

## Department Application Gold Award

## ATHENA SWAN GOLD DEPARTMENT AWARDS

A Gold department award recognises sustained progression and achievement, by the department, in promoting gender equality and addressing challenges particular to the discipline. A well-established record of activity and achievement in working towards gender equality should be complemented by data demonstrating continued impact. Gold departments should be beacons of achievement in gender equality, and should champion and promote good practice to the wider community.

Note: Not all institutions use the term 'department'. There are many equivalent academic groupings with different names, sizes and compositions. The definition of a 'department' can be found in the Athena SWAN awards handbook.

## COMPLETING THE FORM

DO NOT ATTEMPT TO COMPLETE THIS APPLICATION FORM WITHOUT READING THE ATHENA SWAN AWARDS HANDBOOK.

This form should be used for applications for Gold department awards.
You should complete each section of the application
If you need to insert a landscape page in your application, please copy and paste the template page at the end of the document, as per the instructions on that page. Please do not insert any section breaks as to do so will disrupt the page numbers.

## WORD COUNT

The overall word limit for applications are shown in the following table.
There are no specific word limits for the individual sections and you may distribute words over each of the sections as appropriate. At the end of every section, please state how many words you have used in that section.

We have provided the following recommendations as a guide.

## Gold Department application

Word limit
Recommended word count
1.Letter of endorsement 500
2.Description of the department 500
3. Self-assessment process 1,000
4. Picture of the department 2,000
5. Supporting and advancing women's careers 7,000
6. Case studies $\quad 1,500$
7. Further information 500

Our total word count for this application is 13,147 please note this includes an additional 196 words for the incoming Head of Department letter for which we are allowed an extra 200 words according to the AS Handbook.

| Name of institution | University of York |
| :--- | :--- |
| Department | Biology |
| Focus of department | STEMM |
| Date of Gold application | November 2018 |
| Date of current Gold award | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ |
| Institution Athena SWAN <br> award | Date: $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ |
| Contact for application |  |
| Must be based in the department |  |
| Email |  |
| Telephone |  |
| Departmental website |  |

## 1. LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT FROM THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

Recommended word count: 500 words
An accompanying letter of endorsement from the head of department should be included. If the head of department is soon to be succeeded, or has recently taken up the post, applicants should include an additional short statement from the incoming head.

Note: Please insert the endorsement letter immediately after this cover page.


# University of York 

The Department of Biology
Wentworth Way, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, UK
Professor Ian Graham Head of Department Direct Telephone: (01904) 328555

E-Mail:
biohod@york.ac.uk

Dr Ruth Gilligan<br>Associate Director - Equality Charters<br>Advance HE<br>First Floor<br>Westminster Tower<br>3 Albert Embankment<br>London<br>SE1 7SP

28 November 2018

Dear Dr Gilligan
As outgoing Head of Department I enthusiastically endorse this application.
The Department of Biology is proud of our reputation for providing a supportive culture whose values fully align with those of the Athena SWAN charter and we ensure there are no barriers to our staff and students reaching their goals. Our approach remains transparent and inclusive; poor working practices disproportionately discriminate against women whilst good practices benefit all. I hope the significant commitment of resource, and the embedding of AS activities within our Departmental structures that is evident throughout the report underlines both my personal commitment as HoD to AS values and the longerterm commitment of the Department. The AS renewal application was a key discussion point in the handover process to the new HoD, Professor Jennifer Potts and I know she has been actively engaged with the selfassessment team since taking up her post in July.

The Department has undergone significant cultural change since first engaging with Athena SWAN; Equality and Diversity, especially around gender, has simply become part of what we do. This doesn't mean we have addressed all the issues, and we are aware of the challenges ahead, but it does mean that we have taken the important step of embedding AS values fully into our Departmental culture so that staff feel comfortable raising issues and have confidence they will be listened to.

I am particularly proud of our ongoing progress, impacts and beacon activities during our Gold Award, in particular we have:

- Increased the \% of female applicants for academic posts, particularly the \% female lecturers
- Maintained \% of female professors above the UK benchmark
- Mentored a female professor to become only the second female HoD in fifty years
- Staff surveys showing a high level of satisfaction
- Increased the \% of promotion applications that come from women and their success rate
- Reduced the loss of women progressing from UG to PGR
- Supported 13 other Institutions to achieve AS awards

Our ambitious action plan for the next four years has been developed during our Gold Award, drawing on our experience, and constant learning, of AS to develop targeted actions toward equality for other protected
characteristics. This sharing of good practice is a key advantage of running our AS activities through our BioEDG Committee (Chaired by Deputy HoD) which reports to the Departmental Management Committee (chaired by HoD). DMT authorises any resources for AS actions over the significant ring-fenced budget of $£ 3,000$ pa, plus PSS support ( $\sim 0.2$ FTE) and WAM allocation for BioEDG membership.

Our Department has acted as an active and enthusiastic advocate for Athena SWAN and, under the direction of the new HoD, further Beacon activities are planned that exploit our AS experience to help others, including learned societies in which our staff are involved. We recognise that we learn as much from these activities as the Departments/organisations we are supporting.

I confirm that the information presented in this application (including qualitative and quantitative data) is an honest, accurate and true representation of the department.

Yours sincerely

Professor Ian Graham

## Word Count: 499



University of ofork
The Department of Biology
Wentworth Way, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, UK
Professor Jennifer Potts
Head of Department
Direct Telephone: (01904) 328555
E-Mail:
biohod@york.ac.uk

Dr Ruth Gilligan<br>Associate Director - Equality Charters<br>Advance HE<br>First Floor<br>Westminster Tower<br>3 Albert Embankment<br>London<br>SE1 7SP

29 November 2018

Dear Dr Gilligan

I am immensely proud to be the second female Head of the Biology Department since it was founded. I was strongly supported by colleagues in my application for the HoD role and received particularly strong mentorship from the previous HoD. I have found the Department to provide a highly collegial, inclusive environment that enabled me to develop both my science and leadership skills.

As a female head of a STEMM Department I am well aware of the importance of championing gender equality and will enthusiastically sustain and extend our efforts.

Despite considerable progress, important issues remain. I welcome the encouragement to ensure PSS are fully engaged with AS and will appoint a PSS AS champion. I will work with BioEDG to understand the gender pay gap and support the University in addressing this issue and will continue to investigate and stem leaks in the pipeline from UG to Professor. I will champion a healthy work life balance for our staff - demonstrating this to our students (who are our staff of the future). Lastly, I will continue to provide the significant resource (including staff time, money and enthusiastic support) needed to achieve our ambitious Action plan.

Yours sincerely

Professor Jennifer Potts
Head of Department - Biology

Word Count: 196

| KEY ABB <br> (Provided | TIONS AND ACTION COLOUR CODING REFERENCE additional information sheets for ease) |
| :---: | :---: |
| AGM | Annual General Meeting |
| AM | Administration manager |
| ART | Academic, Research and Teaching |
| AS | Athena SWAN |
| ASFC | Athena SWAN Faculty champion |
| ASFWG | Athena SWAN Faculty Working Group |
| ASWG | Athena SWAN Working Group (Biology) |
| BASC | Biology Athena SWAN champion |
| BCPG | Biology Chemistry Planning Group |
| BioEDG | Biology Equality and Diversity Committee |
| BME | Black and Minority Ethnic |
| BoS | Board of Studies |
| Comms. | Communications |
| DACS | Development and Assessment Centre Scheme |
| DHLE | Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education |
| DMT | Departmental Management Team |
| DRC | Departmental Research Committee |
| DTO | Departmental Training Officer |
| DTP | Doctoral Training Programme |
| ECU | Equality Challenge Unit |
| E\&D | Equality and Diversity |
| F | Female |
| F-T | Full-time |


| FTC | Fixed term contract |
| :---: | :---: |
| FTE | Full Time Equivalent |
| FWR | Flexible Working Request |
| H\&S | Health and Safety |
| HE | Higher Education |
| HERA | Higher Education Role Analysis |
| HESA | Higher Education Statistics Agency |
| HoD | Head of Department |
| HR | Human Resources |
| HYMS | Hull York Medical School |
| IRF | Independent Research Fellow |
| IST | Institute of Science and Technology |
| LGBTQ+ | Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (or questioning) \& others |
| M | Male |
| NSS | National Student Survey |
| P@Y | Professional@York |
| PDR | Performance and Development Review |
| PDRA | Post-doctoral Research Associate |
| PG | Postgraduate |
| PGCAP | Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice |
| PGR | Postgraduate Research |
| PGT | Postgraduate Taught |
| PI | Principal Investigator |
| PR | Performance review |
| PSS | Professional Support Staff |

```
P-T Part-time
R Research Staff
R&S Research & Scholarship
R&T Research & Teaching
RAs Research Associates
REF Research Excellence Framework
RETT Research Excellence Training Team
RFL Research Focus Leader
RG Russell Group
SAT Self-Assessment Team
SMART Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound
SSA Senior Staff Administrator
STEMM Science, Technology, Engineering, Medicine and Mathematics
T&S Teaching and Scholarship
TQG Teaching Quality Group
UB Unconscious Bias
UCAS Universities and Colleges Admissions Service
UG Undergraduate
UoY University of York
UKRI Research Councils UK
WAM Workload Allocation Model
```

To ease linking with the action plan our actions are highlighted throughout the submission document with the following colour coding.

| Theme | Action numbers | Theme rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ENGAGE | 1.0 to 1.3 | To ENGAGE all Departmental staff and students to raise the profile of Athena SWAN within the Department and embed gender equality throughout all Departmental activity. |
| PROGRESS | 2.0 to 2.7 | To continue to listen to different groups in order to recognise and make PROGRESS in removing barriers to equality to achieve new impacts. |
| ENHANCE | 3.0 to 3.5 | To ENHANCE our well-established record of activity, which recognises that the Biology Department cannot reach its full potential unless it can benefit from the talents of all. |
| SUSTAIN | 4.0 to 4.5 | Recognising that there are more improvements to make, put in place ambitious new actions to SUSTAIN this culture and best practice to ensure we do not become complacent. |
| INSPIRE | 5.0 to 5.10 | Through our beacon activities, that we promote the benefits of our activities - both internally and externally - to disseminate gender equality and INSPIRE others to reach their Athena SWAN ambitions. |

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE DEPARTMENT

Recommended word count: 500 words
Please provide a brief description of the department, including any relevant contextual information. Present data on the total number of academic staff, professional and support staff and students by gender.

Summary: Largest department at the University of York (334 staff and ~900 students). Our philosophy recognises that poor workplace practices disproportionately discriminate against women, and that good practices benefit all and allow all our staff and students to reach their full potential.

Housed within three closely-linked buildings, research in the Department of Biology focusses on three Global Challenges; Impacting on Health and Disease, Sustainable Production of Food and Fuel, and Living with Environmental Change. Academic staff are members of nine overlapping Research Foci that intersect with affiliated Research Centres/Institutes involving staff from other departments. This structure facilitates synergistic collaborations, and our diverse portfolio gives our research-led teaching breadth and depth. REF2014 placed Biology at York in the top 10 in the UK, and first for Impact.

We have a longstanding commitment to inclusivity and promotion of E\&D. We have engaged with AS since its inception; gaining Silver in 2006 and Gold in 2014. Our staff ( 334 total: 34 different nationalities) comprises 75 academics (35\%F: increased from 27\% in 2014), 103 researchers (48\%F) and 156 professional support staff (71\%F).

## Biology Staff Away Day 2018 - Photo

The Department first admitted undergraduates in 1965, and currently has $>900$ students - intake for 2017/18 was 306 undergraduates (64\%F), 14 taught postgraduate ( $64 \% \mathrm{~F}$ ) and 42 postgraduate research (60\%F) students. We score very highly for student satisfaction in the National Student Survey reflecting our supportive culture. $85 \%$ of our UK undergraduates come from state schools and $18 \%$ are from underrepresented socioeconomic groups; well above Russell Group Universities averages of $76.7 \%$ and $6.2 \%$, respectively, underscoring our commitment to inclusivity.

