SBCS Athena SWAN self-assessment team
Notes of meeting held
22nd June 2016, 12.00-14.00

Present:
Georgia Tsagkogeora [GT], Kim Warren [KW], Helen Fitton [HF], Stuart Cadby [SC], Fiona Marsh [FM], Angelika Stollewerk [AS], Richard Pickersgill [RWP], Vicky Byers [VB]

Notes: Sarah Heskett

Action summary

3.1	AS to ask Sunita to gather data on paternity, adoption and parental leave and flexible working	AS
3.2	SH to gather data on male/female representation on the different SBCS Committees and HF to up-date the website accordingly.	SH&HF
3.3	Vicky to speak with Darren Dun to see how turnover data is gathered and to clarify certain data	VB
3.4	Vicky to ask some questions about I-grasp to determine exactly what is captured centrally and how it is stored to see if we can try and find out the gender of applicants.	SB
3.5	SH to contact Kelly Rosa for missing promotion data and promotion data broken down by grade.	AS

1. **Apologies:**

Maxi Roessler [MR], Beth Clare [BC], Janelle Jones [JJ], Sarah Heskett [SH].

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting**
   The minutes had not yet been circulated – to be approved at the next meeting.

3. **Examination of the data**

The student data is complete and was emailed to the SAT by FM on 15th June. Student data for the different years has been broken down according to type of student and subject.

Issues surrounding the gathering of staff data persist. College data has been produced but it is not quite right and so is being revised. Sandra Brown and Margaret Ayres are working with ITS to try and get the data packages correct.

Prior to the meeting AS had sent the SAT a data requirement sheet and two completed case studies that will be used for the application. These case studies are complete and ready to go into the application.

Still to be gathered is data on paternity, adoption and parental leave and flexible working by grade and gender. AS will ask Sunita if she can gather this. **[ACTION: AS]**
Data on male/female representation on the different SBCS Committees is also required.
SH to gather this and HF to up-date the website accordingly. **[ACTION: SH & HF]**

VB reminded the SAT that the Asset survey – deadline is coming up on the 28[th]June.
HF offered to mention in this in the SBCS newsletter and Vicky agreed to send the details. **[ACTION: HF]**

The Data
Breakdown of Academic posts by gender

The data available shows an increase in female staff from 22% of total academic staff in 2011/12 to 43% in 2014/15. This increase is predominantly in lectures rather than in senior lecturers and above and has resulted from actions taken by the School to increase the number of female academic staff. Actions taken include: ensuring gender balance on recruitment panels, careful consideration over the phrasing of job adverts, sending staff involved in recruitment on unconscious bias training.

While the data for senior lecturers and above does not show an increase in female staff, this can be explained by the fact that the newly recruited female lectures have not yet exited probation and thus have not been eligible for promotion. However, it is reasonable to expect that the numbers of female senior lecturers and readers will increase as recently appointed female lecturers become more established. It was agreed that this needs to be well explained in the application.

The SAT discussed the fact that the number of female professors in the School is very low. However, the number of professors being recruited generally is also low and this can be seen, in part, as a result of the restructure in 2011. Resources need to be available to attract top level academics to the School and the challenge SBCS faces is how to attract professors in general as well as female professors more specifically. A further consideration is that Professors generally stay in post for longer periods than lecturers

and senior lecturers who are more likely to move for career progression purposes. It was recognised that if established professors are not leavening SBCS it is difficult for the School to recruit professors of either gender and this should be pointed out in the application.

However, the ratio of female to male professors is still below average. This needs to be discussed in the application and it was agreed that the application should highlight that actions taken since 2012/13 have resulted in fundamental change at the lecturer level. Going forward the School needs to take action to ensure these gains are capitalised upon and women are given the opportunities to move up to higher level posts.

Mentoring was suggested as one way of facilitating this but it was agreed that the SAT would need to consider other ideas to include in the action plan.

KW pointed out that while the increase in lecturers had been predominantly female, the increase in research is almost entirely male. This is something that would need to be recognised in the application.

Turnover by career path
Data for turnover by career path needs to be checked as there were some discrepancies. Data also needs to be looked at against benchmark data to see if turnover is high or low compared to national averages.

KW also highlighted that percentage turnover in male staff would need to be calculated to make the female turnover relevant. Female turnover cannot be looked at independently of male.

Vicky was going to speak with Darren Dun to see how the data is gathered and get clarification on certain data. **[ACTION: VB]**

Turnover by grade
Broadly speaking the data suggests that ¼ of male staff have left and ¼ of female staff have left since 2012. This seems high but the data includes postdocs who are on fixed term contracts which will be pushing the turnover up. High turnover rates might be

expected following the restructure but the SAT agreed it is concerning that they remain this high.

