

“Going for Bronze, Silver and Gold”



This document has been created using material from a presentation by Sarah Fink, Equality Charters Adviser

Good practices for Athena SWAN departmental applications

Psychology Workshop – February 2016

Athena SWAN

- = Recognition scheme of excellence in women's employment in STEMM
- = 2005: 10 founder members
- = 2016: 128 members
- = Institutional and departmental awards



Equality Challenge Unit



STEMM =
Science
Technology
Engineering
Maths
Medicine

Advancing equality and diversity in universities and colleges

29 Psychology Department Awards

Bronze – 17 Bronze departments

- = identified challenges
- = planned activities for the future

Silver – 11 Silver departments

- = ongoing activity
- = evidence of impact

Gold – 1 Gold department

- = significant record of activity and impact
- = beacons for gender equality, Athena SWAN & good practice

Advancing equality and diversity in universities and colleges



Equality Challenge Unit



Athena SWAN: post-May 2015



= Recognition scheme of commitment to gender equality across institutions

= Adapted from Athena SWAN and ECU's gender equality charter mark, based on consultation

= 10 principles

AHSSBL =

Arts

Humanities

Soc Sci

Business

Law

STEMM =

Science

Technology

Engineering

Maths

Medicine

Post-May 2015 in a nutshell



- = Not just about one gender
- = Not just about academics
- = Not just about the Sciences
- = More complete data analysis

Athena SWAN: post-May 2015

Principles

1. Recognise talents of all
2. Advance gender equality
3. Recognise disciplinary differences
4. Tackle the gender pay gap
5. Remove obstacles
6. Address short-term contracts
7. Tackle discrimination against trans people
8. Demonstrate senior commitment
9. Make structural and cultural changes
10. Consider intersectionality



Equality Challenge Unit



Key changes

- = Inclusion of professional and support staff
- = Inclusion of trans staff and students
- = Consideration of intersectionality
- = Questions rationalised
- = Questions added
- = Four year award (and action plan)
- = Aggregated, extended word count



Equality Challenge Unit



Advancing equality and diversity in universities and colleges

The award judging process

- = Two submission rounds a year
- = Peer-review process, judged by a panel
- = 5 panellists, 1 Chair – academics, E&D/HR, subject specialists
- = Declaration of interest
- = 1 moderator, 1 note taker – ECU staff
- = Panellist and Chair training rolled out



Bronze award

Bronze department awards recognise that in addition to institution-wide policies, the department is working to promote gender equality and to identify and address challenges particular to the department and discipline.

- = an thorough self-assessment including quantitative and qualitative evidence
- = identify both challenges and opportunities
- = the development of a structure to carry proposed actions forward

Advancing equality and diversity in universities and colleges



Equality Challenge Unit



Silver award

In addition to the future planning required for Bronze department recognition, Silver department awards recognise that the department has taken action in response to previously identified challenges and can demonstrate the ***impact*** of these actions.



Gold award

A Gold department award recognises significant and sustained progression and achievement by the department in promoting gender equality and to address challenges particular to the discipline.

- = A well-established record of activity and achievement
- = data demonstrating continued impact



Equality Challenge Unit



Gold award

Gold departments should be ***beacons*** of achievement in gender equality and should champion and promote good practice and Athena SWAN to the wider community.



Equality Challenge Unit



Letter of endorsement

- = Involvement and personal engagement in Athena SWAN work
- = Awareness of key issues
- = Include one or two examples of good practice
- = Strategy and resources in place to deliver the action plan



What's changed, how has it affected the whole department?
How have they made it happen?
Have additional initiatives or actions been implemented since the award?
Is there recognition of the benefits of Athena SWAN work?

Real appreciation for Athena SWAN initiatives.
What's next?

Advancing equality and diversity in universities and colleges

Description of the Department

- = any relevant contextual information
- = Present data on the **total** number of academic staff, professional and support staff and students by gender



Equality Challenge Unit



Advancing equality and diversity in universities and colleges

The Self Assessment Process

- = Who?
- = What?
- = Why?
- = When?
- = How?



Equality Challenge Unit



Advancing equality and diversity in universities and colleges

A picture of the department: student data

- = Access or foundation courses
- = UG, PGT, PGR by gender
- = FT and PT by programme. Provide data on course applications, offers, and acceptance rates, and degree attainment by gender.
- = Progression pipeline between undergraduate and postgraduate student levels – any issues?



A picture of the department: staff data

- = Academic staff by grade, **contract function** and gender
- = Analyse the career pipeline. Any gender issues at particular grades/job type/**academic contract type**?
- = Academic and research staff by grade on fixed-term, open-ended/permanent and **ZHCs** by gender – support available?