Our ethos is to support all staff and students to reach their full potential. AS is firmly embedded in our management structure (Fig. 2.1) through the Biology E\&D Committee (BioEDG). BioEDG reports to the Departmental Management Team (DMT; currently 4F and 5M staff) which is chaired by our HoD (F) and meets monthly; membership includes administrative leads and academics responsible for overseeing our education and research strategy. DMT membership includes the Director for Students, the Chair of Staff Committee, and DHoD (who is Chair of BioEDG), so equality issues and all staff and students have a strong voice on DMT. Additionally staff have a direct voice through attendance at termly Staff Meetings where BioEDG is a standing item, and students have representatives on BoS. We have recently implemented:

- Staff Meetings for all staff (replacing separate ART and PS staff meetings) recognising our shared endeavour toward excellent teaching and research.
- Online BoS discussions/comments prior to meetings to ensure all voices (not only those comfortable in large forums) are heard.

Biology at York, where we can all
be ourselves
\#equalityatYork
Athena SWAN
Gold Award


A major impact from our Athena actions since 2013 is the substantial increase in female academic staff. The largest increase has been at lecturer level and we provide positive senior female role models to facilitate career progression (Figure. 2.1 \& Table 2.1).

Table 2.1 - Women in the Department with diverse senior roles act as highly visible role models to female scientists and professional staff.

| Name | Photo | Role |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professor Jennifer Potts |  | Head of Department (HoD) |
| Professor Nia Bryant |  | Chair of Cell Biology and Biology Athena SWAN Champion (BASC) |
| Professor Jane Hill |  | Deputy Head of Department (Research) and Chair of Faculty of Sciences Athena SWAN Working Group |
| Professor Sue Hartley |  | Director of York <br> Environmental Sustainability Institute (YESI) |
| Professor Jenny Southgate |  | Director of the Jack Birch Unit of Molecular Carcinogenesis |
| Dr Thorunn Helgason |  | Chair of the Board of Studies |
| Professor Reidun Twarock |  | Professor in the York Crossdisciplinary Centre for Systems Analysis (YCCSA) |
| Professor Katherine Denby |  | Academic Director of the N8 Agrifood Resilience Programme |
| Natalie Armstrong |  | Department Manager |
| Lucy Hudson |  | Department Operations Manager |


| Name | Photo | Role |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dr Betsy Pownall |  | Manager of BBSRC DTP in <br> 'Mechanistic Biology' |
| Ann Mathe |  | Student and Academic <br> Services Manager |

UoY introduced a Faculty system in 2014. Biology is one of 10 departments in the Science Faculty: this benefits our AS agenda through our close relationship with the other departments who we support in their AS journeys, including Chemistry, who recently celebrated 10 years of AS Gold. We provide critical friendship and are supported by the Science AS Faculty Champion (ASFC), and University AS co-ordinator.

Word Count: 531

## 3. THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Recommended word count: 1000 words
Describe the self-assessment process. This should include:
(i) a description of the self-assessment team
(ii) an account of the self-assessment process
(iii) plans for the future of the self-assessment team

Summary: Our self-assessment process is administered through the BioEDG Committee which draws membership from all staff and student groups.

## (I) A DESCRIPTION OF THE SELF-ASSESSMENT TEAM

Our AS actions are carried out by the Biology Department's E\&D Committee (BioEDG), whose members (currently $14 \mathrm{~F}, 7 \mathrm{M}$ ) are responsible for delivering actions and supporting gender equality. Membership reflects all staff and student groups, part-time and full-time staff, a mix of caring responsibilities and those working with disabilities.

BioEDG's terms of reference embed the 10 key AS Charter Principles into Departmental life. BioEDG's diverse membership includes representatives of all staff groups and students (ensuring 'buy-in' across our community and helping drive activities and change). Members of BioEDG (Table 3-1) are either ex-officio, to ensure integration of AS with all aspects of Departmental life, or are recruited via open advertisement. In addition, BioEDG has a critical friend from the Department of Chemistry ensuring good practice and driving initiatives within the Faculty of Science.

BioEDG meets termly, with additional sub-group meetings arranged to advance specific actions: meeting minutes are posted on our internal Wiki site. An annual Data Census meeting also takes place at the end of each academic year to review progress against action targets. Membership is reviewed annually: Departmental administrative roles rotate on 3-year cycles, bringing fresh ideas but ensuring stability.

BioEDG is chaired by our Deputy HoD (Teaching \& Staff) who is also a member of DMT; this provides a direct mechanism for BioEDG views and AS issues to feed into Departmental strategy, operationslevel decisions and processes e.g. BioEDG identified an issue of low female applications for Lectureship posts, which was taken to DMT by the Deputy HoD prior to advertising a new post. Discussions at DMT resulted in an improved Job Specification and an increase in female applicants (IMPACT). The Department workload model recognises BioEDG membership, and AS activities.

Table 3-1 BioEDG Committee

| Name/Photo | Job Title/Staff or Student Group/Role |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Employability Manager, PGR Training \& Development Officer. Associate Lecturer <br> PSS \& Research <br> Leads on Supporting students with protected characteristics in careers and training |
|  | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year PGR Student <br> Elected Student PGR Rep <br> Leads on LGBTQ+ Equality |
|  | Professor - Cell Biology <br> Academic R\&T <br> Biology Athena SWAN Champion (BASC) |
|  | $1^{\text {st }}$ Year UG Student <br> UG Student Rep <br> Leads on Student LGBTQ+ and Disability |
|  | Lecturer <br> Academic T\&S <br> Lead for Staff Disability and Inclusion |
|  | Chemistry Departmental Manager PSS |


| Name/Photo | Job Title/Staff or Student Group/Role |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Critical friend from Department of Chemistry |
|  | Research Fellow <br> PDRA <br> Researchers Rep \& Disability Committee member |
|  | Deputy Head of Department - Teaching \& Staff <br> Academic R\&T <br> Chair of BioEDG and Departmental Equality \& Diversity Champion |
|  | Lecturer <br> Academic R\&T <br> Ex officio member - Chair of Undergraduate Admissions |
|  | Professor \& Director of Graduate Studies <br> Academic R\&T <br> Ex officio member - Chair of Biology Graduate School Board |
|  | Senior Lecturer <br> Academic R\&T <br> Ex officio member - Chair of Biology Board of Studies |
|  | Deputy Head of Department -Research \& Chair of DRC <br> Academic R\&T <br> Faculty Athena SWAN Champion on University ASSG |
|  | Department Operational Manager <br> PSS <br> Technical Rep - Leads on Technician Commitment |
|  | HR Adviser |


| Name/Photo | Job Title/Staff or Student Group/Role |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | PSS <br> Provides HR advice to BioEDG Committee |
|  | Lecturer <br> Academic T\&S <br> Ex officio member - Disability Officer (Students) |
|  | Department Administration Manager PSS <br> Lead Administrator for AS Activity |
|  | Student Engagement Manager PSS <br> Leads on Student Engagement |
|  | Senior Lecturer (joint Biology \& Maths) <br> Academic R\&T <br> Ex officio member - Biology Research Committee |
|  | Administrator PSS <br> Leads on BME actions |
|  | 3rd year PhD student <br> Elected Student PGR Rep |
|  | Professor <br> Academic T\&S |


| Name/Photo | Job Title/Staff or Student Group/Role |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Director of Students |
|  |  |

## (II) AN ACCOUNT OF THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Our philosophy is that: "Poor practices disproportionately discriminate against women whereas good practices benefit all", and our motto is "Biology@York, where we can all be ourselves".

Our AS initiatives are evidence-based (drawing on e.g. Bohnet (2016) What works: gender equality by design. Belknap Press; Valian (2014) Why so slow? The Advancement of Women. MIT Press; Saini (2017) Inferior. 4thEstate; William \& Dempsey (2014) What Works for Women at Work. NYUniv. Press). To maximise the impacts from our actions, we use a variety of mechanisms to collect and analyse data, to assess progress of our actions against targets, and to identify areas for improvement. This includes:
I. Biennial culture surveys to collect honest feedback on Departmental life (staff response rates are consistently high with $83 \% \mathrm{~F}$ and $75 \% \mathrm{M}$ responding in 2017)
II. Pulse surveys of specific staff groups, in between culture surveys
III. Annual student surveys
IV. Qualitative interviews, and focus groups, covering topics identified by BioEDG

Data, actions and impacts are posted on our web pages, and updates from BioEDG are standing items at termly Staff Meetings and annual Staff Away Days, usually leading to lively discussions, where staff provide feedback and input into new AS initiatives.

Those who prefer not to voice their opinions in public can discuss issues with individual BioEDG members, and multiple avenues for staff engagement with AS enable everyone to feel comfortable sharing their opinions: this approach echoes our ethos of fostering a supportive culture. The Department now runs more activities via google and we will use this mechanism to allow people to share their views in relation to AS (Action 1.0 Increase engagement of PSS with AS)

AS items at BioEDG Committee meetings map onto the five themes around which our AS Action Plan is structured (Page 7) reflecting our ambitions to:

ENGAGE staff and students (actions 1.0-1.3)

PROGRESS issues (actions 2.0-2.7)

ENHANCE our activities (actions 3.0-3.5)

SUSTAIN the cultural improvement we have made (actions 4.0-4.5)

INSPIRE others to achieve their Athena SWAN ambitions (actions 5.0-5.10)

Our AS activities are overseen by BASC, with other BioEDG members taking responsibility for specific actions and reporting back at termly BioEDG meetings. Members of BioEDG serve as AS 'ambassadors', representing the Department at University events, and sharing information with their representative groups in the Department. Thus, our AS beacon activities integrate with, and impact on, AS activities across the University as illustrated in Figure 3-1.

## Data \& Benchmarks

Benchmarks are from the ECU Equality in HE: Students \& Staff Statistical Reports 2017 (UK Biological Sciences). Census date for all data $=1^{\text {st }}$ December.

The majority of our students count as 1.0 FTE except Biochemists ( 0.67 FTE) and Biomedical Scientists ( 0.5 FTE ). We provide data for the past five years and, where necessary to demonstrate sustained impact, 10 years data is presented. We report output from statistical tests assessing gender trends over time using R software, reporting significant differences ( $\mathrm{P}<0.05$ ) when present. Analysed data are presented as \% values (usually in graphs) and/or raw data (Tables).

Figure 3-1-Biology Athena SWAN champion integrates with Departmental and University equality and diversity strategies and Athena SWAN forums, disseminating good practice and receiving support from the University AS co-ordinator


BioEDG reports to DMT and so our AS activity is firmly embedded within our Departmental governance. BioEDG feeds into our Faculty and University-level AS structures. We will continue to be proactive with regards to AS principles, ensuring that we look for ways to improve. We will continue to use focus groups to develop new ideas and assess impacts, engaging the whole Department with AS, with new activities focusing particularly on PSS. Action Point 1.0 - Increase engagement of PSS with AS

BioEDG will build on our experience of advancing gender equality to heighten awareness of other protected characteristics, enabling us to engage further with intersectionality, and progressing
our overall goal of providing a safe and nurturing working environment where all can reach their full potential.

Action 3.3 - Expand Departmental AS activity to include more protected characteristics to better promote under-represented groups

Word count: 881

## 4. A PICTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT

Recommended word count: 2000 words

### 4.1. Student data

If courses in the categories below do not exist, please enter $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$.
(i) Numbers of men and women on access or foundation courses
n/a
(ii) Numbers of undergraduate students by gender

Full- and part-time by programme. Provide data on course applications, offers, and acceptance rates, and degree attainment by gender.

## Summary: Our UG population is currently 64\% F, comparable to the UK Benchmark for Biological Sciences of 61.6\%.

We run F-T undergraduate (UG) degree programmes (BSc and Integrated MBiol) in Biology, Biochemistry (joint with the Chemistry Department), and Biomedical Sciences (joint with the Hull York Medical School; HYMS). Our annual UG intake has more than doubled since 2008/9, to > 300 in 2017/18; the proportion of females remains similar and consistent with AdvanceHE/ECU Biological Sciences Benchmark (61.6\%).

Figure 4-1 - Biology Undergraduate Entry by Gender (2013/14-2017/18) with ECU UK Benchmark for UG in Biological Sciences


Our gender balanced admissions team demonstrates to applicants that both women and men play key roles in our Department. Termly planning meetings with Chemistry (AS Gold) and HYMS (AS Silver) have E\&D as a standing item. More applications are from women, who are more likely to receive offers than men (Table 4.1), in line with national trends for Biosciences.