One way of explaining the continuing high turnover would be to discuss high turnover in relation to the restructure. For example, data for 2012/2013 can be explained by the redundancies that occurred. Following this data for those on fixed term and permanent contracts needs to be compared to see if the number of fixed term contracts explain the turnover.

Following the restructure incoming T&R staff were given a third of the usual teaching load to enable them to establish their research. The School then hired a series of fixed term T&S contracts to cover the deficit in teaching. Thus, the high turnover should be disused in the context of fixed term contracts that resulted from a deliberate strategy following the restructure.

However, broadly speaking the turnover seems high for academic and research staff and the same is true for administrative and technical staff turnover. This needs to be addressed and explained in the application.

Staff leavers

The data for female leavers is not shown as a percentage turnover but rather a percentage of the total number who have left. So overall percentage is not known as we do not have the overall numbers. This is outstanding data that is required.

We can broadly say: of our leavers fewer than 50% are women and of our hires more than 50% are women which explains the increase in women in the department.

RWP explained that the culture of the organisation is changing and the School is under considerable pressure. It has the highest SSR in the Russel Group, is asked to make an enormous surplus and needs more resourcing all of which undoubtable contribute to the high staff turnover. This will need to be explained in the application and it would also be good to include comments or a plan on how these issues can be addressed going forward.

<u>Staff Hires</u>

The data for hiring staff was not accurate so no real comment could be made. Vicky informed that this might be all that is available form HR.

The data required for the application is: 'recruitment data broken down by application numbers, shortlisting, interviewed and appointed'. If nothing further is available from HR then Sunita should be able to produce numbers hired if nothing more. It is also possible that she might have details on shortlisted candidates somewhere on file. AS to ask Sunita if she has this data. **[ACTION: AS]**

It was recognised that applications do not require applicants to state their gender and so determining this from names alone will be difficult. However, it was agreed that we must try and find this data for the application.

RWP suggested contacting Elaine Chew from EECS to see where they got this data. However, AS clarified that she had actually brought Elaine in contact with the respective HR person.

Vicky offered to ask some questions about I-grasp to determine exactly what is captured centrally and how it is stored to see if we can try and find out the gender of applicants. **[ACTION: VB]**

<u>Promotion data</u>

The promotion data broken down by grade was not yet available. FM suggested asking Kelly Rossa from HR if she can provide it. **[ACTION: SH]**

The successful promotion applications for 2015/16 are awaiting official conformation but this is due soon and so the data will be available in plenty of time for submission.

2011/12 data is missing SH to ask Kelly Rossa for this. **[ACTION: SH]**

The data available shows that in 2013/14 one female applicant was successful in each year which equates to 100% of those who applied. The ratio of male to female applicants is low. However, if looked at comparatively in terms of total numbers of men

and women eligible, this is likely to be less extreme than it first appears and could even be around the 50:50 mark.

As the number of female lecturers increased significantly from 2012/13 we would expect to see higher numbers of female academic staff applying for promotion in 2016/17 as this is the first year they will be eligible.

Fixed and open-ended contracts
The data shows that the percentage of women on permanent contracts has doubled in three years.

Over the last three years there have been 3 men hired on permanent contracts and compared to 14 women. This is a significant improvement and suggests there should be an increase in female progression going forward.

In the previous set of data the gender balance was looking good at postdoc level but tailed away at lecturer level. A trend identified across the tables this time round is that there have been significant improvements at the lecturer level. It was agreed that this should be seen as a positive gain and going forward the tail off after lecturer will need addressing. Although, this should occur naturally as the recently appointed female lecturers exit probation and become eligible for promotion.

AS asked the people responsible for each paragraph to look at the data in relation to their various sections.

Student data
UG male and female numbers remain stable – SBCS is 66% female and 35% male which remains steady. Benchmark data from the ECU is 60% compared to 40% so SBCS is close to the national average.

AS reported that at the College Athena SWAN meeting there was discussion over whether Nanchang students should be included in the data. It was decided that it was not necessary or appropriate to include them as SBCS has little control over the policies and recruitment of students to the programme and it is unlikely to add significantly to the application.

For PGT, student numbers are very low and this will need to be commented on in the application.

For PGR, numbers are good and well balanced: 52% are female 48% male compared to the benchmarking data of 60% to 40%.

<u>Next steps</u>
AS to try to get corrected and outstanding data as soon as possible. People can then examine the data more closely in their individual groups, write their paragraphs and fill in the action plan accordingly.

It was agreed that the next meeting should be held at the beginning of September and the first draft completed by the end of August.

4. Any other business
Carol reported that Sandra is still in discussion with Max Morecroft over why the nursery subsidy was cut. She hopes to have more information by the time of the next meeting.

The Champion Network meetings will follow shortly and dates will be circulated soon.