Equality Challenge Unit



Consider the transition of technical staff to academic roles.

Supporting and advancing careers: key career transition points

- = Recruitment: applications, shortlisted candidates, offer and acceptance rates.
- = Induction: supportive? Uptake? Feedback?
- = Promotion: data on applications and success rates + analysis on the process
- = **Inclusion in the REF**



Equality Challenge Unit



Induction and promotion for professional and support staff.

Long-list candidates

Advancing equality and diversity in universities and colleges

Supporting and advancing careers: career development

- = Training
- = Appraisal/development review
- = Support given to academic staff and students for career progression
- = Support offered to those applying for research grant applications

Training, appraisal and development review and support for career progression for professional and support staff.



Supporting and advancing careers: flexibility and managing career breaks

- = Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: before, during and after leave
- = Maternity return rate
- = Paternity, shared parental, adoption, and parental leave uptake
- = Flexible working
- = Transition from part-time back to full-time work after career breaks

Note: present professional and support staff separately

Staff remaining in post six, 12 and 18 months after return from maternity leave.



Supporting and advancing careers: Organisation and culture

- = Culture
- = HR policies
- = Committee representation
- = Participation on influential external committees
- = Workload model
- = Timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings
- = Visibility of role models
- = Outreach activities

Beacon activity?



Case Studies (Silver and Gold only)



- = show how the inclusive culture and working practices of the department have enabled them to pursue and progress their career
- = demonstrate the support they have received
- = Include policies that are broadly available, rather than being individual arrangements



Note: case study criteria is different depending on if Silver or Gold and if pre-May or post-May

Ways to measure impact

- = Staff numbers
- = Representation
- = Take-up
- = Qualitative data
- = Applications



What's changed? How is it benefitting (female) staff?
Any new concerns? How will you improve things further?

Beacon activity



- = Leads others in the institution
- = Department promotes Athena SWAN and good practice internally and externally
- = Staff champion and promote activities and principles

Consider the impact of initiatives externally and how initiatives have been embedded.

Action Plan

- = SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound)
- = Referred to throughout application and linked directly to the content: data → analysis → action
- = 4 years



Equality Challenge Unit



Advancing equality and diversity in universities and colleges

Planned action/ objective	Rationale	Key outputs and milestones	Person responsible	Success criteria and outcome
<p>1. An annual workshop on promotion, for all staff, to be run in the department.</p>	<p>43% of all staff and 52% of female staff report a “poor” understanding of criteria, believed to be contributing to low application rates.</p>	<p>4 months prior to the upcoming promotion round-annually</p> <p>Evaluation to be undertaken after each workshop, and on completion of each promotion round.</p> <p>Review of data to be undertaken in Spring term, in 3 years’ time.</p> <p>Outcomes reported in next submission.</p>	<p>Head, HR, SAT to input</p>	<p>100% of staff attend the first workshop.</p> <p>15% women apply for promotion before 2017, compared to baseline figure of 4% over past three years.</p> <p>80% of female staff report a “good” or “v good” understanding of criteria in next annual survey, compared to baseline figure of 32% in 2014.</p>

Renewals



Renewals need to show development and ideally improvement, if not at least response to previous work.

= progress on previous action plan

= 5 years of data

Advancing equality and diversity in universities and colleges

Challenges

- = Not a tick-box exercise
- = Common reasons for being unsuccessful:
 - = Poor action plan that is not **SMART**
 - = Lack of senior management **buy-in**; team lacks power
 - = **Descriptive**, rather than analytical narrative
 - = Applications not **identifying** issues raised by the data
 - = Action plan not **targeted** to issues raised
 - = Inappropriate balance between process and **proactive** action
 - = Changing the women not the processes



Tips for the panel

- = It takes 2–3 hours to read a submission thoroughly
- = 1 day, 6 submissions, 45 mins per submission
- = Make things easy for panels to find and assimilate the information they want
- = Do not assume that each of an institution's submissions will be seen by the same panel



Equality Challenge Unit



Improvements to the process

- = Applicants have right to appeal decision – application may be put to new panel
- = Applicants may object to specific panellists
- = Mechanism for raising objections to assessment or award
- = ECU may put application to new panel if the decision is inconsistent
- = Chair training
- = More complete guidance in new handbook

Advancing equality and diversity in universities and colleges



Equality Challenge Unit



Further information

= Contact your account manager

= Website

www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/

= Questions?



Equality Challenge Unit

