

Appendix II

Athena Swan Survey 2021 - The Numbers

DNR = Did not Respond

A. Respondent demographics

N=79 respondents (71 with complete data) – This is an increase of 20% for complete responses from 2019 (i.e., 12 more people)

Gender: 29 female, 30 male, 10 Prefer not to say, 10 DNR

Sexual Orientation: 1 Bisexual; 5 Homosexual; 50 Heterosexual; 1 Queer; 12 Prefer Not to Say; 10 DNR

Age: 16 people 26-35, 27 people 36-45, 20 people 46-55, 6 people 56 and above, 10 DNR

Work: 63 Full-time, 5 Part-time, 1 Prefer not to say, 10 DNR

Role: 1 PDRA, 18 Lecturers, 13 Senior Lecturers, 4 Readers, 4 Professor, 5 Professional-Services 1-4, 3 Professional Services 5-7; 1 Technical-Services 1-4, 4 Technical-Services 5-6, 2 Other, 14 Prefer Not to say, 10 DNR

Current contract: 65 Permanent/open-ended, 4 Fixed-term/Temporary, 10 DNR

Post Description: 48 Non-clinical academic, 16 Professional services or technical staff, 15 DNR

Time in current job: 10 0-2 years, 24 3-5 years, 16 5-10 years, 9 11-20 years, 4 21+ years; 16 DNR

Caring responsibilities: 30 Yes, 19 No, 4 Prefer not to say, 6 DNR

1A. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Initiatives

On average, respondents agreed that they were aware of EDI initiatives in SBCS ($M=5.32$, $SD=1.72$). This is an increase from 2019 ($M=5.02$) but not quite at levels of the previous surveys (2017: $M=5.96$; 2015: $M=6.00$).

On average, respondents said that 8 EDI aims were important to them ($M=8.29$, $SD=4.89$). This is an increase from 2019 (~7 important aims, $M=6.71$).

Important aims

- Seminars and meetings held in core hours – 43 Yes (2019: 32)
- Mentoring encouraged for all staff – 30 Yes (2019: 33)
- Gender balance when arranging seminar series – 32 Yes (2019: 25)
- **Improved gender balance at all levels** – 56 Yes (2019: 37)
- **Improved BAME representation at all levels** – 57 Yes (2019: 36)
- **Improved gender balance in decision making committees** – 51 Yes (2019: 34)
- **Improved BAME representation in decision making committees** – 52 Yes (2019: 31)
- Improved gender balance in recruitment panels – 42 Yes (2019: 30)
- Improved BAME representation in recruitment panels – 45 Yes (2019: 27)
- Support career advancement for women – 39 Yes (2019: 28)
- Menopause guidelines – 24 Yes (2019: 19)
- Parental leave – 36 Yes (2019: 35)
- Part-time and flexible working – 48 Yes (2019: 29)
- Other – 5 Yes (2019: 2)
- **Mental Health & Well-being – 50 (New option)**
- Anti-harassment & bully – 45 (New option)

For 'Other', people said to avoid overwhelming a minority/female staff to achieve gender balance on panels; gaslighting behaviour from managers should not be tolerated; LGBTQ+ in all the above; student inclusion and diversity.

On average, respondents agreed that they support Athena Swan and EDI initiatives in SBCS ($M=6.08$, $SD=1.19$). There is general support for the Athena Swan initiative; **Increase from the last survey bringing rating in line with previous surveys** (2019: $M=5.69$, $SD=1.44$; 2017: $M=6.36$, $SD=.93$; 2015: $M=6.17$).

On average, respondents agreed that EDI initiatives are effectively communicated in SBCS ($M=5.43$, $SD=1.46$). **This is an increase from 2019: $M=4.71$, $SD=1.46$** , which brings ratings in line with previous surveys (2017: $M=5.45$, $SD=1.31$; 2015: $M=4.44$, $SD=1.42$).

On average, respondents slightly agreed that SBCS addressed the EDI initiatives that are important to me $M=4.91$, $SD=1.45$ (2019: $M=4.71$, $SD=1.50$).

On average, respondents disagreed that AS and EDI initiatives in SBCS are irrelevant for me $M=2.27$, $SD=1.34$. **This is a decrease from 2019: $M=2.81$, $SD=1.83$** .

On average, respondents slightly agreed that SBCS' EDI initiatives have improved working conditions for all staff $M=4.53$, $SD=1.44$. This is a slight increase from 2019 ($M=4.40$, $SD=1.42$).

On average, respondents were neutral that because of its EDI initiatives, they see SBCS is an inclusive workplace ($M=4.88$, $SD=1.43$).

