



**SBCS Athena SWAN self-assessment team
Notes of meeting held
21st April 2016, 14.00-15.30**

Present: Angelika Stollewerk, Monique Arthur, Kim Warren, Petra Ungerer, Rachel O’Callaghan, Andrew Hirst, Helen Fitton, Sandra Brown, Stuart Cadby, Janelle Jones, Georgia Tsagkogeorga, Alan McElligott

Notes: Sarah Heskett

Action summary

3.1	HF to discuss an ‘SBCS Experts’ section for the website with her PR manager in relation to what is taking place centrally across the College.	HF
3.2	Sandra Brown to consult with the Westfield nursery manager to get more information on provision for staff, how places are allocated and how this is advertised and report back at the next meeting.	SB
5.1	AS to meet with Beth, Natalie and Tiina to go over their case studies.	AS
8.1	SH and GT to discuss a time to run a postdoc mentoring training session and SH to contact Rui to arrange.	SH>
9.1	Sandra to circulate details of London networking Athena Swan event to AS.	SB
10.1	HF and GT to discuss actions for ‘promoting positive role models and attracting and supporting female students’.	AS

1. Apologies:

Maxi Roessler, Fiona Marsh, Beth Clare, Matthew Evans, Richard Pickersgill, Sarah Heskett.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes were accepted.

3. Matters arising and actions from the previous meeting

- 2.1 - SH to finalise a representative from the admin team to join the Committee. This was done and Stuart Cadby was welcomed as the Committees admin representative.
- 3.3 - ME to provide AS with the number of female promotion applications out of the total number of applications along with the percentage of success. This was done.

- 3.4 - HF to consider developing the website to include a section on ‘SBCS Experts’ where male and female colleagues are encouraged to engage with the media. HF informed the Committee that the College’s central PR team are working on implementing something similar that this is an objective that is underway and ongoing. Rather than duplicate content HF agreed to discuss this with her PR manager and see if this is something that could be worked on together. **[ACTION: HF]**
- 3.5 - AS to raise the issue subsidy and availability of places for staff at Westfield nursery at the next College Athena Swan meeting. It was agreed that Sandra Brown would consult with the nursery manager to get more information on provision for staff, how places are allocated and how this is advertised and report back at the next meeting. **[ACTION: SB]**

4. New members

The following new members were introduced to the Committee: Petra Ungerer – technical representative, Stuart Cadby – admin representative and Rachel O’Callaghan – Cell and Molecular Biology representative.

5. Case studies

AS informed the Committee that Natalie Lebrasseur, Tiina Eilola and Beth Clare have agreed provide case studies for the application. Beth has agreed to write her case study first to provide an example for the others. AS will meet with all three to go over them in May. **[ACTION: AS to meet with Beth, Natalie and Tiina to go over their case studies]**

6. Student data

Monique Arthur has now supplied all the SBCS data; both in terms of the School as a whole and broken down by departments, covering the last five years. This has been submitted to Fiona Marsh. In terms of benchmarking, Monique has extracted three years’ worth of data. The outstanding two year’s worth are on a different system and are more difficult to gather. However, Sandra Brown advised that it is advisable to have five years of benchmark data in order to better identify and demonstrate where changes have occurred over time.

Sandra updated the committee on plans to provide standard Athena Swan data packs for use by Schools College wide. The packs will provide a template which can be used in preparing applications and which meet ECU requirements for the various awards being applied for. These should be ready in time to be considered at the next SAT meeting.

7. Staff data

The staff data was not ready. AS reported that she has some data but as it is incomplete it will be looked at the next meeting.

8. Postdoc mentoring

SH met recently with Rui Pires Martins. He and colleagues are planning an S&E-wide mentoring programme. Rui informed SH that postdoc mentoring has been established in SEMS and SPA but is very much in its infancy and is actually less developed than what currently exists in SBCS.

Rui confirmed that he would be happy to provide a 1-2 hour session with SBCS mentors and mentees. People would get the opportunity to ask questions about the scheme, and Rui would suggest some models and approaches to coaching and mentoring that may be of use. **[ACTION: SH and GT to discuss a time to run a training session and SH to contact Rui to arrange]**

Of the 45 postdocs currently working in SBCS there are 11 established mentor/mentee pairings – which is more than the rest of the Faculty. SH will continue facilitating these pairings going forward.

To help measure the impact of mentoring, Rui is working on a feedback survey for the mentees/mentors in SPA and SEMS and he will send the link to SH for SBCS use when this is.

GT reported that peer mentoring has been raised as something that some postdocs would like to see implemented. Some feel that being able to talk informally and bounce ideas off one another would be more beneficial than academic-postdoc mentoring. It was suggested that the coffee meetings that GT initiated could function as a forum for informal peer mentoring.

