken so that all teachers within the university have some equality and diversity training. (411 words)

(iii) Support for female students.

Undergraduate and Taught Masters students: All undergraduate and taught masters students are allocated an academic advisor within the department and also have a personal college tutor and senior tutor in their college. In Durham, colleges play a central role in pastoral support and personal development for students. Therefore students have a range of individuals who can provide support and advice, including regarding careers etc. While a request to change academic advisor has never been received, it would be treated sympathetically and a note to this effect will be added to the student handbook and included in induction for next academic year. (96 words)

**ACTION POINT 9**

Doctoral Students: It is a university requirement that postgraduate research students have a supervisory team consisting of at least two staff members. In addition, doctoral students have regular departmental progress reviews at 6, 18, 30 and 45 months with two members of staff outwith their supervisory team. Thus there are always at least four members of staff who are familiar with the student’s research and can be consulted at any time. We have recently taken action to ensure that all supervisory teams include both genders. Within the department, doctoral students are also represented on PG Education Subcommittee which serves as a postgraduate staff-student consultative committee. They are also encouraged to see the Director of PG Education (currently female) should they have issues which cannot be dealt with by any of these alternative routes. In addition, postgraduate students are also members of a college with access to a personal tutor and the Senior Tutor in each college for pastoral support and advice. Therefore there are a number of channels of support for research students. Nonetheless, consultation with doctoral students has revealed some areas where such students would like further support (see action point 2) and the department is planning to develop this. (199 words)

**Organisation and culture**

a)

(i) Male and female representation on committees –
Chairs of committees are appointed by the Head of Department taking into account experience, skills and personal preferences. Chairs are normally appointed for 3 years. Over the last 3 years, the chairs of the 6 key departmental sub-committees (those named in figure 13, excluding Head of Department who ex officio chairs Board of Studies) have had 3 male and 3 female incumbents each year (see figure 12). In addition, there are five Research Group Leaders who represent their research group on Research Subcommittee and manage a small budget on behalf on their group: 3 research group leaders are currently female and 2 male. Consultation with staff has suggested that not all members of the department felt aware how chairs of committees are appointed to committees and so it has been agreed that expressions of interest in such appointments will in future be solicited, in order that a wider range of candidates might be considered. This will ensure greater transparency in the process. Nonetheless, it appears that there are no gender biases associated with appointment to committee chairs. *(177 words)*

**ACTION POINT 10**

**Figure 12: Percentage of chairs of key decision making committees which are female.**

[n.b. numbers on bars represent total number of committee chairs represented]

**Figure 13: Membership of Departmental Sub-Committees**

[n.b. the numbers on bars represent the average total number of members of these committees over 3 years]
Examination of membership of the key committees shows that females typically make up approximately 65-70% committee membership (see figure 13). Given that females make up approximately half of both total academic staff and of promoted staff (see figures 6 & 7), they are slightly over-represented in committee membership. While this may represent a work-load burden, it is also a valuable opportunity to gain experience and influence on these important committees. There are undoubtedly some administrative burdens not represented here (e.g. Chair of Board of Examiners: both UG and PG chairs are currently male) as they were considered by the SAT not to be influential decision-making roles. Consideration of these additional administrative roles may redress the gender workload balance. Administrative load is part of the overall workload model considered by the Head of Department in allocating duties, although gender is not currently specifically considered. Nonetheless, the process of considering this application has brought this issue to the attention of the department. After consideration, the department believes that it is neither necessary nor appropriate to make individual appointments to roles on the basis of gender. However, the gender balance in overall administrative load, including committee membership, will in future be monitored and reported to Board of Studies to ensure it remains in line with the gender balance of the department. (218 words)

**ACTION POINT 11**

(ii) **Female:Male ratio of academic and research staff on fixed-term contracts and open-ended (permanent) contracts.**

With one (male) exception, all academic members of staff are on open-ended (i.e. permanent) contracts. Research staff are typically funded on research grants and so are usually fixed-term, although one female research staff member is on an open-ended (permanent) contract. Therefore of the research staff represented in figure 6, in 2012 three females and two males are on fixed-term contracts and one female on an open-ended contract. We see no requirement for further action. (74 words)

b)

