

EDC12D015

Title: Submission for Athena Swan Bronze Award and Next Steps
Author: Helen Murdoch
Circulation: Equality and Diversity Committee – 14 May 2013
Agenda: EDC12A003
Version: Final
Status: Open

1. Current Position

In 2011 achievement of silver award status under the Athena Swan standard was linked to funding from NIHR (National Institute of Health Research). The current value of NIHR funding is in the region of £25m to the University across a cluster of Schools in the Faculty of Medicine and Health and the Faculty of Science.

The University was awarded its Bronze status on 29 July 2012. This was needed before any Schools could begin submitting cases for their own awards. The University has to acquire a number of Schools (number not defined) at Silver level before it is able to submit for a Silver award for the whole institution. Each submission has its own Action Plan – each Action Plan must be in place for a maximum of three years and it is largely through this that the University and individual Schools demonstrate ‘distance travelled’ from one level of award to the next.

Submissions are made at the end of either April or November each year. At the end of November 2012 a submission was made for Norwich Medical School (MED). At the end of April 2013 submissions were made for the Schools of Biological Sciences (BIO), Environmental Sciences (ENV) and Pharmacy (PHA). A further two submissions, for the Schools of Allied Health Professions (AHP) and Nursing Sciences (NSC) have also been under development. The Office believes the submissions made in the April round are strong and substantial. Just after initially submitting submissions for the April round the University was informed the November application for Bronze by Norwich Medical School had not been successful. There was a short window after receiving the feedback for the Norwich Medical School in which some revisions were made to all submissions – and after discussion it was decided to defer the application for Bronze for AHP with a view to working to a stronger and possibly higher level submission in November 2013.

From October 2012 to April 2013 the E&D Office has been involved in work at University level, for the Medical School (submission and work on the current Action Plan) and for the other five Schools in preparing their submissions. A high level of detail is required by the Athena Swan Awards and resourcing in the Equality Office continues to be extremely stretched.

1.1 Submission Results

Due to the high increase in submissions to Athena Swan following the announcement from the NIHR that funding would be linked to success in the standard, results from the November 2012 round were substantially delayed. This meant there was little room for manoeuvre to make changes in light of the feedback, although some revisions, principally to timescales in the Action Plans for Biological Sciences, Environmental Sciences and Pharmacy were made.

Feedback for every submission is received from the judging Panel. A summary of the feedback received for both the NMS submission and the UEA Bronze Award is shown at Appendix 1. Key points for NMS were the short timescale within which the submission was developed, some elements of data presentation, linking of actions devised to the evidence emerging from qualitative and quantitative data and the narrow range of consultation undertaken. A review meeting is to take place in MED on Friday May 10th to analyse feedback and clarify work moving forward, with revisions to the Action Plan, if required. A verbal report of this meeting will be brought to the Committee on May 14th. Feedback from both the University and the Medical School Submissions are summarised at **Appendix 1**. This will be shared with all participating Schools and will inform future work

2. Revisions to future practice

In light of the learning acquired through working with multiple Schools and setting up several award templates populated with around 80 pieces of data each, the Equality Office has established an Audit Trail to be attached to each submission (see **Appendices 2 and 3**) which will help create tighter management controls within the Office, a higher level of quality control and finer degree of accountability. In the next submission stage all data will be produced and double checked within the Office to a strict deadline before passing this to Schools for analysis and action. The aim of this is to avoid some of the inaccuracies and subsequent rework encountered with all submissions in the last round. Resource permitting the E&D Office would like to engage in a much higher level of intelligence gathering in future stages. This involves finding multiple successful examples from the most recent round(s) of submissions, engaging with other E&D leads via a JISmail forum and meeting with the Eastern Regional Athena Swan Group (next meeting on Friday 17th May at University of Essex).

The resource for the E&D Office is under discussion following the dis-banding of PPE. There is a real need for effective support to be in place if the University wants to achieve the stated goals under Athena Swan.

2.1 Central Steering Group

The next meeting of the Central Steering Group is to be scheduled at the end of May/early June. The meetings for the next twelve months are also being scheduled. The Steering Group has two clear functions: one is for guidance of the overall Athena Strategy and the other is for sharing of good practice/issues encountered between participating Schools. It is intended to schedule dates slightly more frequently next session but to make the nature of each meeting clear so participants can opt in

or out of particular meetings depending on their role within the Steering Group. The volume of work, number of people involved, and strict external deadlines have made it challenging to maintain the central information sharing during the latter period. This aspect will be prioritised moving forward, supported by a higher level of email update inviting views and feedback from the members of the Central Steering Group.