GT reported that another Postdoc, has joined the Research Strategy Group (RSG) and suggested that this representative could join the Athena Swan coffee sessions to report on what is going on at the RSG. This could be developed into a networking event occurring roughly every 3 months. GT could take the notes and action points from SAT meetings and the same could be done for the RSG, thus, providing the postdoc community with useful and relevant information. This may also result in increased attendance. It was established that a postdoc other than GT should take on responsibility for organising this.

9. Old and new action plan

AS had circulated the old and new action plan prior to the meeting. One item has been changed on the old action plan and AS has generally tidied up. AS asked the SAT to see if there are any other changes or additions to be made and report back if needed.

The new action plans retains the different columns that were used in the old plan as these provided a useful means of seeing what has been done, what remains to be done and which members are responsible for which aspects.

Identifying best practice

AS informed the Committee that identifying best practice should become a greater focus especially if planning to apply for the Gold award in the future. Suggestions for identifying best practice included:

- Inviting one or two experts on gender and equality to speak at departmental seminars. It was agreed that this would be a good initiative and would be particularly important for departments who struggle to achieve gender balance in seminar speakers. It was recognised that there are problems around gender balance in seminar series, as speakers are suggested by academics and the seminar series coordinator then has to pick based on the individuals put forward. AS will ask the coordinators to reiterate the importance of suggesting a balance of male and female speakers when they email staff for suggestions for next year.
- Greater involvement in London gender diversity networking events. Sharing best practice means it is important to be aware of what other UoL institutions are involved in. Sandra mentioned a practical practitioner's event which has recently been opened up to SAT members. This is a very recent development and Sandra will circulate details of this to the various SAT Chairs. **[ACTION: Sandra Brown]**
- A College wide Athena Swan Champions Network event has been established. The first meeting will take place on the 27th April. The network will provide an opportunity to share best practice across QM. The first meeting will be semiformal and introduce terms of reference. Meetings will be chaired by Sandra Brown until a regular Chair is found. Sandra would like to see at least three member's from each SAT attending each of the meetings. The first meeting will provide an opportunity to look at how the members would like the meetings to be structured and how frequently they will occur.

Establishing the Athena Swan initiative

Establishing the Athena Swan initiative and communication of Athena Swan is another area that needs attention. The Committee have been active in implementing some initiatives such as providing reports for the School Committee Meeting, a stronger presence on the web and in the newsletter and representation across all levels of the School. However, there are continuing issues to address. Suggestions to address these included:

- Developing induction material to show students at induction week. VSG feedback at a previous meeting that it would be good to have something targeted and specific for UGs educating them on Athena issues surrounding equality and gender which are relevant to them. The same could be done at PhD level.
- Implementing biannual surveys to demonstrate whether knowledge of Athena Swan is increasing.
- To gain greater exposure in the School, GT suggested that the SAT should aim to have a short slot at School events such as PhD conferences, staff away days, research away days and so on. A member could speak for 5-10 minutes on current Athena Swan initiatives and activities. HF was asked to keep the SAT up-to-date on when events like this are scheduled.

10. Application – data analysis and who writes which part

It was agreed that GT and HF take responsibility for the ‘**Promoting positive role models and attracting and supporting female students**’ part of the application. HF to be responsible for ensuring School literature and photos on the website feature a balance of male and female staff and students. HF and GT were asked to discuss actions that could address this section. **[ACTION: HF and GT]**

Sandra Brown reminded the Committee that it is important to have an overall narrative in addition to the different action points that have been established. While actions are based on the problems the Committee have encountered so far and which arose from staff feedback, it was recognised that once all the data becomes available changes and adaptations might need to be made.

Paragraphs

1. **Account of the Self Assessment process** – AS
2. **A picture of the department** – FM
3. **Student data** – FM
4. **Staff data** – All
5. **Presenting the data** – All
6. **Explaining the data** – All

Once all the data is available the SAT will need to decide who writes which part of the application – this will be decided at the next meeting. There are areas where certain people have more experience - for example it would make sense for BC and MR to write the section on flexible working. However, other aspects are less clear. AS asked the SAT to think about which aspects of the application they would be best placed to contribute to and it was agreed that newer members would work with members who have previous experience. The SAT were asked

to look at old applications and other silver applications and think about what paragraphs they would be comfortable writing.

The importance of getting a completed draft as soon as possible was recognised as it will inevitably take some time to put together the final version following the initial draft.

11. Any other business

There was none.

12. Date of next meeting

SH to circulate doodle poll for a meeting at the end of May.