(i) **Representation on decision-making committees**

The data above suggests that females are well represented on key decision-making bodies within the department (Figure 13) and also in chairing these committees (Figure 12). However, female staff in the department also have experience of sitting on influential committees within the university outside the department and are supported in taking these roles. For example, female members of the department have been Deputy Head of Faculty of Science (Eacott), Chair of the University Ethics Committee (Campbell), members of Faculty Education Committee (Campbell and Meins) and a member of the Faculty Ethics Committee (Centifanti). In addition, a female member of staff (Reissland) has served as staff representative on the University’s Senate. While serving as Deputy Head of Faculty, Professor Eacott was allocated a half load of departmental teaching and administrative responsibilities to allow her to take the faculty role. Therefore female members of the department have role models for successful contributions outside the department and are encouraged to do so. (159 words)
(ii) **Workload model**

There is a workload model which is publicly available electronically and is used as a tool by the Head of Department in allocating teaching and administrative duties. The allocation of roles, especially those with a heavy load, is usually by negotiation and is rotated, usually every 3 years. Consultation with staff has revealed that some staff would welcome opportunities to contribute further and in future, expressions of interest will be solicited for any available position of responsibility (see action point 10 above). Such service to the department and university are explicitly taken into account in the promotion criteria (see above). *(100 words)*

(iii) **Timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings.**

Departmental meetings take place within core hours (i.e. 9.30-4.30) and their dates are published online at the beginning of the year to facilitate planning. Some years ago, the starting time of the major departmental meeting (Board of Studies) was shifted from 2.30pm to 1.00pm in order to ensure finishing within these hours. In addition, departmental seminars at the Durham site were moved from 5.00p.m start to 4.00 start to be more family friendly (seminars at the Queen’s campus have always been at lunchtime, lunch provided). One issue identified by staff at the staff consultation meeting (see section 2.b) is that the teaching timetable extends until 6.00p.m. while the university nursery closes at 6.00p.m. causing difficulty for staff using the nursery if teaching in the late slot. In the past this has been dealt with informally within the department, moving the teaching commitments of those using the nursery. Nonetheless the department has recently brought this issue to the attention of the relevant university ProViceChancellor who has assured us that the nursery opening hours will be reconsidered forthwith. This suggests that the Athena SWAN process is already bearing fruit within the university. We will follow-up to ensure this occurs and bring pressure within the university if it does not. *(207 words)*

**Action point 11**

Departmental social gatherings are usually at lunch-times to ensure all can attend. For example there is a Christmas lunch during working hours. In summer, a departmental barbeque is held in the late afternoon/evening but is family-friendly and family members, including children, are encouraged to attend and many do so. *(49 words)*

(iv) **Culture.**

The department aims to be inclusive, supportive, friendly and transparent. For example, there is staff common room and well-attended coffee at 11.00 each working day with free coffee and biscuits provided for all staff. Staff have reported they value this time to interact socially with colleagues within work hours. As detailed above, there are other family-friendly departmental social gatherings and seminars take place at times when all staff can attend: either lunch-time or at 4-5p.m. Seminars are accompanied by either lunch (at lunchtime) or drinks and nibbles (at 4.00p.m.).

Transparency is also important to ensuring an inclusive culture. There are regular ad-hoc staff consultation meetings, often accompanied by a sandwich lunch on issues such as departmental views on to-be-advertised appointments. In addition, all departmental documents including agendas and minutes of meeting are placed on-line and so are
accessible by all academic members of the department from home or office. Furthermore, all departmental budgets (and spending from them) are available online so that members of the department can view the spending of any sub-committee etc. Therefore there is a generally transparent culture where information is freely available to any who seek it and all views are welcomed. However, there is also an electronic forum available where members of the department can post anonymous suggestions/points should anyone feel it necessary to do so. This has been in existence for two years and no anonymous posts have ever been posted (although a few posts have been made), perhaps suggesting that staff feel able to voice their opinions openly without fear.