3. Next Steps

3.1 UEA

Pending results of current submissions the focus for our work on Athena Swan will be:

- AHP –Bronze/Silver in November 2013 (level t.b.a.).
- BIO – Silver: aiming for November 2013
- ENV – Silver: aiming for April 2014
- MED – Silver: aiming for November 2013 or April 2014 – t.b.a.
- NSC –Bronze in November 2013
- PHA – Silver: aiming for April 2014
- University: Silver aiming for November 2014, depending on results of next submissions and work achieved via plan.

It is important to ensuring that our chances of success are high that Schools submitting in the next round have their submission ready save for final revision by **October 14 2013** to allow time for any final adjustments. This will be challenging given the high volume of activity at the beginning of the academic year and so it is recommended that work continue intensively during the summer for those Schools (re-)submitting in November 2013 (AHP, BIO, MED, NSC). An initial project plan is shown at Appendix 4

3.2 BioSciences Institutes

A meeting is scheduled with the Athena lead at the John Innes Centre on May 9th (verbal update to be given at Committee Meeting) whose application for Bronze as an Institute has been given a deadline in July 2013. It is anticipated that this will be the first of many links and information and experience will be exchanged in a spirit of mutual support.

3.3 National developments

The ECU has been piloting a separate standard based on Athena for non-STEMM subjects. The School of Political, Social and International Studies has expressed an interest in taking forward work on gender equality as has the School of Law. While the Office cannot provide a high level of support due to the prioritisation of STEMM subjects it will provide information, advice and guidance to these Schools to help them move initiatives forward in the interests of gender equality, particularly where initiatives in STEMM Schools begin to take effect.

It is also likely that ECU will launch a sister standard to Athena for the development of race equality. No date has been announced for this yet.

Letter of Endorsement

Positive	Negative
Senior level commitment and ambition shown (UEA Bronze)	Integration of Athena Swan into School's overall strategy and leadership process less clear (MED Nov 2012)
Integration of Athena Swan with wider strategy (UEA Bronze)	
Personal enthusiasm and organisational context shown (MED Nov 2012)	

Self Assessment Process

Positive	Negative
Self Assessment Team alongside core contact group was positive (UEA Bronze)	More male participation recommended (UEA Bronze)
Composition generally praised along with Senior Staff involvement (UEA Bronze)	More clarification of the future plans for the SAT to meet was needed (UEA Bronze)
Good level of consultation demonstrated (UEA Bronze)	Time-frame for Self Assessment Process was too short (MED Nov 2012)
Lead people had been identified in progressing both application and Action Plan (MED Nov 2012)	Wider consultation needed as part of process (MED 2012)
Diverse membership praised (MED 2012)	Reporting structure was unclear (MED 2012)

Description of University or Department

Positive	Negative
Data presentation mostly clear (UEA Bronze)	In some places Panel felt data presentation not clear (UEA Bronze)
Panel appreciated detailed turnover data, in particular higher proportion of women than men leaving senior lecturer/reader posts (UEA Bronze)	Questioned why International Development had been classed as a STEMM subject (UEA Bronze)
Impressed with equal pay data and that number of gaps had been falling (UEA Bronze)	Indications of numbers would have been helpful throughout to help Panel judge significance (UEA Bronze)
Narrative and analysis was coherent (UEA Bronze)	Labelling of numbers and percentages should have been consistent throughout application (MED Nov 2012)
Praised fact that School level data was presented (UEA Bronze)	Not possible to judge extent of issues with data in its current form and advised data be broken down by grade throughout application (MED Nov 2012)
Labelling of both numbers and percentages on some graphs was useful (MED Nov 2012)	Analysis too superficial but did directly signpost to actions (MED Nov 2012)
Praised disaggregation of data between ATR and ATS contracts (MED Nov 2012)	

