



**SBCS Athena SWAN self-assessment team  
Notes of meeting held  
25<sup>th</sup> January 2016, 14.00-15.30**

**Present: Angelika Stollewerk, Fiona Marsh, Sarah Heskett, Georgia Tsagkogeorga, Janelle Jones, Maxi Roessler, Matthew Evans, Viviana Santos Gomes, Margaret Ayres**

**Notes: Sarah Heskett**

**Action summary**

|     |  |    |
|-----|--|----|
| 3.1 | GT to contact SH for information on unconscious bias training  | SH |
| 4.1 | MR to ask Sonia Dagnino if she would consider joining the Committee as technical staff representative                                | MR |
| 4.2 | SH to email SBCS-admin to ask for a volunteer to join the Committee  | SH |
| 4.3 | FM to speak with Research Services Manager regarding communication of funding opportunities to postdocs                              | FM |
| 4.4 | AS to meet with Sandra Brown to clarify what is required to form the baseline for writing the staff data section of the application. | AS |
| 4.5 | FM to ask Anne Parry if additional unconscious bias training can be arranged for academic staff                                      | FM |
| 4.6 | AS to go over and send revised action plan before the next meeting   | AS |
| 7.1 | SH to set date of next meeting   | SH |

**1. Apologies:**

Alan McElligott, Kim Warren, Helen Fitton, Richard Pickersgill

**2. Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes were accepted.

**3. Matters arising and actions from the previous meeting**

- GT reported that postdocs would be interested in a peer mentoring scheme and would find this more useful than the current scheme of pairing postdocs with academic staff. They would also like to see funding opportunities advertised on a notice board or an XLS file with an extra column detailing funds which are specific to postdocs. People are happy with the career development opportunities and information offered by CAPD but expressed interest in unconscious bias training. **[ACTION: GT to contact SH for information]**  
Postdocs feel they would benefit from a centralised career development service similar to that which is offered to undergraduates and PhD students. In particular they would like to see symposium days where all postdocs could

be invited to give talks. Symposiums were very well received at PhD level and GTs feedback indicated that people would like to see this rolled out at postdoc level. An away day for postdocs to help develop relationships was also something people would like to see offered.

GT received positive feedback from the coffee meet session and people would like these to continue.

- AS introduced Margaret Ayers to the Committee.
- HF has updated the website, including adding resources with links to topics of interest and has updated the Committee membership and meeting minutes.

#### **4. Athena Swan Silver renewal application (AS)**

AS ran through what is needed for the resubmission of the silver award by paragraph.

##### **1. Opening paragraph from the HoS**

2. **Self-assessment process and team section** – AS suggested thinking about the representation on the committee and it was established that it would be beneficial to gain representation from the technical side of the school. Monica Struebig, Petra Ungerer, Sonia Dagnino were suggested as possible new recruits and MR agreed to informally ask Sonia if she would consider joining the Committee.

##### **[ACTION: MR]**

It would also be desirable to have another person from the administrative team. This individual could be responsible for communicating Athena Swan initiatives to administrative staff. This will become increasingly important now that the charter has extended to include administrative and technical staff. Embedding these aspects at this stage in the submission process will put SBCS in a good position when it comes to applying for the Gold award. SH agreed to email SBCS-admin to ask for a volunteer. **[ACTION: SH]**

3. **Case studies** – Case studies needed for the resubmission are; promotion, work life balance and flexible working and can apply to either research or academic staff. It was agreed that a minimum of two case studies are needed – one to come from within the Committee the other can be from the wider school/department. Tiina Eilola and Natalie Lebrasseur who have been promoted from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer were suggested as possibilities.

It was suggested that Beth Clare could provide a case study for the maternity postdoc scheme. AS informed that case studies would need to be written by the individuals themselves rather than produced by the Committee. This was feedback after the previous application.

GT suggested including case studies of male academics who have taken advantage of paternity leave and flexible working and Chris Jones and Jamal Hamden were suggested as possibilities.

It was recognised that it will be important to demonstrate the impact that Athena Swan initiatives have had on examples used and highlight the ways the Committee and the School have facilitated the process. MR could provide evidence of this as she joined SBCS following a period of maternity leave and found the School to be supportive.

4. **Student data** – AS gave an update on the student data collected which includes undergraduate data and PGT data PGR data. However, comparative student data and foundation programme data are missing. FM recommended that as the majority of applications produce the same level of data, central HR could work on a template that would be appropriate for all Schools. It was agreed that FM would meet with HR and Planning to advise them of the data required **[ACTION: FM]**

Margaret Ayres advised that data collection is a rolling process as the levels of data required differ depending on the level of award being applied for. Recruitment data for example is required for Gold applications but not for Silver or Bronze. In addition, previous applications submitted by the various Schools affect the level of data expected.

AS stressed the importance of ensuring that, in addition to data specific to the School, the application needs to show comparative data to demonstrate the position/progress of SBCS relative to other Russel Group and London Universities.

5. **Staff data** – AS reported that she received data from HR but among others the following data are missing; full and part time contracts by gender, fixed term contracts by gender, turn over by grade and gender and job application success rate. It was agreed that AS meet with Sandra Brown to clarify exactly what is needed to form the baseline data needed to write this section of the application. **[ACTION AS]**.

It was noted that care should be taken over confidentiality in relation to salary, pay grade and promotion to ensure individuals cannot be identified.

Margaret advised that the timeframe available for adding in data for 2015/16 is very narrow. As a result data from 2011-2015 should be written up first and 2016 added once it is available.

6. **Supporting/advancing women's careers** – This section should demonstrate and describe the impact that the actions taken have had on career development.
7. **Organisational culture** – Data relating to the following could be used here; gender balance on committees, ratios of men to women in decision making, gender in relation to fixed and permanent contracts and timing of school meetings falling within core hours.
8. **Flexibility and managing career break** - Data relating to the following will be used here: return rate after maternity leave, paternity, adoption and parental leave uptake, number of applications and success rate for flexible working by gender and grade.

#### Action plan –

AS recommended devising a new action plan as soon as possible. The committee will be subdivided to take responsibility for different elements.

The following rough guide was established –

1. **Establishing the Athena Swan initiative** - RWP, AS and HF
2. **Promoting positive role models and attracting and supporting female students** – GT, VSG and KW. Promoting opportunities for early career researchers and students, support in preparing for fellowship applications and CV clinics are offered at college level and students and postdocs can book 1:1s for this kind of help. GT reported that a helpful addition would be a notice board of funding opportunities detailing whether funds can be applied for independently or in conjunction with a PI.
3. **Enhancing Gender Equality: Attracting and retaining female staff and offering support to female staff in their career** – JJ, GT and AM. SBCS could offer diversity and equality training for appraisers. General appraisal training is currently offered but is not gender specific. Unconscious bias training has been undertaken by some senior SBCS staff but it would be desirable to roll

this out and offer it more widely. Margaret advised speaking to Anne Parry to see if this can be arranged. **[ACTION: FM]**

- 4. Promote good work/life balance** –MR and BC (can include administrative and technical staff too)

AS to go over and send revised action plan before the next meeting **[ACTION: AS]**

## **5. Mentoring**

SH emailed postdocs last week and attached a brief questionnaire to capture views on mentoring in SBCS. So far only one person has indicated that they are interested in the scheme. GT suggested that mentoring could be made obligatory. The DoR in conjunction with individual postdocs could assign mentors based on what postdocs identify as being most important to them. For example, an academic suited to helping with public speaking, writing research papers and so on.

- 6. Any other business:** there was none.

- 7. Date of next meeting:** **[ACTION: SH]**