The department also aims to celebrate success: regular emails inform all of significant achievements by members of staff and congratulate them. This is inclusive, including the achievements of our technical and secretarial staff as well as awards or grant success by academic staff members. Similar emails announce the regular arrival of babies (see maternity and paternity leave below).

The current Head of Department is the Science Faculty’s representative on the University’s Diversity and Equality Advisory Group. In addition, some staff have research interests which relate to gender issues (Boothroyd: parenting, including the effects of father absence; Campbell: sex differences in aggression; Hausmann: sex differences in cognition; Rosenthal: stereotypes, including gender stereotypes). Thus, there is generally a good awareness of gender issues within the department and as a result there are few gender-related expectations. For example, there is no expectation that pastoral roles within the School should be taken by women while “research leadership” roles are taken by men: 2 of our 3 year tutors (who are responsible for student advice and support re coursework extensions etc.) are currently male, while 2 from 5 research group leaders are male. Therefore, the department considers that it is sensitive to possible gender issues over a wide front. (461 words)

(v) Outreach activities.

The department has a record of engaging in a wide range of outreach activities. Given the gender balance of undergraduate psychology students nationally, such activities are often aimed broadly at encouraging appreciation of science or participation in Higher Education, rather than targeting females specifically. Nonetheless, the message we aim to convey is that psychology is a fascinating science: given the gender balance of our department, this message often comes from female scientists.

Some of our activities are contributions to university-managed schemes such as Supported Progression where we run a number of summer schools each year for year 10-12 pupils with the potential to study at Durham University but from a socio-economic background that is under-represented in higher education. It provides support to these students to help them achieve their potential (see [http://www.dur.ac.uk/supported.progression/](http://www.dur.ac.uk/supported.progression/)). In addition, a large number of staff give talks at schools both locally and nationally. For example, 16 different members of current staff (10 females, 6 males) report that they have been involved in an outreach activity aimed at either school students or the general public within the last 3 years.
However, there are also a number of innovative outreach schemes initiated within the department. For example, two members of the department (one male, one female) have jointly held two Royal Society Partnership grants with a local primary school. Royal Society Partnership grants aim to bring science to life within schools. One project involved creating an outdoor play area based on large interactive visual illusions. As part of the project several members of the Department of Psychology spent a day at the school, working with the illusions with the children and giving presentations on perception to the older children. As a result of these two grants, the innovative projects, their success and the department’s overall engagement with the project, the school has been awarded Associate School Status with the Royal Society.

In addition, the department runs an innovative credit-bearing 3rd year module for undergraduates, ‘Psychology into Schools’ (see http://www.dur.ac.uk/science.outreach/sis/). The module develops science communication skills in students through developing and carrying out psychology-based science projects in schools. As part of the module, students discuss issues in psychology education including stereotypes surrounding both science and psychology. Therefore, undergraduates consider the public perception of science, including gender stereotypes. Moreover, given the gender balance of our student population, by involving themselves in schools they undoubtedly help to break down these stereotypes.

(402 words)

Flexibility and managing career breaks

a)

(i) Maternity return rate.

In the last 3 years, 3 academic members of staff have taken maternity leave. In two cases, a full year leave was taken and in the other 9 months. All chose to return to work full-time. In addition, the senior IT technician and a member of secretarial staff have taken maternity leave. Therefore it appears that all staff are aware of such leave and feel comfortable in taking it. (69 words)

(ii) Paternity, adoption and parental leave.

In the last 3 years, 4 members of academic staff have taken paternity leave. To our knowledge, this is all the males who have had children during this period. In addition, one male member of staff took special parental leave to cover a family situation. Therefore it appears that staff are aware of such leave and feel comfortable in taking it. (61 words)

(iii) Numbers of applications and success rates for flexible working by gender and grade.