Supporting and Advancing Women's Careers

Positive	Negative
Co-opting experienced individuals from other areas for recruitment panels into areas where not many women to avoid over-burdening women in areas where there are few, was praised (UEA Bronze)	Numbers as well as percentages would have been useful re women recruited since 2009 (UEA Bronze)
RESNet praised and commended as an area of noteworthy good practice (UEA Bronze)	Panel would have liked to have known the frequency of appraisals (UEA Bronze)
Panel generally felt support for researchers was good (UEA Bronze)	Section on Organisation and Culture had actions in Plan but these were not highlighted in the text (UEA Bronze)
Impressed with the appraisal training to ensure research staff career development is discussed and that there is a specialist career advisor for research staff – moving forward noted it would be important to monitor effectiveness of provision (UEA Bronze)	Error noted in Table6 (percentages over 100% in total) (UEA Bronze)
Development of mentoring scheme for returners from maternity/adoption leave was seen as a good idea and praised as noteworthy good practice (UEA Bronze)	Low female representation on Committees especially those for Promotion, needs to be addressed urgently (UEA Bronze)
Keeping record of women's media appearances was praised but Panel not sure how this was disseminated or how women were encouraged to do this (UEA Bronze)	Data broken down too far to draw useful conclusions (MED Nov 2012) (NB potential inconsistency with the comment immediately below)
Commitment to investigate rate of staff leaving was welcomed (UEA Bronze)	Data should be broken down by grade as much as possible in order to be helpful in identifying leak in pipeline (MED Nov 2012)
Application showed good induction support and commended the research forum for women in science. (MED Nov 2012)	Three years data better shown on one graph to show trends effectively (MED Nov 2012)
Idea for women staff's advisory group was well received but Panel would have liked more detail able reporting mechanisms. (MED Nov 2012)	Application showed some awareness of areas of possible concern for the School but these lacked connection to either the data or the action plan (MED Nov 2012)
Panel pleased to see mention of informal consultation with staff but there were no results or actions from this and these should have been embedded throughout the application (MED Nov 2012)	Identification of current workload issues had been identified but there were no initiatives to address these (MED Nov 2012)
Some proactivity on maternity and flexible working was noted but see opposite comment (MED Nov 2012)	Maternity return rate data was lacking and flexible working request data was analysed by gender (MED Nov 2012)
	Data presentation outweighed analysis and narrative – noted data should support discussion not replace it (MED Nov 2012)

Any other comments

Positive	Negative
Pleased School had noted they were on the beginning of a journey and were conscious of how the journey should begin (MED Nov 2012)	Once a proportion of the work outlined had been completed a bronze application would be timelier (MED Nov 2012)

Action Plan

Did address the issues identified in the submission (UEA Bronze)	Somewhat lacking in ambition (UEA Bronze)
Actions around appraisal and promotion were praised (UEA Bronze)	Responsibilities could have been spread more widely – actions centred on E&D Team and HR – would have benefitted from more STEMM input (UEA Bronze)
	Panel found it difficult to link the findings of the SAT laid out in the body of the application and the actions in the Action Plan (MED Nov 2012)
	Felt actions in Plan were mostly generic and not specific enough to women – simply just good management practice (MED Nov 2012)
	Allocating responsibility to groups was not helpful (MED Nov 2012)
	Concerned by the very short time frame covered by Action Plan which should prioritise actions across three years (MED Nov 2012)

Final Comments

Good foundations in place but evidently much work to be done (UEA Bronze)	Committees in particular require proactive attention (UEA Bronze)
ResNet mentioned as noteworthy good practice (MED Nov 2012)	Future submissions must take account of word counts (UEA Bronze)
	Information about Self Assessment Team's work life balance should be noted (UEA Bronze)
	Self assessment process had been too short for an application to be made and as a result limited reflection or analysis and a focus in the action plan on data collection which would have been better completed before application was made (MED Nov 2012)
	Panel recommended SAT use consultation and qualitative data to support future applications (MED Nov 2012)
	Current application did not represent a baseline or living document from which the SAT could work (MED Nov 2012)
	Would like to see more senior buy-in in future applications (MED Nov 2012)

	Submission (School, level, date):						
	Individual Reports required:			First Action		Checked by:	
	Student Data		Source of Raw Data	Initials	Date	Initials	Date
1	Numbers of males/females on access or foundation courses	3 years	ARM/Matt Gooch via SITS				
2	Undergraduate male and female numbers full time - UEA	3 years	Discoverer				
3	Undergraduate male and female numbers part time - UEA	3 years	Discoverer				
4	Undergraduate male and female numbers full time - National	3 years	From HEIDI national database				
5	Undergraduate male and female numbers part time - National	3 years	From HEIDI national database				
6	Postgraduate Taught male and female numbers full time - UEA	3 years	Discoverer				
7	Postgraduate Taught male and female numbers part time - UEA	3 years	Discoverer				
8	Postgraduate Taught male and female numbers full time - National	3 years	From HEIDI national database				
9	Postgraduate Taught male and female numbers part time - National	3 years	From HEIDI national database				
10	Postgraduate Research male and female numbers full time - UEA	3 years	Discoverer				
11	Postgraduate Research male and female numbers part time - UEA	3 years	Discoverer				
12	Postgraduate Research male and female numbers full time - National	3 years	From HEIDI national database				
13	Postgraduate Research male and female numbers part time - National	3 years	From HEIDI national database				