Gender differences?

There were gender differences in perceptions of initiative irrelevance only. This is a change from 2019 where trends were also seen for gender differences in perceived importance and support in addition to relevance. **Encouragingly, men and women both agree that SBCS addresses the EDI initiatives that are important to them and generally support EDI initiative in SBCS.**

2021: No difference (Women: $M=4.86$, $SD=1.53$, Men: $M=4.90$, $SD=1.31$; $t(56)=-.087$, $p=.931$).

2019: Women agreed more that SBCS addressed the EDI initiatives that were important to them ($M=5.29$, $SD=1.57$) relative to men ($M=4.45$, $SD=1.31$; $t(46)=1.98$, $p=.053$).

2021: Men disagreed less that EDI initiatives were irrelevant for me ($M=2.59$, $SD=1.43$) relative to women ($M=1.90$, $SD=1.50$; $t(56)=2.10$, $p=.040$).

2019: Men disagreed less that AS and EDI initiatives were irrelevant for me ($M=3.34$, $SD=1.63$) relative to women ($M=1.31$, $SD=.60$; $t(43.46)=-6.22$, $p<.001$).

***This difference has become smaller since the last survey**

2021: No difference (Women: $M=6.21$, $SD=1.26$, Men: $M=5.93$, $SD=1.31$; $t(56)=-.817$, $p=.418$).

2019: Women marginally agreed more that they supported AS and EDI initiatives in SBCS ($M=6.25$, $SD=1.18$) relative to men ($M=5.53$, $SD=1.39$; $t(46)=1.77$, $p=.083$).

1B. Perceived impact of workplace EDI

On average respondents were neutral in seeing SBCS as an inclusive workplace because of its EDI initiatives $M=4.88$, $SD=1.43$. **This is a slight increase from the last survey** (2019: $M=4.77$, $SD=1.59$)

On average, respondents slightly agreed that EDI initiatives have created a supportive and collegial environment in SBCS $M=4.92$, $SD=1.48$. **This is an increase from the last survey** (2019: $M=4.64$, $SD=1.48$)

On average, respondents slightly disagreed that EDI initiatives in SBCS are ineffective at addressing workplace inequalities $M=3.55$, $SD=1.44$. **There was no change from the last survey** (2019: $M=3.53$, $SD=1.46$)

Gender differences? There were no gender differences in 2021 or 2019.

2. Staff Treatment

On average, respondents slightly agreed that in SBCS, staff are treated on their merits, irrespective of gender $M=5.05$, $SD=1.30$. **This is a decrease from 2019:** $M=5.25$, $SD=1.61$.

On average, respondents slightly agreed that in SBCS, staff are treated on their merits, irrespective of protected characteristics, $M=5.10$, $SD=1.41$; **This is a decrease from 2019:** $M=5.53$, $SD=1.40$.

On average, participants disagreed that they had experienced a situation where they had felt uncomfortable because of their gender, $M=2.56$, $SD=1.79$. **This is slightly higher than in 2019:** $M=2.13$, $SD=1.86$). [2017: $M=2.22$, $SD=1.67$ = Same as the 2015 survey].

On average, participants disagreed that they had experienced a situation where they had felt uncomfortable because of a protected characteristic, $M=2.65$, $SD=1.79$. **This is slightly higher than 2019:** $M=2.33$, $SD=2.11$). [2017: $M=2.23$, $SD=1.80$ = Same as the 2015 survey].

49% of respondents indicated that they would report if they were treated unfairly or discriminated against on the basis of gender. **This is an increase from 34% in 2019.**

52% of respondents indicated that they would report if they were treated unfairly or discriminated against due to a protected characteristic. **This is an increase from 42% in 2019.**

78% of respondents have undertaken unconscious bias training. This is a small increase from 76% in 2019.

Report and Support *New question

60% of respondents are aware of the Report + Support initiative to reduce bullying and harassment (23% unaware, 11% unsure, 6% DNR).

Gender differences?

As in 2019, there were gender differences in the experience of a situation where the respondent has felt uncomfortable because of their gender. **Notably these experiences are decreasing for women.**

2021: Men disagreed more that they have had an experience where they felt uncomfortable because of their gender ($M=1.77$, $SD=1.01$) relative to women ($M=2.66$, $SD=1.90$; $t(42.31)=-2.24$, $p=.031$).

2019: Men disagreed more that they have had an experience where they felt uncomfortable because of their gender ($M=1.56$, $SD=1.01$) relative to women ($M=3.22$, $SD=2.53$; $t(20.11)=2.66$, $p=.015$).