Table 4.1 - Undergraduate Applications, Offers and Acceptances

| Year |  | Applications | Offers | Acceptances | Offers/ <br> Applications | Acceptances / Offers | Acceptance/ <br> Applications |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2013/14 | Female | 816 | 736 | 103 | 90\% | 14\% | 13\% |
|  | Male | 604 | 488 | 75 | 81\% | 15\% | 12\% |
|  | \% Female | 58\% | 60\% | 58\% |  |  |  |
| 2014/15 | Female | 1160 | 1016 | 131 | 88\% | 13\% | 11\% |
|  | Male | 777 | 483 | 81 | 62\% | 17\% | 10\% |
|  | \% Female | 60\% | 68\% | 62\% |  |  |  |
| 2015/16 | Female | 1227 | 1043 | 147 | 85\% | 14\% | 12\% |
|  | Male | 815 | 630 | 107 | 77\% | 17\% | 13\% |
|  | \% Female | 60\% | 62\% | 58\% |  |  |  |
| 2016/17 | Female | 1273 | 1031 | 194 | 81\% | 19\% | 15\% |
|  | Male | 793 | 622 | 107 | 78\% | 17\% | 13\% |
|  | \% Female | 62\% | 62\% | 64\% |  |  |  |
| 2017/18 | Female | 1336 | 1151 | 197 | 86\% | 17\% | 15\% |
|  | Male | 768 | 651 | 109 | 85\% | 17\% | 14\% |
|  | \% Female | 64\% | 64\% | 64\% |  |  |  |
| Overall | Female | 5813 | 4976 | 772 | 86\% | 16\% | 13\% |
|  | Male | 3757 | 2873 | 479 | 76\% | 17\% | 13\% |
|  | \% Female | 61\% | 63\% | 62\% |  |  |  |

Table 4-2 - Proportion of offers made to female students on 3-year BSc and 4-year BSC with a 'Year in Industry'.

| Year <br> of <br> entry | Biology | Biology- <br> Year in <br> Industry | Biochemistry | Biochemistry <br> Year in <br> industry | Biomedical <br> Sciences | Biomedical <br> Sciences - Year <br> in industry |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 55.9 | 59.4 | 50.7 | 59.3 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}^{*}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 59.6 | 56.8 | 57.3 | 63.2 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}^{*}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 58.5 | 66.7 | 56.9 | 63.2 | 64.4 | $\mathrm{73.8}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 59.8 | 60.8 | 52.5 | 61.4 | 68.6 | 71.9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 61.2 | 58.3 | 60.6 | 62.6 | 72.8 | 72.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 60.7 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a} * *$ | 58.3 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a} * *$ | 73.7 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a} * *$ |

*Biomedical Sciences programme started in 2014.
**Applying for year in industry no longer applies at this stage in the degree programme (now apply year 2).
There has been a significant increase in offers made to women for our BSc Biochemistry programme: from $\sim 50 \%$ to $\sim 60 \% ~(r=0.75)$ and our Biomedical Science programme appeals to female applicants. Action 4.4 - Maintain career pipeline between UG \& PGR for female students.

Table 4.3 - Proportion of Male/Female UG Students gaining each Degree Class over 5 years from 2012/13 to 2016/17

| Gender | Class | $\stackrel{n}{N}$ |  | $\stackrel{i n}{\stackrel{i}{7}}$ |  | N <br>  <br>  | $\overline{\bar{T}}$ 0 0 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 1st | 27\% | 32\% | 44\% | 36\% | 36\% | 35\% |
|  | $2 i$ | 56\% | 47\% | 41\% | 48\% | 44\% | 47\% |
|  | 2ii | 8\% | 16\% | 13\% | 13\% | 16\% | 13\% |
|  | 3rd | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% |
|  | Pass | 9\% | 5\% | 0\% | 2\% | 2\% | 4\% |
| Female Total |  | 92 | 111 | 101 | 87 | 167 | 558 |
| Male | 1st | 26\% | 34\% | 38\% | 31\% | 29\% | 32\% |
|  | $2 i$ | 42\% | 45\% | 45\% | 44\% | 48\% | 45\% |
|  | 2ii | 23\% | 14\% | 13\% | 17\% | 14\% | 16\% |
|  | 3rd | 4\% | 3\% | 1\% | 5\% | 3\% | 3\% |
|  | Pass | 5\% | 4\% | 3\% | 3\% | 6\% | 4\% |
| Male Total |  | 57 | 71 | 78 | 60 | 86 | 553 |

Figure 4.2 - Proportion of female/male UG students gaining each Degree Class (2012/13-2016/17)


Similar proportions of male/female students obtain each degree class (Figure 4.2)
Table 4.4 - Undergraduates Ethnicity by Gender (UK \& Overseas)

|  | Male |  | Female |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BME | Non BME | Unknown | BME | Non BME |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |

The proportions of UG students that are BME (Table 4.4) is low for women and men. Action 2.7 Increase BME student, academic staff and PSS population in the department
(iii) Numbers of men and women on postgraduate taught degrees

Full- and part-time by programme. Provide data on course application, offers and acceptance rates and degree completion rates by gender.

Summary: Recent changes to our portfolio of PGT courses has resulted in an increase in the percentage of female PGT students to 64\%

We recently revised our one-year F-T PGT courses, with no PGT courses being offered during the revision (2015/16). We currently offer the following:

- MSc in Molecular Medicine
- MSc in Biodiversity, Ecology and Ecosystems
- MSc in Industrial Biotechnology

Figure 4-3 PGT students by gender (2012/13-2017/18) with UK benchmark for PGT students in Biological Sciences (black line and squares = total number enrolled).


The percentage of women on our PGT courses was lower than both our UG programmes and the UK average for Biological Sciences (Table 4.5). Our actions to review our PGT courses during our Gold Award (e.g. gender audit of our marketing materials, UB training) has had an impact on raising the \% of female students to $64 \%$, much closer to benchmark.

Action Point 2.1 - Maintain gender balance in PGT
Action Point 1.2 - Reduce Unconscious Bias.

Table 4.5 - PGT Student Applications, Offers and Acceptances

| Year |  | Applications | Offers | Acceptances | Offers/ Applications | Acceptances/ Offers | Acceptance/ Applications |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012/13 | Female | 95 | 49 | 16 | 52\% | 33\% | 17\% |
|  | Male | 96 | 50 | 22 | 52\% | 44\% | 23\% |
|  | \% Female | 50\% | 49\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
| 2013/14 | Female | 88 | 52 | 16 | 59\% | 31\% | 18\% |
|  | Male | 70 | 43 | 14 | 61\% | 33\% | 20\% |
|  | \% Female | 56\% | 55\% | 53\% |  |  |  |
| 2014/15 | Female | 109 | 92 | 17 | 84\% | 18\% | 16\% |
|  | Male | 78 | 52 | 12 | 67\% | 23\% | 15\% |
|  | \% Female | 58\% | 64\% | 59\% |  |  |  |
| 2015/16 | Female | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Male | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | \% Female | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| 2016/17 | Female | 25 | 24 | 3 | 96\% | 13\% | 12\% |
|  | Male | 24 | 19 | 3 | 79\% | 16\% | 13\% |
|  | \% Female | 51\% | 56\% | 50\% |  |  |  |
| 2017/18 | Female | 136 | 66 | 9 | 49\% | 14\% | 7\% |
|  | Male | 99 | 39 | 5 | 39\% | 13\% | 5\% |
|  | \% Female | 58\% | 63\% | 64\% |  |  |  |
| Overall | Female | 453 | 283 | 61 | 62\% | 22\% | 13\% |
|  | Male | 367 | 203 | 56 | 55\% | 28\% | 15\% |
|  | \% Female | 55\% | 58\% | 52\% |  |  |  |

Table 4.6 - PGT Students Degree Classifications

| Gender | Class | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \mathrm{H} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{ \pm}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n}}$ | $\stackrel{n}{\sim}$ | - $\substack{n \\ \sim \\ \text { N }}$ | N <br>  <br> 0 <br> $\sim$ <br> $\sim$ | $\bar{\square}$ <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | Distinction | 32\% | 20\% | 40\% | 19\% | - | 0\% | 19\% |
|  | Merit | 5\% | 65\% | 40\% | 56\% | - | 100\% | 44\% |
|  | Pass | 63\% | 15\% | 20\% | 25\% | - | 0\% | 21\% |
| Female Total |  | 19 | 20 | 15 | 15 | - | 2 | 71 |
| Male | Distinction | 40\% | 11\% | 25\% | 40\% | - | 20\% | 23\% |
|  | Merit | 7\% | 53\% | 46\% | 33\% | - | 20\% | 27\% |
|  | Pass | 53\% | 36\% | 29\% | 27\% | - | 60\% | 34\% |
| Male Total |  | 15 | 19 | 23 | 15 | - | 5 | 77 |

Figure 4.4 - Proportion of Male/Female PGT Students gaining each Degree Class over 5 years from 2012/13 to 2016/17


We will monitor gender balance of degree classifications (Table 4.6) as our new PGT courses mature.

We consider the intersectionality between ethnicity and gender for our PGT students. The proportions of our PGT students that are BME has fluctuated with no clear pattern over 5 years, and numbers are small.

Action2.7 - Increase BME student, academic staff and PSS population in the department.
Table 4.7 - PGT Students by Ethnicity and Gender (UK \& Overseas)

|  | Male |  | Female |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BME | Non BME | Unknown | BME | Non BME |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |

(iv) Numbers of men and women on postgraduate research degrees

Full- and part-time by programme. Provide data on course application, offers, acceptance and degree completion rates by gender.

Summary: Our Gold actions had impacts on stemming the loss of female students from UG to PGR, increasing female applicants from $52 \%$ to $57 \%$, and increasing female intake from $46 \%$ to $60 \%$.

We offer PGR degrees in:

- PhD in Biology
- PhD in Mechanistic Biology (BBSRC DTP)
- PhD in Adapting to the Challenges of a Changing Environment (NERC DTP)
- MPhil in Biology
- MSc by Research in Biology

Figure 4-5 PGR students by gender (2013/14-2017/18) with UK benchmark for PGR students in Biological Sciences

Black line and squares = annual intake


We currently have only one female P-T student but all PGR programmes can be studied part time. During our Gold Award we reviewed our adverts/course information, career information and ensured inclusion of positive images of women; our intake increased from 46\%F (2013/14) to 60\%F
(2017/18), in line with the proportion of UG female students. Our Gold actions successfully reduced loss of women progressing from UG to PGR.

Table 4.8 - PGR Student Applications, Offers and Acceptances

| Year |  | Applications | Offers | Acceptances | Offers/ Applications | Acceptances / Offers | Acceptance/ Applications |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2013/14 | Female | 110 | 21 | 16 | 19\% | 76\% | 15\% |
|  | Male | 103 | 28 | 19 | 27\% | 68\% | 18\% |
|  | \% Female | 52\% | 43\% | 46\% |  |  |  |
| 2014/15 | Female | 124 | 38 | 28 | 31\% | 74\% | 23\% |
|  | Male | 120 | 21 | 18 | 18\% | 86\% | 15\% |
|  | \% Female | 51\% | 64\% | 61\% |  |  |  |
| 2015/16 | Female | 207 | 28 | 23 | 14\% | 82\% | 11\% |
|  | Male | 212 | 27 | 23 | 13\% | 85\% | 11\% |
|  | \% Female | 49\% | 51\% | 50\% |  |  |  |
| 2016/17 | Female | 221 | 34 | 24 | 15\% | 71\% | 11\% |
|  | Male | 178 | 19 | 14 | 11\% | 74\% | 8\% |
|  | \% Female | 55\% | 64\% | 63\% |  |  |  |
| 2017/18 | Female | 225 | 31 | 25 | 14\% | 81\% | 11\% |
|  | Male | 170 | 27 | 17 | 16\% | 63\% | 10\% |
|  | \% Female | 57\% | 53\% | 60\% |  |  |  |
| Overall | Female | 887 | 152 | 116 | 17\% | 76\% | 13\% |
|  | Male | 783 | 122 | 91 | 16\% | 75\% | 12\% |
|  | \% Female | 53\% | 55\% | 56\% |  |  |  |

The percentage of PGR applications from women has increased from $52 \%$ to $57 \%$ but is still lower than for UG programmes (64\% in 2017/18; Table 4.1). Action 4.4 - Maintain career pipeline between UG \& PGR for female students. Mean PGR completion rates (Figure 4.6) are improving over five years, and we will examine the tendency in most years for women to have slightly lower rates than men, and whether this reflects male students requesting fewer leave-of-absences and/or extensions.

Figure 4-6 - PGR Completion Rates


The proportion of BME PGR students has decreased over five years for both men and women. Action 2.7 Increase BME student population in the department.