No academic member of staff has applied for flexible working hours although one (male:Reader) works part-time. As detailed below, the department facilitates informal flexible working and so this may be why it is not formally required. However, two members of staff (both female: one technical, one administrative) have successfully applied for flexible working hours to accommodate caring commitments and there are no unsuccessful applications. Therefore staff have models of successful flexible and part-time working in the department. (77 words)
b)  

(i) **Flexible working.**

In addition to the above formally recognised flexible working, academic staff have a great deal of control in their work and many informally work flexibly at times. Many departmental resources are available electronically and this can facilitate such flexible working. For example, all budgets, agendas and minutes of meetings etc. are remotely available electronically and other resources (e.g. departmental car and meeting/teaching rooms) can be remotely booked electronically. (68 words)

(ii) **Cover for maternity and adoption leave and support on return.**

Cover for maternity leave is arranged according to need on each occasion (we currently have no examples of adoption leave). It is sometimes possible to cover work via colleagues while sometimes temporary appointments are made, depending on issues such as departmental capacity within the teaching area, timing and length of leave. Consultation with those who have taken maternity leave recently (4 members within the last 5 years) has, however, revealed some things that the department can improve upon. Consequently we plan to develop a “Returners’ Policy” aimed at those returning from maternity/paternity leave or long-term sickness of over 3 months: The Returners’ Policy would ensure that returners:

(i) are not allocated any new teaching requiring substantial preparation time (e.g. new lecture courses) in their first academic year back to work.
(ii) meet with their Research Group Leader (if appropriate) or Head of Department on their return to discuss needs with regard to resuming their research activities;
(iii) have access to funds set aside for development needs of returners (e.g. pump priming for pilot studies to aid new grant application etc.)
(iv) have flexible arrangements regarding their staff allocation to be individually agreed with HoD depending on needs. (All staff have a small annual allocation, at present £1,000, to cover incidental expenses. Any unspent portion is zeroed at year end. Those who take maternity leave within a year currently receive a pro rata allocation. However, those who took maternity leave across years found they could not fully capitalise on this. Recognising this, the Returner’s Policy will include a more flexible arrangement, based on individual circumstances and priorities based on discussion with their Research Group Leader and/or HoD.) (268 words)

**Action Point 13**

[Section 4: total 4385 words]

5. **Any other comments:**

In both 2007 and 2011, the university commissioned an externally conducted survey of all staff (academic, technical, secretarial etc.), parts of which asked about diversity and equality issues. Unfortunately, the response rate was relatively low and does not dissociate respondents by role (academic, secretarial etc.) or grade. While dissociation by gender was potentially possible, it was not available where the number of respondents in any category was low and unfortunately in Psychology the male respondents fell below this criterion.
Nonetheless the data is of some interest. In 2007 97% of respondents from Psychology (n=33) agreed with the statement “Durham University respects equally people of different genders”. In 2011, the proportion remained high although it has fallen slightly to 87% (n=23). Unfortunately, the data does not reveal whether the relatively few who disagreed believed that the lack of respect occurred at departmental or university level, although the Science Faculty average of respondents agreeing with this statement was 88% which suggests any dissatisfaction is not differentially prevalent within the Psychology Department and may have fallen over the faculty as a whole. Nonetheless, the process of compiling the current application has prompted wide discussion of equality issues, including a departmental staff meeting to raise and address issues (see section 2.b), and the completed application has been circulated for comment to all staff and any issues fed into the current application, thus raising the profile of such issues. We shall encourage greater engagement with any future surveys by the university so that a more representative sample of staff opinion can be gauged. (258 words)

**ACTION POINT 13**

As part of this process we have also examined the proportion of female speakers at our departmental seminars.

**Figure 14: Percentage of speakers at departmental seminars who are female**

The data showed that typically overall 50% of our speakers are female. Nonetheless further examination revealed that this was due to the greater percentage of female internal speakers and fewer external female speakers. While this may reveal a better gender balance within the Durham department than other similar research-intensive psychology departments (see figure 7 for some examples), it may nonetheless provide a poor role model for our postgraduate students who are strongly encouraged to attend seminars. In future we will monitor the proportions of both internal and external female speakers with a view to ensuring an appropriate gender balance. (117 words)

**ACTION POINT 14**
Finally, the department is very aware of the importance of female role models and the relative lack of them within the Science Faculty in which the department sits. The department currently has two female professors, both of whom have had leadership positions (see section on “Representation on decision-making committees”). For example, Madeline Eacott was for 10 years Deputy Head of the Faculty. She is currently chair of the Athena SWAN SAT but also a founder member of an Academic Peer Mentoring Network within the university which aims to provide mentoring and support to individuals, primarily but not exclusively females, across the university. (102 words)