3A. Workplace culture

On average, respondents checked off 4 workplace descriptors ($M=4.11$, $SD=2.31$)

Workplace descriptors

- **Supportive** – 43 Yes (2019: 43, 2017: 28, 2015: 30)
- Inclusive – 33 Yes (2019: 31; 2017: 27, 2015: 13)
- Miserable – 4 Yes (2019: 5; 2017: 20, 2015: 7)
- **Demotivating** – 20 Yes (2019: 15)
- **Competitive** – 24 Yes (2019: 19; 2017: 20, 2015: 15)
- **Happy** – 26 Yes (2019: 18; 2017: 15, 2015: 9)
- **Welcoming** – 43 Yes (2019: 37; 2017: 26, 2015: 21)
- Macho – 6 Yes (2019: 6; 2017: 7, 2015: 5)
- Cliques – 14 Yes (2019: 12; 2017: 14, 2015: 18)
- Rewarding – 16 Yes (2019: 8)
- **Pressurized** – 40 Yes (2019: 36; 2017: 33, 2015: 32)
- **Stressful** – 46 Yes (2019: 28)
- Sexist – 1 Yes (2019: 4; 2017: 2, 2015: 4)
- Racist – 0 Yes (2019: 1;)
- Other – 9 Yes (2019: 6; 2017: 4, 2015: 4) (Collegiate, Friendly, good core – impacted by college, hierarchical, isolating, money-oriented, old-boy's network, unrewarding, punitive (probation))

3B. Workplace Bullying, Harassment & Exclusion (New questions)

On average, participants disagreed that during their time in SBCS they had experienced bullying in the workplace, $M=2.83$, $SD=1.96$

On average, participants disagreed that during their time in SBCS they had experienced harassment in the workplace, $M=2.63$, $SD=1.80$

On average, participants disagreed that during their time in SBCS they had experienced exclusion in the workplace, $M=2.83$, $SD=1.77$

3C. Workplace Challenges resulting from COVID (New questions)

43% of respondents indicated that they have caring responsibilities (43% No, 4% Prefer Not to Say; 10% DNR)

On average, participants slightly agreed that they had difficulties balancing their work responsibilities during the pandemic, $M=5.19$, $SD=1.82$

On average, participants slightly agreed that they had difficulties balancing their caring responsibilities during the pandemic, $M=4.54$, $SD=1.93$

On average, participants were neutral that they felt supported by SBCS to cope with the challenges posed by the pandemic, $M=4.10$, $SD=1.96$

During the pandemic, we have had online training in SBCS (e.g., blended teaching) *New question

- 25 - Attend regularly (32%)
- 31 - Attend occasionally (39%)
- 7 - Choose not to attend (9%)
- 6 - Not attend because unaware of training (8%)
- 10 - DNR (13%)

Were you employed at SBCS before the pandemic? *New question

- 69 – Yes (87.3%)
- 5 – No (6.3%)
- 5 – DNR (6.3%)

Before the pandemic, we had social and networking events in SBCS *Re-worded questions

- 15 – Yes, and I attend regularly (2019: 9)
- 38 – Yes, and I attend occasionally (2019: 33)**
- 5 – Yes, but I am unable to attend (Organized at the wrong time) (2019: 6)
- 4 - Yes, and I choose not to attend (2019: 4)
- 2 – No, but I wish we had them (2019: 2)
- 2 - No, and I would not want to attend (2019: 2)
- 3 – DNR (2019: 13)

On average, respondents slightly agreed that before the pandemic they enjoyed SBCS social and/or networking events, $M= 5.36$, $SD=1.06$ (2019: $M= 4.74$, $SD=1.68$)

On average, respondents slightly agreed that before the pandemic SBCS social and/or networking events promote inclusion $M= 4.94$, $SD=1.27$ (2019: $M= 4.72$, $SD=1.55$)

On average, respondents slightly agreed that SBCS social and/or networking events contributed to their well-being $M= 4.74$, $SD=1.44$ (2019: $M= 4.19$, $SD=1.88$)

It seems that the absence of these events have made people recall them slightly more fondly relative to the previous survey.