Table 4.9 - PGR Students by Ethnicity and Gender (UK \& Overseas)

|  | Male |  |  | Female |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BME | Non BME | Unknown | BME | Non BME | Unknown |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersectionality between Ethnicity and Gender for UK Domiciled Students

Considering intersectionality between ethnicity and gender for our UK domiciled students provides us with a clearer picture of any biases in our recruitment process, and a sufficient sample size.

Table 4.10 - UK Domiciled Students (UG/PGT/PGR) by Gender and Ethnicity

|  | Male |  | Female |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BME | Non BME | Unknown | BME | Non BME |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |

The proportion of BME students is below the UK ECU benchmarks for men and women $(22.8 \% \mathrm{M}$ and $21.1 \%$ F, respectively). Action2.7-Increase BME student, academic staff and PSS population in the department.
(v) Progression pipeline between undergraduate and postgraduate student levels Identify and comment on any issues in the pipeline between undergraduate and postgraduate degrees.

Figure 4-7 Progression Pipeline UG to PGR


Figure 4-8 Progression Pipeline UG/PGT/PGR


We reviewed our marketing literature, admissions processes and provision of role models, and these actions have successfully had impacts on stemming the leaky pipeline between UG and PG study for females; Fig. 4.7 shows that two of the least leaky years since 2012/13 are 16/17 and 17/18.

Action 2.1 - Maintain gender balance in PGT
Action 4.4 - Maintain career pipeline between UG \& PGR for female students

### 4.2. Academic and research staff data

(i) Academic staff by grade, contract function and gender: research-only, teaching and research or teaching-only

Look at the career pipeline and comment on, and explain any differences between, men and women. Identify any gender issues in the pipeline at particular grades/job type/academic contract type.

Table 4.11 - Potential Career Paths of Academic and Research Staff

| Grade | Career Path |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Research-only | Research and Teaching <br> (R\&T) | Teaching and Scholarship <br> (T\&S) |
| 6 | Postdoctoral Research <br> Assistant <br> (PDRA) <br> Research Fellow | Independent Research <br> Fellow (IRF) | Associate Lecturer |
| 7 | Senior Research Fellow | Lecturer |  |
| 8 | Professor | Senior Lecturer |  |
| Reader |  |  |  |
| Prof (1-3) |  | Professor | Senior Lecturer |

Academic staff are on R\&T contracts ( $81 \%, 17 \mathrm{~F} / 41 \mathrm{M}$ ) or T\&S contracts ( $9 \mathrm{~F} / 8 \mathrm{M}$ ). These career paths are interchangeable, and two staff have moved from R\&T to T\&S (1M, 1F) Four out of five (2F; 2M) of our IRF's and two female PDRAs are now Lecturers, demonstrating impacts from our commitment to mentor ECRs during our Gold Award.

Summary: Sustained increase in proportion of female academic staff from $27 \%$ to $\mathbf{3 5 \%}$.

The gender balance of academic staff has improved substantially since the Department was established (Figure 4.10): 12\%F (1968) to 35\%F (2017). We are proud of our reputation as a femalefriendly Department, and encouraged by our successful achievements against our previous actions. Revising recruitment materials to include gender neutral language, emphasize P-T and flexible working opportunities and our commitment to AS principles, and providing male and female academic contacts for each post, had impacts since 2014 on increasing the \% of female academic staff from $27 \%$ to $35 \%$, and the $\%$ of applications from females also rose from $<30 \%$ to $\sim 40 \%$. Our recruitment increased women in senior positions from 10 to 15, and after the 2017 AS census date, we recruited two female Lecturers ( $\sim 30 \%$ of recent new recruits). This rapid progress during our

Gold award still requires further improvement. Action point 3.6 - Continue to improve the \% of female ART applications

Actions toward increasing promotion awareness via lunchtime information sessions and encouragement to take-up opportunities for research leave have also had impacts, and the \% of women being promoted has increased to $43 \%$ of applicants in the last three years; and a woman was promoted to Professor (50\% of recent Professorial promotions).

Figure 4.9 - Proportion of Female Academic Staff by Grade


Table 4.12 - Academic Staff by Grade

| Grade/Role | Gender | $\stackrel{m}{\text { n }}$ | - | N | 0 <br> 1 <br> N | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lecturer (Grade 7) | Female | 5 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 11 |
|  | Male | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 16 |
|  | \% Female | 28\% | 20\% | 25\% | 40\% | 41\% |
| Senior Lecturer/Reader (Grade 8/8R) | Female | 4 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|  | Male | 11 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 16 |
|  | \% Female | 27\% | 32\% | 30\% | 33\% | 33\% |
| Professor (Prof) | Female | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 |
|  | Male | 15 | 14 | 14 | 18 | 17 |
|  | \% Female | 29\% | 30\% | 30\% | 28\% | 29\% |

Figure 4-10 Biology academic staff in 1968 (2 women) and 2017 (26 women)


BIOLOGY ACADEMIC STAFF (as of census 01/12/2017)


Figure 4-11 - Percentage of female academic staff 2008-2017


We have increased the \%F lecturers, maintained the \%F senior lecturers, and are significantly above the benchmark for \%F Professors. We have new actions to ensure newly-appointed lecturers apply for promotion.

## Action Point 3.0 - Support career progression of female academics \& Researchers.

Most new academic posts are advertised at Lecturer grade, and so we are encouraged that impacts from our actions have been greatest at this grade. During this period one female professor was promoted to Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research, and two retired, and so our AS actions have maintained our high \% of female professors during a period of turnover.

The majority of both R\&T and T\&S academics are employed on open contracts, spanning grade 6 to Professor. All academic staff have annual PDR meetings, full access to staff development courses, and a transparent promotions process, regardless of contract type.

Figure 4.12 - Proportion of Female Research Staff by Grade


Table 4.13 - Research Staff by Grade and Gender

| Grade/Role | Gender | n $\sim$ $N$ | - | n | 0 -1 $\sim$ | $\stackrel{N}{\text { N}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Postdoctoral Research Associate (Grade 6) | Female | 33 | 27 | 33 | 43 | 40 |
|  | Male | 24 | 31 | 35 | 33 | 44 |
|  | \% Female | 58\% | 47\% | 49\% | 57\% | 48\% |
| Research Fellow (Grade 7) \& Senior Research Fellow (Grade 8) | Female | 7 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 9 |
|  | Male | 9 | 9 | 12 | 11 | 10 |
|  | \% Female | 44\% | 50\% | 37\% | 45\% | 47\% |

The \% of female Research staff is close to gender parity but slightly below the ECU Benchmark; over five years, $56 \%$ of PGR students were female compared to $51 \%$ of research staff. Our actions successfully reduced the fall-off of \%F between researcher and lecturer. In addition to the provision of female role models (Table 2-1) but there is still more to be done.

Action 4.0 - Reduce career pipeline leak from PDRA to lecturer \& raise \% of female PDRAs to Benchmark

Figure 4-13 - Staff Career Progression Pipeline - Research - Academic (Non-Prof) - Academic (Prof)

(ii) Where relevant, comment on the transition of staff between technical and academic roles.

Staff can transition from technical to academic roles (see Case Study 2). We will continue to showcase the wide variety of career paths of our staff, including transition to/from technical roles.

Action Point 2.6 - Improve visibility/understanding of career progression pathways for PDRAs to reduce perceived insecurity
(iii) Academic and research staff on fixed-term, open-ended/permanent and zerohour contracts by grade and gender

Comment on the proportions of men and women on these contracts. Comment on what is being done to ensure continuity of employment, and to address any other issues, including redeployment schemes.

Summary: 95\% of academic staff are on open contracts and there is gender parity in the proportion of open and fixed-term contracts (FTCs) held by researchers.

No staff are on zero hours contracts, $95 \%$ of academic staff are employed on open contracts with the 4 staff ( $2 \mathrm{~F} ; 2 \mathrm{M}$ ) on FTCs (Grade 6 T\&S) providing cover for specific short-term needs e.g. cover for Fellowships and maternity/paternity leave. We recognise the insecurity of FTCs and mentor staff to apply for newly advertised posts.

Table 4.14 - Proportions of male and female researchers on open ended and fixed term contracts

|  |  | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{2}}$ | - - $\sim$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{N}{\mathbf{N}} \end{aligned}$ | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | Open-Ended | 30 | 25 | 31 | 36 | 33 |
|  | Fixed-Term | 10 | 11 | 9 | 17 | 16 |
|  | \% on FT Contracts | 25\% | 31\% | 22\% | 32\% | 33\% |
| Male | Open-Ended | 23 | 29 | 37 | 31 | 43 |
|  | Fixed-Term | 10 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 11 |
|  | \% on FT Contracts | 30\% | 27\% | 22\% | 31\% | 20\% |

A large number of research-only staff (mostly grade 6, but a few grades 7) are on FTCs linked to grants. All grade 8 Research staff are on Open contracts. Table 4.13 shows that over the last 5 years there is little difference in the likelihood of men or women being on FTCs. It is University policy that research staff move automatically to an open contract after six years, or their fourth contract whichever is soonest.

Table 4.15 - Proportions of male and female researchers on open ended and fixed term contracts by Grade

|  | Fixed term |  | Open |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Grade | Male | Female | Male | Female |
|  | G6 | $78 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
|  | G7 | $33 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
|  | G8 | - | - | - | - |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | G6 | $87 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
|  | G7 | $29 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
|  | G8 | - | - | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | G6 | $94 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
|  | G7 | $29 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
|  | G8 | - | - | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | G6 | $94 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
|  | G7 | $30 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
|  | G8 | - | - | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | G6 | $93 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
|  | G7 | $29 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
|  | G8 | - | - | $100 \%$ | - |

Figure 4-13 Research staff on fixed term vs. open contracts


We are committed to implementing the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers and recognise the insecurity of staff on FTCs; this can impact particularly severely on women who may be less able to move Institutions. We will improve visibility of different career paths and encouraging PDRAs to engage with a new inter-Departmental mentoring scheme.

Action Point 1.3 - Produce more comprehensive understanding of PDRA career destinations.
Naming researchers on grant applications is one way to ensure FTC researchers remain in the Department, but it is also important to encourage PDRAs toward more secure career options. Over the last three years, named researchers comprise $70 \% \mathrm{~F} / 30 \% \mathrm{M}$. Action Point 2.0 looks to identify reasons behind this gender imbalance.

Action 2.0 - Support career progression of PDRAs and understand factors affecting gender balance of 'Named Researchers' on research applications

All FTC staff are treated equally when funding is coming to an end and:

- can join the University redeployment register within six months of end of funding to see redeployment opportunities before they are advertised externally.
- are offered a full consultation process: the viability of moving to open contract; extension to existing contract; redeployment opportunities and training or support in applying for other posts are discussed.
(iv) Academic leavers by grade and gender and full/part-time status

Comment on the reasons academic staff leave the department, any differences by gender and the mechanisms for collecting this data.

Summary: Low turnover amongst academic staff, with only 9 staff leaving/retiring since 2013, and gender parity in leavers amongst research-only staff.

Table 4.16 - Leaving rates of Academic \& Research Staff

|  |  | 2013 |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staff grp/ grade |  | 先 | $\frac{0}{\sum_{\Sigma}^{\pi}}$ | - | $\frac{0}{\sum_{\sum}^{\pi}}$ | - | ${ }_{\sum}^{\frac{0}{10}}$ | ¢ | $\frac{0}{10}$ | O $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{0}$ U U | $\frac{\text { ¢ }}{\frac{10}{10}}$ |
| Research 6 | Leavers | 3 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 5 |
|  | Staff | 33 | 24 | 27 | 31 | 33 | 35 | 43 | 33 | 40 | 44 |
|  | Leaving rate | 9.1\% | 37.5\% | 33.3\% | 25.8\% | 12.1\% | 11.4\% | 18.6\% | 30.3\% | 22.5\% | 11.4\% |
| Research 7/8 | Leavers | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
|  | Staff | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 10 |
|  | Leaving rate | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 22.2\% | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 11.1\% | 18.2\% | 22.2\% | 10.0\% |
| Academic Lecturer | Leavers |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | Staff | 5 | 13 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 16 |
|  | Leaving rate | 0.0\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% | 8.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 8.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Academic - Snr Lecturer/Reader | Leavers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | Staff | 4 | 11 | 6 | 13 | 6 | 14 | 7 | 14 | 8 | 16 |
|  | Leaving rate | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 7.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Academic Prof | Leavers |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 |
|  | Staff | 6 | 15 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 14 | 7 | 18 | 7 | 17 |
|  | Leaving rate | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 7.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 17.6\% |

Average turnover of academic staff is $\sim 5 \%$ per annum (gender parity). In 2017, one female academic retired and remains at the University as Emerita; of three male leavers one retired and still holds an honorary post and two moved institutions (both for family reasons). Turnover of research staff is higher, but with no clear gender pattern. All but two leavers were F-T and the two P-T leavers were Grade 6 Researchers (1 M; 1 F). A bullying issue was raised in our "leavers questionnaire/meetings" and we updated our communication of support through signposting posters around the department (Figure 5-27: see also HR Policies Section 5.6 (vi)). Action Point 5.8

- Encouraging healthy working practices, will further address bullying
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## 5. SUPPORTING AND ADVANCING WOMEN'S CAREERS
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5.1. Key career transition points: academic staff

Figure 5.1 - Career pipeline of students, researchers and academic staff (2013-2017)


Our actions have successfully helped stem the leak of females between Lecturer and Professor, but despite progress, leaks in the career pipeline remain at Researcher to Lecturer (Fig 5.1).