[Section 5: total 477 words]
6. **Action plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
<th>Action taken already and outcome at Jan 2013</th>
<th>Further action planned at Jan 2013</th>
<th>Progress Log</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Success Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1            | Baseline Data and Supporting Evidence | i) Workshop on “The reviewing process in publication” for postgraduates students run by female member of staff.  
ii) Post-graduate-led peer mentoring network launched.  
iii) Opinion of postgraduate students solicited on relaunch of “Women in Science” workshop.  
Encourage, support and grow initiatives including, but not limited to:  
i) Introduce annual “Women in Science” workshop to offset negative perceptions & inspire PGs to consider a career in academic psychology.  
iii) Survey PGs re further initiatives to develop postgraduate community in the department. | Director of PG Education | From Oct 2013 intake onwards. Will take at least 2 further years to fully judge impact. | October 2013. | i) Well attended workshops run and well-reviewed by students who attend.  
ii) Positive outcomes from postgraduate surveys. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
<th>Action taken already and outcome at Jan 2013</th>
<th>Further action planned at Jan 2013</th>
<th>Progress Log</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Success Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Introduce session on postgraduate study into undergraduate “Employability Retreat”</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Introduce session to Employability Retreat planned for June 2013. Consider inviting current postgraduate students to enthuse undergraduates at retreat.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organiser of Employability Retreat</td>
<td>New session in June 2013 has potential to influence intake to masters courses in Oct 2014 and doctoral students 2015 and thereafter.</td>
<td>Retreat of June 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Monitor effects of new selection process for PG entrants and funding</td>
<td>Data from first year reviewed and possible gender effects noted</td>
<td>Keep effects under review for 2 further application rounds so that sufficient data can be examined.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Director of PG Education</td>
<td>Two further years from Oct 2013.</td>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
<td>Examination of data indicates that PG selection procedures are fair and transparent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Description of action</td>
<td>Action taken already and outcome at Jan 2013</td>
<td>Further action planned at Jan 2013</td>
<td>Progress Log</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>Success Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continue to monitor the achievement of male and female students at undergraduate level, particularly the relative underachievement by male students.</td>
<td>Noted relative underachievement of male students in comparison to female students</td>
<td>Interrogate student records to see where difference arises (e.g. different intake grades, exams vs. course work, etc.) and take action if necessary, dependent on findings. Monitor to see effect of any changes made.</td>
<td>Director of UG Education</td>
<td>Three years – one student cohort.</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>Identified source of gender differences (by end 2013). Have put into place any necessary action by end of academic year 2013-2014. Monitor effects over one student cohort (2014-2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Description of action</td>
<td>Action taken already and outcome at Jan 2013</td>
<td>Further action planned at Jan 2013</td>
<td>Progress Log</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>Success Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Consider standard wording for advertising posts to highlight inclusivity. Review all departmental information to ensure it fully reflects the opportunities available in the department regardless of gender.</td>
<td>Standard wording of advertising considered and in need of review.</td>
<td>Rewrite standard information, including statement about diversity. Highlight university Athena SWAN award and any future departmental award. Review all departmental information to ensure it fully reflects the opportunities available in the department regardless of gender.</td>
<td>Departmental administrator</td>
<td>For next appointing round.</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>Revised wording approved by Head of Department. Review of other departmental information completed and all appropriate changes made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Monitor proportion of female applicants to academic posts in relation to those interviewed and appointed.</td>
<td>Data from last 3 years reviewed</td>
<td>i) Report to Board of Studies data from each appointing round  ii) Report to Board of Studies rolling data from last 3 appointing rounds.</td>
<td>Departmental administrator</td>
<td>From next appointing panel onwards</td>
<td>Next appointing round</td>
<td>Ratio of females interviewed and appointed to academic posts on average matches the proportion applying to posts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Description of action</td>
<td>Action taken already and outcome at Jan 2013</td>
<td>Further action planned at Jan 2013</td>
<td>Progress Log</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>Success Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Monitor proportion of females on interview panels for academic posts.</td>
<td>Data from last 3 appointing panels reviewed</td>
