



**Minutes of SBCS Athena SWAN self-assessment team
26th March 2014 11:00-12:30
Fogg 3.15**

Present:

Bertille Calinaud (BC), Elizabeth Clare (EC), Sunita Devi-Paul (SDP), Janelle Jones (JJ), Joanne Littlefair (JL), Alan McElligott (AMc), Kelly Peaston (KP), Richard Pickersgill (RWP), Maxie Roessler (MR), Ruth Rose (RR), Angelika Stollewerk, Chair (AS), Jim Sullivan (JAS)

Part 1

1. Apologies for absence

Received from Matthew Evans, Fiona Marsh, Marina Resmini

AS welcomed new members of the team: Sunita Devi-Paul, Joanne Littlefair, Janelle Jones, Beth Clare and Maxie Roessler

2. Minutes of the previous meeting - approved

3. Matters arising

KP commented that she had written to PDRAs to remind them of their mentor and to see whether they had any feedback, positive or negative about their mentoring experience. There was no negative feedback.

In regards to the question about mentoring training, BC responded that written guidelines were available but training could be provided by CAPD, perhaps using an online course.

Part 2

1. Review of data

The assessment team reviewed the current data and the following points were noted:

Foundation students: more information is needed to show foundation students in SBCS.

Student recruitment: there were fewer female PhD applicants than male in 2010/11 and 2012/13. The team discussed whether more could be done to attract female PhD candidates. The recommendation from this group was that all PhD recruitment panels should have female representation but in practice this is difficult due to the small number of female academic staff. The criteria for School studentships should be checked to ensure that it does not disadvantage female candidates. There was a discussion about the allocation of studentships awarded to each division and it was agreed that RWP would recommend good practice to other HoDs to ensure transparency.

ACTION

There was an additional recommendation to use female research technicians or PDRAs in the recruitment process for PhD students to ease the burden on female academic staff. This could be beneficial for PDRAs to allow them to gain experience in such selection processes. BC reminded colleagues that recruitment training covers the entire recruitment process not just the interview process and that staff should be reminded of this.

Staff numbers: it was noted that there is disparity between divisions in the proportion of female and male staff. Two of the fixed term posts in the psychology division are to be made permanent.

The data for staff turnover was not available to check for gender disparities.

Staff numbers by grade: there are clearly fewer female academic staff at the higher grade levels. Due to the input of this group into the last recruitment phase, female candidates should not be put off applying. It has been difficult to attract females at chair level. The data for recruitment would continue to be monitored.

2. Exit interviews

BC reported that she is meeting with HR business partners to discuss exit interviews. They will also review the staff satisfaction questionnaire, which is due to be circulated in August 2014.

3. Recruitment

As mentioned above there is inequality in the divisions in the proportion of female and male staff. It would be useful to see a gender breakdown of the numbers of applicants in the last major recruitment round. There was a discussion about whether career breaks are taken into account in the selection process. The emphasis tends to be on H-index as the primary factor to sift the candidates' suitability. BC would discuss this with Sam Holborn.

The team discussed the developments with shared parental leave and how the College could support male and female staff in ways other than providing a PDRA. **ACTION:** A sub-committee comprising RR, JAS and EC will meet to discuss these issues and report at the next meeting.

BC commented that she was organising a parent group for employees.

JAS and RR would meet to discuss setting a policy for recruitment practices for PhD recruitment panels. **ACTION**

SDP reported that the forthcoming academic recruitment entails advertising five T&R posts and 7 T&S posts (pending College authorisation).

Cell & Molecular Biology 1 x T&R; 2 x T&S (1 staff member moved from FTC)
Chemistry/Biochemistry 1 x T&R; 2 x T&S (1 x FTC to be extended)
Organismal Biology 2 x T&R; 1 x T&S
Psychology 1 x T&R; 2 x T&S (internal interviews held)

4. Beacon Activities

The team discussed what sort of activities might be appropriate. A particular area to focus on could be the integration of PDRAs. GT recommended setting up an informal meeting where PDRAs could talk to the Head of School in particular about routes to promotion. It was acknowledged that involving PDRAs in PhD recruitment panels is one way of developing their skills.

The details for beacon events are to be confirmed. The team would need to identify the real issues/purpose behind the events.

5. Meetings within core hours

AMc commented that it is worth reminding colleagues at the staff meeting that meetings should be held within core hours. The recent Nancy Rothwell lecture had been scheduled for 4pm-5pm and BC explained that this time of day is often more popular than lunchtime for seminars.

AMc advised that the newsletter/school meeting is a chance to reiterate two or three points from the Action Plan and that it is always appreciated when the HoS endorses the actions to give them more weight.

6. Any other business

None.

7. Date of the next meeting

KP to circulate a doodle poll for June.