## (i) Recruitment

Break down data by gender and grade for: applications; long- and shortlisted candidates; offer and acceptance rates. Comment on how the department's recruitment processes ensure that women (and men where there is an underrepresentation in numbers) are encouraged to apply.

## Summary:

- Increase of $6 \%$ in applications, $12 \%$ in shortlisting and $12 \%$ in selection of females across academic and research posts.
- $5 \%$ increase in \%F applicants for academic posts.
- Gender parity in \%F/M interviewed and selected for Researcher posts.

All recruitment is administered by the AM (member of BioEDG) and includes the HoD office to ensure consistency. We use standardised recruitment materials, reviewed annually by BioEDG (e.g. checking for gender-neutral text and images) and emphasise our family-friendly policies and commitment to gender equality (including the AS Gold logo). Male and female contacts are included, or a generic, gender-neutral contact for enquiries. These actions have been effective at increasing the \% of female applicants. To build on these successful impacts, we plan to trial software
to reduce gendered language in our recruitment materials. Action Point 3.6 - Continue to improve the \% of female ART applications and will work with the University to improve candidate briefs across the institution - Action 5.6

Figure 5-2 - Standard Recruitment Paragraph in Department Section of Candidate Brief

The Department of Biology operates a set of family-friendly policies and welcomes applications that are made on a part-time and job share basis. We will do our best to accommodate such requests where possible. Staff working patterns are flexible and a formal flexitime system is also in operation and the University has a nursery on site. We are proud to foster a supportive culture that helps staff and students reach their full potential and we embrace equality, diversity and inclusion as well as the values of the Athena SWAN Charter in all our departmental activities. Our philosophy is that poor working practices discriminate disproportionately against women whereas good practices support all. We have a Gold Athena SWAN award in recognition of our culture, ethos and activity.

## Athena SWAN Gold Award

Figure 5-3 - Selection of pictures from Biology Candidate Briefs


Recruitment panels for all roles include women and men; the relatively high number of women in the Department ensures women are not over-burdened. All panel members have UB training and chairs complete Recruitment and Selection training, with regular updates; compliance is monitored by the AM.

An observer attends short-listing meetings for recruitment of academic staff to gather gender information e.g. length of time spent discussing candidates, whether inappropriate/irrelevant information is discussed. No significant differences according to the gender of the applicant have been identified; one possibility is that the presence of the observer may help ensure best practice (Smith et al. BioScience (2015) 65: 1084-1087). Discussion of gender balance of shortlisted applicants is standard practice in our recruitment process.

Interviewees are offered the option of a Skype interview and flexible timing; ensuring that candidates with caring responsibilities or disabilities are not disadvantaged. Interviewees are asked for anonymous feedback by our central HR team. No general problems have been identified to date; we will continue to monitor these reports. We are proud of feedback demonstrating that our actions are producing an equality culture in recruitment (see quote next page).

The AM advises on offers of employment for all staff levels, to ensure parity in starting salaries; recognising that females tend not to negotiate as strongly. Years of relevant experience are directly linked to specific points on the salary scales.

We make direct appointments for short term positions (less than 12 months) and we monitor these in respect to gender.

Figure 5.4-Academic Recruitment showing impacts from our actions -2013-2017


The interview process with Biology at York was excellent - this was the first interview I have been to where there was no effort made to indirectly find out about my family status. Feedback from Female Academic Applicant (Jan 2018)

Table 5.1 - Academic and Research Recruitment by Grade/Gender

| Year | Grade | Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2013 | Grade 6 Research | Female | 220 | 35 | 8 | 16\% | 23\% | 4\% |
|  |  | Male | 309 | 44 | 12 | 14\% | 27\% | 4\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 41.60\% | 44.30\% | 40.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Grade 7 Lecturer | Female | 42 | 4 | 1 | 10\% | 25\% | 2\% |
|  |  | Male | 103 | 7 | 2 | 7\% | 29\% | 2\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 29.00\% | 36.40\% | 33.30\% |  |  |  |
|  | Professor | Female | 6 | 1 | 1 | 17\% | 100\% | 17\% |
|  |  | Male | 21 | 3 | 0 | 14\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 22.20\% | 25.00\% | 100.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Female | 268 | 40 | 10 | 15\% | 25\% | 4\% |
|  |  | Male | 433 | 54 | 14 | 12\% | 26\% | 3\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 38.20\% | 42.60\% | 41.70\% |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Grade 6 Research | Female | 214 | 42 | 7 | 20\% | 17\% | 3\% |
|  |  | Male | 261 | 34 | 11 | 13\% | 32\% | 4\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 45.10\% | 55.30\% | 38.90\% |  |  |  |
|  | Grade 7 Research | Female | 13 | 3 | 3 | 23\% | 100\% | 23\% |
|  |  | Male | 12 | 6 | 1 | 50\% | 17\% | 8\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 52.00\% | 33.30\% | 75.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Grade 7 Lecturer | Female | 45 | 2 | 0 | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 93 | 9 | 2 | 10\% | 22\% | 2\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 32.60\% | 18.20\% | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Professor | Female | 4 | 1 | 0 | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 9 | 3 | 1 | 33\% | 33\% | 11\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 30.80\% | 25.00\% | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Female | 276 | 48 | 10 | 17\% | 21\% | 4\% |
|  |  | Male | 375 | 52 | 15 | 14\% | 29\% | 4\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 42.40\% | 48.00\% | 40.00\% |  |  |  |


| Year | Grade | Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | Grade 6 Research | Female | 315 | 41 | 13 | 13\% | 32\% | 4\% |
|  |  | Male | 479 | 49 | 11 | 10\% | 22\% | 2\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 39.70\% | 45.60\% | 54.20\% |  |  |  |
|  | Grade 8 Senior Lecturer | Female | 6 | 1 | 0 | 17\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 8 | 3 | 1 | 38\% | 33\% | 13\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 42.90\% | 25.00\% | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Professor | Female | 1 | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | Male | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | -! | 0\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 14.30\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Female | 322 | 43 | 14 | 13\% | 33\% | 4\% |
|  |  | Male | 493 | 52 | 12 | 11\% | 23\% | 2\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 39.50\% | 45.30\% | 53.80\% |  |  |  |
| 2016 | Grade 6 Research | Female | 147 | 39 | 10 | 27\% | 26\% | 7\% |
|  |  | Male | 231 | 37 | 8 | 16\% | 22\% | 3\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 38.90\% | 51.30\% | 55.60\% |  |  |  |
|  | Grade 7 Lecturer | Female | 65 | 4 | 0 | 6\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 114 | 11 | 3 | 10\% | 27\% | 3\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 36.30\% | 26.70\% | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Grade 8 Senior Lecturer | Female | 10 | 3 | 0 | 30\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 7 | 1 | 1 | 14\% | 100\% | 14\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 58.80\% | 75.00\% | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Female | 222 | 46 | 10 | 21\% | 22\% | 5\% |
|  |  | Male | 352 | 49 | 12 | 14\% | 24\% | 3\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 38.70\% | 48.40\% | 45.50\% |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Grade 6 Research | Female | 195 | 41 | 9 | 21\% | 22\% | 5\% |
|  |  | Male | 221 | 36 | 11 | 16\% | 31\% | 5\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 46.90\% | 53.20\% | 45.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Grade 7 Research | Female | 1 | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |
|  |  | \% Female | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Grade 7 Lecturer | Female | 38 | 7 | 3 | 18\% | 43\% | 8\% |
|  |  | Male | 67 | 3 | 0 | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 36.20\% | 70.00\% | 100.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Professor | Female | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | - | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 10 | 1 | 0 | 10\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 23.10\% | 0.00\% | - |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Female | 237 | 49 | 13 | 21\% | 27\% | 5\% |
|  |  | Male | 298 | 40 | 11 | 13\% | 28\% | 4\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 44.30\% | 55.10\% | 54.20\% |  |  |  |


| Year | Grade | Gender |  |  |  | suo! |  | Acceptances/Applications |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overall | Grade 6 Research | Female | 1091 | 198 | 47 | 18\% | 24\% | 4\% |
|  |  | Male | 1501 | 200 | 53 | 13\% | 27\% | 4\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 42.10\% | 49.70\% | 47.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Grade 7 Research | Female | 14 | 4 | 4 | 29\% | 100\% | 29\% |
|  |  | Male | 12 | 6 | 1 | 50\% | 17\% | 8\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 53.80\% | 40.00\% | 80.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Grade 7 Lecturer | Female | 190 | 17 | 4 | 9\% | 24\% | 2\% |
|  |  | Male | 377 | 30 | 7 | 8\% | 23\% | 2\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 33.50\% | 36.20\% | 36.40\% |  |  |  |
|  | Grade 8 Senior Lecturer | Female | 16 | 4 | 0 | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 15 | 4 | 2 | 27\% | 50\% | 13\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 51.60\% | 50.00\% | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
|  | Professor | Female | 14 | 3 | 2 | 21\% | 67\% | 14\% |
|  |  | Male | 46 | 7 | 1 | 15\% | 14\% | 2\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 23.30\% | 30.00\% | 66.70\% |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Female | 1325 | 226 | 57 | 17\% | 25\% | 4\% |
|  |  | Male | 1951 | 247 | 64 | 13\% | 26\% | 3\% |
|  |  | \% Female | 40.40\% | 47.80\% | 47.10\% |  |  |  |

Applicants for academic and research posts increased from 38\%F (2013) to 44\%F (2017) as a consequence of our actions. We have gender parity in researcher recruitment; we have actions to increase female applicants and reach gender parity at higher grades. Increases in \% of F applicants to $44 \%$ resulted in shortlists increasing from $43 \% \mathrm{~F}$ to $55 \%$ F, supporting the recognised reluctance of women to apply unless they fill all role descriptions.

Action 3.6 - Continue to improve the \% of female ART applications

Figure 5-5-Research Recruitment-2013-2017

(ii) Induction

Describe the induction and support provided to all new academic staff, at all levels. Comment on the uptake of this and how its effectiveness is reviewed.

Summary:

- $100 \%$ of respondents ( $52 \%$ F; $48 \% \mathrm{M}$ ) said Induction provided the necessary information about their role in the Department
- All new academic and research staff are allocated a mentor to ensure they successfully settle into their new role.

Induction communicates our inclusive Departmental culture. All new staff receive a Biology Induction Plan with signposting to HR policies/procedures, including our E\&D best-practices, flexible working and other family-friendly policies. Mandatory training is highlighted in this document:

- Equality \& Diversity
- Unconscious bias
- Safeguarding \& Security
- Computer workstation assessment
- Fire safety
- Information Security (GDPR)

The process is improved in response to feedback gathered via a survey form sent to each new starter and manager.

All new Academic staff meet with the HoD in their first week; meetings are timetabled with other key staff e.g. Deputy HoDs, Chairs of Research Committee, Board of Studies, Graduate School, Department Manager/Admin Manager, Operations Manager, Workshops \& Technology Centre Managers, Research Facilitator. To familiarise staff with the physical layout of the Department, they meet all these people in their offices.
$100 \%$ of respondents (52\%F; 48\%M) said they felt the induction process gave them all the necessary information about the role \& department
"I was given specific induction on Lab procedures, my induction also included signposting to relevant online induction resources and connection with relevant support networks which was really useful" - Male Researcher


This feedback has been acted on and a tour of the Technology Facility is now arranged for all new academic staff.