	Individual Reports required:			First Action by		Checked by	
	Ratio of course applications to offers and acceptances by gender for :			Initials	Date	Initials	Date
14	Undergraduate	3 years	Matt Gooch from SITS				
15	Postgraduate Taught	3 years	Matt Gooch from SITS				
16	Postgraduate Research	3 years	Matt Gooch from SITS				
17	Degree Classification by Gender	3 years	Adam Green - BIU				
	Staff Data						
18	Female/male ratio of academic and research staff	3 years	Stuart Gascoyne				
19	Turnover by grade and gender	3 years	Stuart Gascoyne				
20	Job application and success rates by gender and grade	3 years	Stuart Gascoyne				
21	Applications for promotion and success rates by gender and grade	3 years	Stuart Gascoyne/Schools				
22	Male and female representation on Committees	3 years	Schools				
23	Female:male ratio of academic and research staff on fixed term contracts and open ended (permanent) contracts	3 years	Stuart Gascoyne				
24	Maternity return rate	3 years	Kate Whistlecraft				
25	Paternity, adoption and parental leave uptake	3 years	Kate Whistlecraft				
26	Numbers of applications and success rates for flexible working by gender and grade	3 years	Kate Whistlecraft				

1 Submission Details

School: _____
 Level of Award Application _____
 Working to Guidance Dated: _____
 Copy Attached Initials: ____

 Athena Swan Lead: _____
 Tel: _____
 Email: _____

2 Self Assessment Team

S.A.T. Formed Date _____
 Dates Met Date _____
 Date _____
 Date _____
 Date _____
 Date _____

3 Deadlines Set

Deadline to School for Final Draft Date: _____
 Deadline to Print Date: _____
 Deadline ECU Date: _____
 Deadline Email Date: _____
 Deadline Hardcopies Date: _____
 Arrangements for Courier: _____

4 Action Plan Checks

Timescales initials _____
 'SMART'ness initials _____
 Balance of Plan initials _____
 Gender Focussed initials _____

 Actions Cross Ref'd to Text initials _____

5 Final Submission Stage

Word Count Checked initials _____
 Index Created – Pages initials _____
 All Action Points Highlighted in text initials _____

 All Actions in Text Included in Action Plan initials _____

 Tables Numbered Correctly initials _____
 Graphs Numbered Correctly initials _____
 Tables Cross Referenced to Text Correctly initials _____
 Graphs Cross Referenced to Text Correctly initials _____

1st Sign Off: initials _____

2nd Sign Off: initials _____

6 Circulation for Approval

HoS Date _____ Rec'd _____
 School Lead Date _____ Rec'd _____
 Dean Date _____ Rec'd _____
 HR Manager Date _____ Rec'd _____
 HR Director Date _____ Rec'd _____
 P.V.C Date _____ Rec'd _____

7 Print Schedule

Booked with Printers initials _____
 Deadline Date: _____
 Colour _____
 Black & White _____

8 Sent To

Sent to Print Date: _____
 Sent ECU Date: _____
 Sent by Email Date: _____
 Sent Hardcopies Date: _____

Appendix 4 Initial Project Plan – Next Stages

Initial Project Plan - Athena Swan Submissions	06/05/2013	13/05/2013	20/05/2013	27/05/2013	03/06/2013	10/06/2013	17/06/2013	24/06/2013	01/07/2013	08/07/2013	15/07/2013	22/07/2013	29/07/2013	05/08/2013	12/08/2013	19/08/2013	26/08/2013	02/09/2013	09/09/2013	16/09/2013	23/09/2013	30/09/2013	07/10/2013	14/10/2013	21/10/2013	28/10/2013	04/11/2013	11/11/2013	18/11/2013	25/11/2013	
Meetings of all Self Assessment Teams to take place frequently to steer actions within existing plans and develop work for next submission Stage																															
Central Steering Group Meetings (x 5)																															
Data retrieval for 2012 figures																															
Populate templates with data tables/including quality checks																															
Share templates with Schools																															
E&D Office work with Schools on drafts																															
Final Drafts to be ready from Schools																															
Central Steering Group to comment on Final Drafts																															
Circulation to HR, Deans, PVC etc																															
E&D Office work with Schools and others on final changes																															
Final Sign-off of final copy																															
Submission to ECU																															
Hard copies to Print																															
Hard copies despatched by courier to ECU																															