<td>i) Report to Board of Studies data from each appointing round ii) Report to Board of Studies rolling data from last 3 appointing rounds. iii) Take action to ensure that proportion of females on interview panels for academic posts on average at least matches proportion of promoted female academic staff.</td>
<td>Departmental administrator</td>
<td>From next appointing panel onwards</td>
<td>Next appointing round (anticipated 2013)</td>
<td>Increase in female departmental members of appointing panels to match proportion of promoted female academic staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Description of action</td>
<td>Action taken already and outcome at Jan 2013</td>
<td>Further action planned at Jan 2013</td>
<td>Progress Log</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>Success Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Clarify with University how periods of non-standard working (e.g. maternity leave, part-time working etc.) should be taken into account when assessing achievements in relation to promotion applications in order to ensure fair consideration.</td>
<td>Clarification sought from University Human Resources.</td>
<td>Ensure that the university response is received and is fully understood by those applying for and considering promotion applications in the department.</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>Before beginning of 2014 promotions round</td>
<td>Before beginning of 2014 promotions round</td>
<td>Clear response received from university. Discussion of response at Board of Studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Clarify to students that request to change academic advisor for good reason will be treated sympathetically. A note to this effect will be added to the student handbook and included in induction for next academic year</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>i) Add information to undergraduate handbook ii) include information at undergraduate induction.</td>
<td>Departmental administrator.</td>
<td>i) Added to handbooks produced summer 2013 onwards ii) included in Induction 2013 onwards</td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>i) Handbooks changed ii) induction information changed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Expressions of interest for appointment to roles such as chair of sub-committees will be solicited before appointments made.</td>
<td>Expressions of interest for a number of forthcoming roles currently being sought.</td>
<td>Solicit expressions of interest from staff when roles become available.</td>
<td>Head of Department/Departmental administrator</td>
<td>From now onwards</td>
<td>With immediate effect</td>
<td>Emails soliciting expressions of interest sent when roles available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Description of action</td>
<td>Action taken already and outcome at Jan 2013</td>
<td>Further action planned at Jan 2013</td>
<td>Progress Log</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>Success Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The gender balance in overall administrative load, including committee membership, will in future be monitored and reported to Board of Studies</td>
<td>Workload considered in terms of overall gender balance as well as by individual.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of Department/ Departmental Administrator</td>
<td>From allocation of 2013-2014 duties onwards</td>
<td>Allocation of 2013-2014 duties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender balance in teaching and administrative duties appropriate given gender balance of department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University nursery opening hours will be brought into line with teaching timetable.</td>
<td>Brought issue to attention of responsible ProViceChancellor (PVC) at Diversity and Equality Action Group.</td>
<td>University opening hours brought in line with university teaching timetable</td>
<td>Action needed by responsible PVC. Action will be monitored by Head of Department</td>
<td>ASAP onwards</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>University nursery opening hours will reflect teaching timetable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Develop Returners’ Policy.</td>
<td>Consultation with staff who have recently taken maternity leave.</td>
<td>Write a Returners’ Policy and have it approved at Board of Studies.</td>
<td>Athena SWAN champion in consultation with recent returners from maternity leave.</td>
<td>To be approved during academic year 2013-2014.</td>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
<td>Returners’ Policy approved by Board of Studies by end 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Encourage greater engagement with future university staff surveys.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>All staff to engage with survey</td>
<td>Departmental administrator/ all staff</td>
<td>When next surveyed</td>
<td>When appropriate</td>
<td>Response rate of at least 50% of staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Description of action</td>
<td>Action taken already and outcome at Jan 2013</td>
<td>Further action planned at Jan 2013</td>
<td>Progress Log</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>Success Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Monitor the proportions of both internal and external female seminar speakers</td>
<td>Current data reviewed.</td>
<td>Monitor the proportions of both internal and external female seminar speakers and encourage female speakers if needed.</td>
<td>Seminar organiser</td>
<td>Next academic year (2013-2014)</td>
<td>With invitation s summer 2013</td>
<td>Proportions of both internal and external female seminar speakers approximately 50%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>