Acting on staff feedback that it was slow to get to know other staff outside of their own lab/office, we will hold monthly induction briefings where important information will be provided face-to-face and new starters can meet each other.

Action Point 4.5 - Review induction to include opportunity for new starters to meet other new starters in Department

Since 2013, all new academic staff are assigned a teaching mentor, to familiarize them with our teaching procedures and ethos, and to give constructive feedback on teaching. within their two-year probation period, for which they receive workload reduction. Academics on R\&T contracts also have a reduced teaching load for the first two years of appointment ( $30 \%$ and $60 \%$ teaching load in years 1 and 2 , respectively), to help them establish their research.

All staff receive a University Induction document with additional information and signposting on E\&D. For researchers there is an active and welcoming Biology Post-doc Society; mentors make contact before new staff arrive, to make the starting experience as welcoming as possible.

Figure 5-6 - The E\&D Section of the University Induction Checklist

## Equality and diversity

Completion of online Diversity in the Workplace package
Familiarise yourself with Athena SWAN
Review the Equality and Diversity pages
Review the Disability Support for Staff pages
Informed of who your Harassment Adviser is

Date completed

(iii) Promotion

Provide data on staff applying for promotion and comment on applications and success rates by gender, grade and full- and part-time status. Comment on how staff are encouraged and supported through the process.

Summary: 89\% of females applying for promotion are successful, now in line with success of males (81\%).

Figure 5.7 - Schematic to show how we support staff in the University Promotions Process

University Promotion Process

'Promotion readiness' is part of the annual PDR discussion. An annual email from HoD invites staff to talk face-to-face outside of PDR meetings. The HoD and deputy HoD recognise some staff (particularly women) are less likely to apply so actively encourage promotion applications. Lunchtime sessions provide informal opportunities to discuss the process with members of University Promotions committee; ~50\% of staff attended last year (54\%F; 47\%M). An increasing
( $81 \%$ to $87 \%$ ) proportion of staff agree they understand the promotions process. We will provide support to those who are unsuccessful to improve their applications.

Action Point 3.0 - Support career progression of female academics \& Researchers.
Table 5.2 - Number of Academic Staff Promotions

| Year of <br> application | Application <br> for | Male <br> applicants | Female <br> applicants | Successful |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Over seven years (Table 5.2), female academics submitted $37 \%$ of promotion applications compared to $27 \%$ before our Gold award (2011-2014). Female success rates have improved, demonstrating impacts from the instigation of our pro-active approach, with $89 \%$ of female applicants successfully applying for promotion in the last seven years compared to $27 \%$ in the period 2011-2014. Male success rates have also risen, from $42 \%$ (2011-2014) to $81 \%$, suggesting all staff are receiving helpful advice and support.

Table 5.3 - Promotion application rates at different grades

| Grade/Role |  | $\underset{\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{N}}}{\underset{\sim}{n}}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{7}}$ |  | 0 <br>  <br>  |  | N$\mathbf{N}$$\mathbf{N}$N |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\underset{\sim}{7}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gender | ¢ ¢ ¢ U1 | $\frac{\square}{ \pm}$ | O <br> ¢ <br> ¢ <br> U | $\frac{\stackrel{0}{10}}{\sum^{10}}$ | $\underset{\text { ¢ }}{\stackrel{0}{0}}$ | ${ }_{\Sigma}^{\frac{0}{10}}$ | O ¢ ¢ ¢ | $\frac{\square}{ \pm}$ | ¢ ¢ ¢ ¢ | $\frac{\stackrel{0}{10}}{\sum^{10}}$ | U ¢ ¢ U | $\frac{0}{10}$ |
| Research Fellow (Grade 7) \& Senior Research Fellow (Grade 8) | Applicants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eligible Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Application Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lecturer (Grade 7) | Applicants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eligible Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Application Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Senior Lecturer/Reader (Grade 8/8R) | Applicants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eligible Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Application Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professor (Prof) | Applicants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eligible Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Application Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Promotion application rates show no pattern across grades 7 to 8; applications from grade 6 are low because posts are often linked to fixed funding with less flexibility in the job specification.

No women applied for internal promotion to Professor during the period 2011-2016 when seven men applied, but two female internal applicants were appointed through externally-advertised Chair posts. Our actions to support promotion applications by female Readers resulted in a woman being promoted to Professor in 2017-18.

Action Point 3.0 - Support career progression of female academics \& Researchers.
Three P-T staff successfully applied for promotion over the last 7 years ( $2 \mathrm{~F}, 1 \mathrm{M}$ ) and three female members of staff were on maternity leave when they were promoted.
"During my maternity leave in XXXXXX the Department encouraged me to apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Without the encouragement, I probably would not have felt that applying was appropriate during maternity leave. I was very pleased to be promoted despite not actually being at work, and that having had two periods of maternity leave did not appear to affect career progression." Female Academic (feedback from promotions focus group)

We know that promotion has impacts on gender pay-gap analyses. Our analyses show no overall gender pay-gap in the Department, in contrast to the sector, but a pay-gap for our senior academics, where women are paid less. We will work with the University to better understand the reasons for these pay-gaps, and support women applying for promotion. Action 5.10 - Work with the University to address the gender pay gap.
(iv) Department submissions to the Research Excellence Framework (REF)

Provide data, by gender, on the staff submitted to REF versus those that were eligible. Compare this to the data for the Research Assessment Exercise 2008. Comment on any gender imbalances identified.

In RAE2008 all eligible staff were returned; 40M, 18F. In REF2014 a more strategic approach returned 47 of 67 eligible staff ( 35 M and 12F) with no significant difference in the proportion of eligible men and women submitted (i.e. REF-returned staff $\sim 26 \%$ F against REF-eligible staff $\sim 28 \%$; $p>0.3$ ). Members of the then Departmental 'ASWG' were on the REF sub-group, to ensure gender equality in processes.

To support staff preparing for REF2021:

- Departmental funds and research leave opportunities enable completion of outputs (gender parity in requests to date).
- Mentoring and support improve manuscript acceptance rates.
- Regular information at staff meetings ensures transparency in processes e.g. grading of outputs.


### 5.2. Key career transition points: professional and support staff

Our PSS comprise Management Services, Technical, Research, and Finance Support staff; these posts often allow a high degree of flexibility and many of our staff work P-T or term time. The proportion of both our male and female staff working P-T is above the ECU benchmark (2017) for PSS across the UK; on average women are ~twice as likely as men to be working P-T. PSS over five years are 69\%F which is higher than the benchmark (62.7\%).

Action Point 2.3 - Ensure there are no barriers to male representation in specific PSS grades.

Figure 5-4 Numbers of PSS by Gender - 5 years

| Year | Females | Males | \%Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2013 | 104 | 54 | $66 \%$ |
| 2014 | 121 | 58 | $68 \%$ |
| 2015 | 124 | 55 | $69 \%$ |
| 2016 | 120 | 54 | $69 \%$ |
| 2017 | 111 | 45 | $71 \%$ |

Figure 5-8 Graph showing PSS by Gender - 5 years


Table 5.5 - Part-time/Full-time Breakdown for PSS against ECU Staff Benchmark 2017

| Gender | Full-Time / part-Time | $\stackrel{\sim}{\text { N }}$ | - N | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{N}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\sum_{\text {in }}^{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Women | Full-Time | 74 | 64 | 66 | 65 | 56 | 65 |  |
|  | Part-Time | 30 | 57 | 58 | 55 | 55 | 51 |  |
|  | Proportion Part-Time | 29\% | 47\% | 47\% | 46\% | 50\% | 44\% | 40.70\% |
| Men | Full-Time | 46 | 45 | 39 | 42 | 37 | 42 |  |
|  | Part-Time | 8 | 13 | 16 | 12 | 8 | 11 |  |
|  | Proportion Part-Time | 15\% | 22\% | 29\% | 22\% | 18\% | 21\% | 17.30\% |
| Proportion of all staff who are female |  | 66\% | 68\% | 69\% | 69\% | 71\% | 69\% | 62.70\% |

Figure 5-9-Representation of PSS at different Career Stages


We are close to gender parity for PSS at the lower and higher grades, however this diverges in the middle grades.
Action Point 2.2 - Reduce gender disparity across PSS grades and support PSS careers
Action Point 2.3 - Ensure there are no barriers to male representation in specific PSS grades.

## Induction

Describe the induction and support provided to all new professional and support staff, at all levels. Comment on the uptake of this and how its effectiveness is reviewed.

The generic aspects of the Induction process described above for academic and research staff are mandatory for all new PSS. PSS have a probation plan with reviews at 3 months, 6 months and 9 months (for Grades 6-8) and a 'buddy' or mentor. They also complete the University Induction Checklist. Recent feedback identified the desire for PSS to meet staff from other groups as part of induction.

Action Point 4.5 - Review induction to include opportunity for new starters to meet other new starters in Department
(ii) Promotion

Provide data on staff applying for promotion, and comment on applications and success rates by gender, grade and full- and part-time status. Comment on how staff are encouraged and supported through the process.

There is no formal (in-role) promotion route for PSS within the University; PSS looking to progress to a higher grade apply for a vacant position.

To support staff toward higher grade posts we offer:

- Opportunities to take on additional responsibilities;
- Mentorship, and job shadowing opportunities and secondments;
- 'Acting-up' opportunities for short periods where a 'Temporary Responsibility Allowance' is paid; (8 in 2017: 7F; 1M)
- Opportunities for role review in-line with HERA guidelines (see Table 5.6);
- Encouragement to engage with Professional@York (See Section 5.4)
- Support to the Technicians Commitment (See Section 5.4 i)
- Encouragement to apply for Development \& Assessment Centre Scheme (DACs)
- Encouragement to apply for 'So you want to be a Manager' course.
- Coaching, mentoring and development as part of PDR.

Table 5-6 - Role Review Data for PSS

|  |  |  |  | Positive RRs |  | Total |  | No Upgrade |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | M Requests | F Requests | Total RR Requests in Year | M | F | Female Proportion of Successful | Male <br> Proportion of Successful | M | F | Female Proportion of No Upgrade | Male Proportion of No Upgrade |
| 2008 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 60\% | 40\% | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 50\% |
| 2010 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | 1 | 4 | 5 |  | 3 | 100\% | 0\% | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 50\% |
| 2012 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 83\% | 17\% |  | 1 | 100\% | 0\% |
| 2014 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 33\% | 67\% | 2 | 1 | 33\% | 67\% |
| 2015 | 0 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 100\% | 0\% |  | 1 | 100\% | 0\% |
| 2016 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 0 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 100\% | 0\% |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 16 | 30 | 46 | 12 | 25 |  |  | 4 | 5 |  |  |

Of 46 role reviews requested over a 10-year period Table 5.6), 37 were progressed ( $68 \% \mathrm{~F}$, $32 \% \mathrm{M})$ which is in-line with our PSS gender balance.

## Action Point 3.1 - Collect role review data for PSS staff by grade

DACs have been running since 2015; 5F PSS applied (three were successful; Grade 7/8 scheme) and 1M applied and was successful (Grade $5 / 6$ scheme). We will run focus groups to assess the benefits of DACs and encourage more, especially male, PSS to apply.

Action Point 4.2 - Improve uptake of Leadership \& Management training and Development \& Assessment Centres (DACS)

## Intersectionality Biology Staff Gender and Ethnicity

Table 5-7 - All Staff Groups by Gender and Ethnicity

|  |  | Academic | Research | PSS | ECU <br> Benchmark <br> 2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BME | Male |  |  |  | 13.60\% |
|  | Female |  |  |  | 11.70\% |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 12.60\% |
| Non BME | Male |  |  |  | 86.40\% |
|  | Female |  |  |  | 88.30\% |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 87.40\% |
| Not Declared | Male |  |  |  | - |
|  | Female |  |  |  | - |
|  | Total |  |  |  | - |

BME figures are similar for women and men in each staff group. \% of BME staff is at the benchmark for Research staff, however academic and PSS are below the benchmark.

Action 2.7 Increase BME student, academic staff and PSS population in the department
5.3. Career development: academic staff
(i) Training

Describe the training available to staff at all levels in the department. Provide details of uptake by gender, and how existing staff are kept up to date with training. How is its effectiveness monitored and developed in response to levels of uptake and evaluation?

Summary: $>60 \%$ academic staff ( $64 \% \mathrm{M} ; 62 \% \mathrm{~F}$ ) agree they are actively encouraged to take up career development opportunities.