Before the pandemic, we had social and/or networking events in my department *Re-worded questions

- 18 – Yes, and I attend regularly
- 26 – Yes, and I attend occasionally**
- 3 – Yes, but I am unable to attend (Organized at the wrong time)
- 1 - Yes, and I choose not to attend
- 3 – No, but I wish we had them
- 2 - No, and I would not want to attend
- 6 - DNR

On average, respondents slightly agreed that before the pandemic they enjoyed departmental social and/or networking events $M= 5.10$, $SD=1.34$ (2019: $M= 5.32$, $SD=1.45$)

On average, respondents slightly agreed that before the pandemic departmental social and/or networking events promote inclusion $M= 4.95$, $SD=1.06$ (2019: $M= 5.33$, $SD=1.37$)

On average, respondents slightly agreed that departmental social and/or networking events contributed to their well-being $M= 4.94$, $SD=1.42$ (2019: $M= 4.77$, $SD=1.86$)

Successes and achievements are celebrated in SBCS

- 42 – Yes (2019: 28)** Increase from 2019 (now 53%)
- 1 – No (2019: 1)
- 20 – Sometimes but not every time (2019: 19)
- 7 – Sometimes, but only for certain people (2019: 9)
- 9– DNR (2019: 2)

Successes and achievements are celebrated in my department

36 – Yes (2019: 24; 2017: 23, 2015: 6)

5 – No (2019: 3; 2017: 7, 2015: 2)

17 – Sometimes but not every time (2019: 24; 2017: 19, 2015: 25)

9 – Sometimes, but only for certain people (2019: 4; 2017: 6, 2015: 13)

12 – DNR (2019: 4, 2017: 2, 2015: 1)

The school is improving in recognizing successes and achievements. This is also happening in departments. More could be done in both.

Gender differences?

None (looked at the perceived enjoyment, inclusion and well-being at SBCS and departments)

4. Visibility and Representation

On average, respondents slightly agreed that they saw SBCS as a diverse and inclusive workplace, $M= 5.14$, $SD=1.43$ (2019: $M= 5.39$, $SD=1.16$)

On average, respondents slightly agreed that when they look around SBCS, they see diverse and inclusive images, $M= 4.75$, $SD=1.57$ (2019: $M= 4.68$, $SD=1.50$)

On average, respondents slightly agreed that SBCS promotional materials showcase diversity and inclusion, $M= 5.16$, $SD=1.16$ (2019: $M= 5.14$, $SD=1.35$).

Gender differences?

None (2019: None)

5. Promotion and Progression

On average, respondents were neutral that career advancement information was effectively communicated in SBCS $M=4.51$, $SD=1.69$ (2019: $M=3.89$, $SD=1.58$).

On average, respondents were neutral that support for career advancement is provided in SBCS, $M=4.22$, $SD=1.68$ (2019: $M=3.98$, $SD=1.66$).

On average, respondents were neutral that decisions about progression within SBCS were fair and transparent, $M=3.99$, $SD=1.60$ (2019: $M=3.57$, $SD=1.63$).

On average, respondents were neutral that decisions about promotions within SBCS were fair and transparent, $M=3.96$, $SD=1.71$ (2019: $M=3.50$, $SD=1.73$).

Perceptions of promotion and progression have slightly improved since the last survey. Notably, there is almost slight agreement (i.e., greater than 4.5) that career advancement information is effectively communicated.

Gender differences?

None* (2019: None)

*There is a trend in the 2021 data ($p=.135$) that men slightly agree that career info is effectively communicated ($M=5.10$, $SD=1.50$) relative to women ($M=4.50$, $SD=1.50$) – will need to monitor this from now to the next survey.

6. Workload responsibilities and distributions

On average, respondents slightly disagreed that the workload model in SBCS is transparent, $M=3.56$, $SD=1.66$ (2019: $M=3.51$, $SD=1.76$; 2017: $M=3.58$, $SD=1.82$) **No change since 2017 – have not been able to shift this appreciably in 6 years – really need to do something about this.**

On average, respondents slightly disagreed that the workload model in SBCS is fair, $M=3.55$, $SD=1.50$ (2019: $M=3.54$, $SD=1.58$; 2017: $M=3.30$, $SD=1.60$). **No change from 2019.**

On average, respondents were neutral that they had a say in their allocation to different workload roles and responsibilities, $M=4.17$, $SD=1.83$ (2019: $M=3.82$, $SD=1.75$; 2017: $M=3.52$, $SD=1.76$) **Steady improvement over last 6 years**

On average, respondents slightly disagreed that there is a regular rotation of workload roles and responsibilities, $M=3.71$, $SD=1.47$ (2019: $M=3.32$, $SD=1.62$; 2017: $M=2.82$, $SD=1.48$). **Steady improvement over last 6 years – need to get this to at least neutral.**

AP 3.4.

Gender differences?

None in 2021.

In 2019, Women disagreed more strongly that the workload model in SBCS was transparent ($M=2.38$, $SD=1.66$) relative to men ($M=3.80$, $SD=1.69$; $t(43)=-2.55$, $p=.014$).