Training is divided into compulsory training (e.g. E\&D, Fire Safety, and Information Security) and optional development opportunities. Training and development needs are usually identified in the annual mandatory PDR meeting and selected from centrally-provided courses which are open to all staff, and delivered face-to-face or on-line. Training may also be sourced externally by individuals with funds from the Departmental training budget (budget split 72\%F: 28\%M (2017); 60\%F; 40\%M (2018)). At the instigation of technicians and researchers, the Department has a ring-fenced research training budget ( $£ 2 \mathrm{k}$ annually) available through application to the Departmental Research Committee.

Regular emails from the AM, the weekly Biology Bulletin, and advertising on the Department Wiki pages inform staff of opportunities. Staff surveys report that academic staff ( $64 \%$ F and $62 \%$ M) are encouraged to take up career development opportunities. Based on $\sim 1500$ training sessions attended over five years, female academics (35\% of academic staff) have undertaken $43 \%$ of training; and are thus more likely to undertake training than men. Action 4.2 -Improve uptake of Leadership \& Management training and Development \& Assessment Centres (DACS) Training undertaken by researchers (based on ~2000 training sessions attended over 5 years) is consistent with gender balance.

Figure 5-10 Training Uptake by gender over 5 years


Over five years, we promoted UB training for staff who did not receive it during Induction or via other roles; the \% of trained staff has risen from 20\% (2013) to 56\% (2017) Action Point 1.2 - Reduce Unconscious Bias. We hosted a lunchtime session on UB training (by Prof Paul Walton; Chemistry Department) open to all staff and students, and we also provide staff with web resources (e.g. Harvard IAT; Royal Society UB briefing documents).

## (ii) Appraisal/development review

Describe current appraisal/development review schemes for staff at all levels, including postdoctoral researchers and provide data on uptake by gender.
Provide details of any appraisal/development review training offered, and the uptake of this, as well as staff feedback about the appraisal/development review process.

Summary: 100\% completion rate for PDRs in 2017 across all staff groups.

All staff who have completed their probation period (which is reviewed separately) take part in an annual PDR, covering:

- What has gone well and barriers to success
- Review previous objectives and setting new ones
- Performance rating by reviewer and reviewee, based on discussions and evidence
- Consideration of areas and ideas for improvement, including wellbeing, work-life balance, collegiality, communication
- Career development aspirations, including readiness for promotion
- Development plan and training needs

Individuals have PDRs with their line manager, and reviewers are encouraged to informally discuss performance and development throughout the year as part of one-to-ones. Training is required for reviewers; compliance is monitored by the AM. Since 2016, reviewee training has been offered to all staff to help them get the most out of their PDR.

In 2017, 100\% of all eligible staff had a PDR, an increase from 98.5\% in 2016 and 89\% in 2011. Our focus is now on increasing PDR quality. Action Point 2.4-Ensure PDR meetings are useful for all staff. To ensure consistency across the department, completed PDR documents are reviewed by HoD, Department Manager and AM.

In our last staff survey (2017), $90 \%$ ( $92 \% \mathrm{~F} ; 92 \% \mathrm{M}$ ) of staff said that their PDR agreed clear objectives, $80 \%$ ( $91 \%$ F; $85 \% \mathrm{M}$ ) agreed their reviewer had appropriate knowledge/experience, but only $62 \%(67 \% F ; 67 \% M)$ said their PDR provided constructive feedback on areas for development. Hence, whilst we are confident our previous actions have had impacts, we have new actions to improve PDRs. Action Point 2.4 - Ensure PDR meetings are useful for all staff.
(iii) Support given to academic staff for career progression

Comment and reflect on support given to academic staff, especially postdoctoral researchers, to assist in their career progression.

PDRAs are encouraged to gain teaching experience through UG tutorials, for which training is provided. Over five years, 19 (12F, 7M) researchers have been tutors.

## Action Point 3.2 - Review selection of postdoctoral Tutors

## "The experience of running tutorials

 really increased my confidence and was invaluable when I needed evidence at interviews" - femaleThe Department also:

- Awards annual 'Summer Student’ grants ( $\sim \notin 3 k$ each) to PDRAs; nine to date (5F; 4M) provide experience of applying for funds, recruitment, project and budget management and the opportunity to develop an independent line of research and preliminary data for a fellowship application.
- has a travel/training fund for PDRAs and technicians.
- encourages Independent Fellowship applications through discussions with RFLs, mentoring and guidance on applications, mock interviews and additional years of support for successful applicants. The Department has a strong track-record of appointing Fellows to lectureships (1F, 2 M in past five years).
- encourages PDRAs to sit on Departmental committees and recruitment panels to gain experience.

It is challenging for potential fellows and new lecturers to gain competitive external funding; we encourage staff to attend 'Research Grant Writing for the Sciences' courses provided by the University, and an Intensive Grant Writing Residential course. An RFL is developing a Biologyspecific grant writing workshop to complement existing courses and further support ECRs, and we will monitor take-up and get feedback.

New academic staff have an experienced mentor to provide advice and guidance at key career points; the University provides training for mentors. Staff are also supported by our nine RFLs who run our Peer Review College (PRC) for grant applications and manuscript submissions.

Previous staff surveys report female academics (57\%) agree less than males (81\%) that they have been provided with a useful opportunity to be mentored. Biology staff recently supported a pilot inter-Departmental mentoring scheme which is now being offered to all staff. The University also offers coaching for all staff, usually focussed on a specific issue. We will encourage staff to take up University mentoring and coaching opportunities.

Action Point 3.0 - Support career progression of female academics \& Researchers.
(iv) Support given to students (at any level) for academic career progression

Comment and reflect on support given to students (at any level) to enable them to make informed decisions about their career (including the transition to a sustainable academic career).

Summary: Two Student Employability Managers support our students, and our Director for Students has oversight of all student-related issues, including employability and skills training.

We take pride in supporting our students, to ensure that they all achieve their full potential. Our UG students have an Academic Supervisor who they meet twice a term and is the student's first port of call for academic issues and personal support. Supervisory meetings include discussion of Personal Employability Plans. Two Student Employability Managers, one of which is a member of BioEDG, provide drop-in sessions and advice for personal development, skills training and careers advice. Over 250 appointments (with gender parity) were taken up last year.


PGR students undertake $\sim 10$ days per year of training in the Researcher Development Framework (following Vitae recommendations) monitored by each student's Thesis Advisory and Progression Panels. PGR students also complete a 'Grad Seed’ activity tailored towards their anticipated career path. Training courses are delivered centrally by RETT, and via our BBSRC/NERC funded DTPs. A Student Employability Manager organises monthly 'Coffee and Career' sessions with a visiting biologist from a diverse range of career destinations. Evidence of our success in supporting our students is that $72.5 \%$ of UG (DHLE statistics for 2016) and $95 \%$ of PGR students secure graduate employment or further study within six months of graduating.


We host an annual careers fair for UG students; in 2016 93\% of attendees reported increased awareness of biology career options. The Department runs 'Year in Industry' (Yil) programmes; Yil students receive help with CV writing and mock interviews and in in 2017/18 there were 62 Yil placements ( $52 \% \mathrm{~F}, 48 \% \mathrm{M}$ ). Our UG students can apply for summer internships (with funding provided by the Department and University), to gain new experiences and skills for life.

Student Feedback demonstrating support from our recent Careers Fair:


At PGR-led 'Gradshare' events, academics talk about their careers and students ask questions about career choices, navigating academic career progression, and non-traditional career paths. Speakers
stay for pizza so students can also ask questions in a less formal setting. Invited speakers ( $\sim 40 \%$ F; ~60\%M since Oct 2014) include ECRs and senior academics.
(v) Support offered to those applying for research grant applications

Comment and reflect on support given to staff who apply for funding, and what support is offered to those who are unsuccessful.

Summary: Our Departmental peer review colleges (PRCs) led by our Research Focus Leads (RFLs) support colleagues submitting grant proposals and manuscripts.

We support staff via our PRCs, led by our RFLs (3F; 6M) (Figure 2-2), who run ideas "pitching" sessions, organise reviews, provide feedback, advise on responses to reviewer comments, and on next steps for unsuccessful applications.

Table 5.8 - Staff applications for Departmental pump priming funds - ECR and newly-appointed staff are prioritised in applications.

| Departmental pump priming and paper completion | 2008/09 | 2009/10 | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. applied for (M) | 9 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 5 | 69 |
| No. applied for (F) | 6 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 30 |
| No. of awards made (M) | 5 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 54 |
| No. of awards made (F) | 6 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 27 |

Table 5.9 - data on academic staff applying for grants and success rates.

| Research grants | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | Total/Avg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of grants applied for (M) | 62 | 63 | 60 | 43 | 55 | 59 | 88 | 72 | 69 | 60 | 631 |
| No of grants applied for (F) | 34 | 23 | 28 | 26 | 21 | 21 | 34 | 21 | 25 | 24 | 257 |
| Average $£$ applied for (M) | 284,560 | 246,630 | 420,315 | 375,694 | 384,644 | 502,630 | 596,965 | 504,505 | 364,465 | 417,677 | 409,809 |
| Average $£$ applied for (F) | 309,931 | 290,770 | 221,425 | 292,287 | 389,245 | 436,827 | 362,208 | 325,580 | 291,440 | 338,700 | 325,841 |
| No of grants funded (M) | 21 | 18 | 18 | 14 | 24 | 18 | 32 | 30 | 29 | 21 | 225 |
| No of grants funded (F) | 15 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 13 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 88 |
| Average $£$ funded (M) | 359,424 | 106,862 | 394,512 | 344,645 | 287,094 | 412,360 | 506,069 | 422,667 | 355,720 | 516,953 | 370,631 |
| Average $£$ funded (F) | 201,128 | 164,252 | 89,545 | 184,053 | 257,989 | 413,723 | 304,792 | 239419 | 218,010 | 332,900 | 240,581 |

The Biology DRC, with representation on BioEDG, provides pump-priming funds (30F, $90 \%$ success; $69 \mathrm{M}, 78 \%$ success; Table 5.7). The number of internal and external applications is in line with the academic gender balance but females applied for less funding per application. Our action encouraging all staff to review budgets has improved gender parity ( $£ 325,841$ F versus $£ 409,809$ M).

Action Point 3.0 - Support career progression of female academics \& Researchers.

Staff with unsuccessful grants receive feedback and mentoring from RFLs and can attend additional training in grant writing. We support and mentor applicants applying for Independent Research Fellowships, and we can extend a Fellow's salary by up to 2 years.
5.4. Career development: professional and support staff
(i) Training

Describe the training available to all professional and support staff, at all levels, in the department. Provide details of uptake by gender, and how existing staff are kept up to date with training. How is its effectiveness monitored and developed in response to levels of uptake and evaluation?

PSS are encouraged via the Biology Bulletin, direct emails, advertising on the Wiki pages, and paid time-out to engage with Professional@York which encourages networking and development of PSS across the University. Themed forums examine strategic University themes, and individual and team awards celebrate success. Feedback from staff is very positive, reporting the events to be "fun and informative" and enabling them to feel part of a "wider community of support staff". PSS have access to DACs to support career development.

Figure 5-11 - Some of the activities and networking that are available to PSS through Professional@York.


Central training is provided by the University and its effectiveness assessed through feedback and PDR discussions. PSS can apply for Departmental training funds, and in 2017/18, 7 out of 15 (5F; 2M) requests were from PSS. In the 2017 Staff Survey, $74 \%$ of PSS reported their PDR was useful in identifying training needs and development opportunities, and $70 \%$ had undertaken learning and development opportunities ( $64 \% \mathrm{~F}$ and $62 \% \mathrm{M}$ ). PSS are encouraged to apply for the University's Management courses e.g. 'Management in Action' (5F; 2M), and 'Leadership in Action' (2F; 1M).

In 2017, the University signed-up to the 'Technician Commitment', supported by the Science Council and the Gatsby Charitable Foundation's Technicians 'Make It Happen' campaign. We have pledged action on the key challenges affecting technical staff. Our Operations Manager is developing generic technical role descriptors for clear career pathways and cross-discipline career development. She has been invited to be a 'Peer Reviewer' for self-assessments from other Institutions. The Technical Commitment Delivery Project Team was nominated for Outstanding Project of the Year (Professional@York awards). Action 5.5-Promote our involvement with the Technician Commitment to other science departments at York and externally to institutions and support them in signing up and carrying out their self-assessment.

Membership of the Institute of Science and Technology (IST) allows Technical PSS to receive professional recognition for their expertise.
We plan to monitor engagement of PSS with IST by gender Action 2.3

In 2018, we used the Apprenticeship Levy to recruit an Apprentice Mechanical Workshop Technician. This post was filled by a woman, who we will support to complete a level 3 NVQ in Advanced Manufacturing Engineering. Action point 5.4 - Promote our use of the apprentice levy to other departments within the University and externally to other Institutions who have not yet taken this approach.

(ii) Appraisal/development review

Describe current appraisal/development review schemes for professional and support staff, at all levels, and provide data on uptake by gender. Provide details of any appraisal/development review training offered, and the uptake of this, as well as staff feedback about the appraisal/development review process. Support given to professional and support staff for career progression

Comment and reflect on support given to professional and support staff to assist in their career progression.

Summary: 100\% of PSS had a PDR in 2017, 74\% said their PDR had been useful in identifying development needs and $70 \%$ said they had undertaken training in the last 12 months.

The PDR process is the same for PSS as for other staff. The AM, as training officer for the Department, monitors training completion. In 2017, 100\% of PSS completed a PDR and 74\% of PSS said that their PDR had been useful in identifying training needs and development opportunities; $70 \%$ had undertaken some learning and development provided by the University in the last 12 months ( $64 \% \mathrm{~F}$ and $62 \% \mathrm{M}$ ). Our focus is to improve the quality and consistency of these reviews, acting on feedback from the Staff Survey Action point 2.4-Ensure PDR meetings are useful for all staff.

### 5.5. Flexible working and managing career breaks

Note: Present professional and support staff and academic staff data separately
(i) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: before leave

Explain what support the department offers to staff before they go on maternity and adoption leave.

We support staff who are pregnant, adopting, or about to take an extended period of leave. H\&S risk assessments put in place reasonable adjustments where required; time off to attend (eg. medical) appointments is provided. The Department has a quiet room where staff can rest. We have a maternity/leave mentor to signpost staff to central HR colleagues and policies. The central HR team has an advisor on Shared Parental Leave who helps staff navigate new policies. Members of staff who are experiencing a difficult pregnancy, or who are nearing the end of their pregnancy, can work from home, work flexibly, or reduce their working hours.

Research staff on FTCs are often concerned about their funding during maternity leave and are offered 1:1 meetings to discuss any concerns. Our AM liaises with the University Research Support Office to ensure funding queries are answered quickly. Teaching responsibilities of academic staff on leave are covered by temporary teaching staff funded by the University and the HoD meets to discuss research cover to ensure the academic's research group is supported. PSS meet the AM to discuss cover arrangements; roles are filled either via internal secondment or temporary fixed-term recruitment. For all staff going on leave we plan handover periods at the start and end of leave.
(ii) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: during leave

Explain what support the department offers to staff during maternity and adoption leave.

Summary: Maternity/leave mentor and communications plan in place.

Our maternity/leave mentor ensures staff are aware of Keep-in- touch (KIT) and Shared Parental Leave in Touch (SPLIT) days, and line managers agree a communications plan to keep staff updated on Departmental news and activity. This helps staff make the transition back into work.
(iii) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: returning to work

Explain what support the department offers to staff on return from maternity or adoption leave. Comment on any funding provided to support returning staff.

Summary: Flexible arrangements and research leave for returning staff.

Towards the end of their leave, staff meet with their line manager to discuss arrangements to support their return. All staff can request a phased return (part-time for a period before returning full-time) and flexible working. Over five years, $100 \%$ of FWRs were agreed; a six-month review ensures new arrangements are working. A handover period between the maternity/leave cover and the returning member of staff, and regular review meetings with the line manager and AM, support a successful transition back into their role.

Returning staff are exempted from committee roles and academic staff have a reduction in their teaching load. In 2013 we introduced a transparent and flexible approach to research leave; all academic staff can apply every nine terms, with an annual application deadline. Staff returning from extended leave can apply outside this deadline and are given priority. Bespoke return programmes are developed depending on individual staff needs and requests.

BASC meets with academic staff returning from leave to assess the effectiveness of our support, make changes where necessary and help staff access support and advice provided centrally by the University. One-to-one feedback meetings show our staff feel well-supported; we are pleased that improvements to our policies and Departmental culture during our Gold Award have helped staff transition back to work. Evidence of the impact of our actions is that two members of staff were promoted during recent maternity leave.

The Departmental Atrium and Concourse are family-friendly locations for meetings, including Cookies Cafe, and there is a private room with fridge and washing facilities for nursing mothers. The University has an on-site Nursery available to all staff and students and runs a childcare voucher scheme.

## "I feel that the Department has been very supportive for both of my

 periods of maternity leave. There was a lot of flexibility when to start and end my maternity leave. One of the reasons why it was easy to change the dates of my maternity leave was that the Department was able to employ my former post-doc as my maternity cover, so all my teaching was covered." Feedback from Senior Lecturer(iv) Maternity return rate

Provide data and comment on the maternity return rate in the department
Data of staff whose contracts are not renewed while on maternity leave should be included in the section along with commentary.

Provide data and comment on the proportion of staff remaining in post six, 12 and 18 months after return from maternity leave.

Summary: Consistently high return rates from maternity leave

Over seven years, $85 \%$ of staff returned after maternity leave; the seven staff who did not return were research staff on grant-funded FTCs that ended during their leave. Additional funding has enabled some Pls to extend contracts through these periods; and we are lobbying for such funding to be provided at University level, in the same way it is for teaching cover. Action 5.9 - Work with University to achieve continuity of research cover during maternity leave.

Table 5.10 Maternity return rates

| Year | Staff category | Number <br> taking leave | No. of staff <br> who made a <br> return to <br> work | Staff who <br> were still in <br> post after <br> $\mathbf{6 / 1 2 / 1 8}$ <br> months |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Teaching \& Research/Teaching \& Scholarship | 1 | 1 | $1 / 1 / 1$ |
|  | Research-only | 5 | 3 | $3 / 3 / 3$ |
|  | Professional \& Support | 3 | 3 | $3 / 3 / 2$ |
| 2012 | Teaching \& Research/Teaching \& Scholarship | 0 | - | - |
|  | Research-only | 2 | 2 | $2 / 2 / 2$ |
|  | Professional \& Support | 1 | 1 | $1 / 1 / 1$ |
| 2013 | Teaching \& Research/Teaching \& Scholarship | 0 | - | - |
|  | Research-only | 3 | 3 | $3 / 3 / 3$ |
|  | Professional \& Support | 3 | 3 | $3 / 3 / 3$ |
| 2014 | Teaching \& Research/Teaching \& Scholarship | 0 | - | - |
|  | Research-only | 3 | 3 | $3 / 3 / 3$ |
|  | Professional \& Support | 2 | 2 | $2 / 2 / 2$ |
| 2015 | Teaching \& Research/Teaching \& Scholarship | 2 | 2 | $2 / 2 / 2$ |
|  | Research-only | 1 | 1 | $1 / 1 / 0$ |
|  | Professional \& Support | 3 | 3 | $2 / 2 / 2$ |
| 2016 | Teaching \& Research/Teaching \& Scholarship | 4 | 2 | $2 / 2 / 2$ |
|  | Research-only | 2 | 2 | $2 / 2 / 2$ |
|  | Professional \& Support | 3 | 3 | $3 / 3 / 3$ |
| 2017 | Teaching \& Research/Teaching \& Scholarship | 2 | 2 | $2 / 2 / 2$ |
|  | Research-only | 7 | 4 | $4 / 4 / 4$ |
|  | Professional \& Support | 1 | 1 | $1 / 1 / 1$ |

(v) Paternity, shared parental, adoption, and parental leave uptake

Provide data and comment on the uptake of these types of leave by gender and grade. Comment on what the department does to promote and encourage takeup of paternity leave and shared parental leave.

Summary: Our action to raise awareness has resulted in improved uptake of paternity leave, and first case of shared parental leave in 2017

We expect rates of paternity and maternity leave to be broadly similar, yet since 2011, only 27 men ( $18 \%$ of all male staff) took paternity leave whilst $26 \%$ of all female staff took maternity leave.

Table 5.11 - Data on males taking paternity leave 20101-2018

| Staff Group | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 2018 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PSS | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |
| Academic | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | 1 |
| Research | - | 2 | 1 | - | 2 | - | 3 | 2 |
| Total | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 |

Investigations during our Gold Award revealed that many men were not taking formal paternity leave, but were taking holiday or had been informally allowed to work flexibly by their line manager. We updated our webpages to include links to central paternity leave information, and raised the profile of parental leave at staff meetings, resulting in more men taking paternity leave now formally reporting.

Our first case of shared parental leave was in 2017, by a male researcher; we have an action to continue to promote this option to staff, and to use this experience as a case study on our website. Action 3.4 - Increased awareness \& uptake of maternity/ paternity/shared parental/adoption leave and flexible working and increased formal reporting of such leave. We regularly promote different types of leave available to all staff via the Departmental weekly Bulletin, staff meetings, Wiki and e-mail.

No staff have taken adoption leave in the last five years.
(vi) Flexible working

Provide information on the flexible working arrangements available.

Summary: $84 \%$ of staff say they can work flexibly; $100 \%$ of flexible working requests were approved in the last 5 years. Flexible working requests have increased by $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ since our Gold Award.

The Department encourages a healthy work-life balance and both formal FWRs (contract change) and a flexi-time system (core working hours 10.00am to 12 noon and 14.00 pm to 16.00 pm ) offer staff flexibility in their working hours/pattern while aligning with the needs of their role. Recruitment material includes positive statements regarding flexible working and remote access to shared computer network drives and University teaching/admin databases enables working from home.

At the time of our Gold award, we had not received any formal requests for flexible working; our action to promote the opportunities for formal arrangements through Departmental communications, website and Wiki has resulted in 43 requests ( $74 \% \mathrm{~F}, 26 \% \mathrm{M}$ ) since 2013, all of which have been approved.

Requests for flexible working have included:

- Reduced hours/changing work patterns to look after an ill relative
- Reduced hours to improve work-life balance
- Reduced hours approaching retirement
- Alternate longer and shorter days or term-time only to accommodate childcare/carer responsibilities

Our 2017 Departmental survey revealed $84 \%$ of staff felt able to work flexibly ( $83 \%$ F; $83 \% \mathrm{M}$ ) and $74 \%$ ( $80 \%$ F; $68 \% \mathrm{M}$ ) said their line manager was considerate of their life outside work.

To encourage a healthy work/life balance and encourage all staff take their full annual leave allowance, we have developed new actions, including actions to addressing bullying and harassment and to agree a departmental communications/email strategy.

Action 5.8 - Encouraging healthy working practices.

Action 3.4 - Increased awareness \& uptake of maternity/ paternity/shared parental/adoption leave and flexible working and increased formal reporting of such leave.

(vii) Transition from part-time back to full-time work after career breaks

Outline what policy and practice exists to support and enable staff who work part-time after a career break to transition back to full-time roles.

We do not distinguish between types of career break; our approach is very supportive and flexible and essentially as described above.

### 5.6. Organisation and culture

(i) Outreach activities

Provide data on the staff and students from the department involved in outreach and engagement activities by gender and grade. How is staff and student contribution to outreach and engagement activities formally recognised? Comment on the participant uptake of these activities by gender.

Summary: Outreach comprises $>1400$ hours of activities, reaches over 15,000 people, and is included in our WAM

We have a new process to record outreach activities through an annual census; in 2017, 70 outreach activities comprised $>1400$ hours of activities and involved both academic staff (34\%F, 66\%M; gender balanced) and students. We estimate $>15,000$ school children and members of the public were reached by our activities including open lectures, 'Café Scientifique' and 'Pint-of Science', as well as activities specifically promoting women in science, such as 'Finding Ada' and 'Soapbox Science' events. A key focus is schools, including workshops, visits to the Department and summer schools, encouraging all young people to consider biology as an exciting and rewarding career. During our Gold award, we incorporated outreach activities into our WAM and PDR, outreach is important in promotion applications (as 'Academic citizenship').

We provide talks at school and college careers events; most activities are carried out by our Schools Outreach Coordinator (currently a male academic), a member of BioEDG, and is supported by researchers, PSS, PGR, PGT and UG students. Supervisors encourage UG students to spend time teaching in schools as part of the University YSIS (York Students in Schools) scheme (2017 21F; 4M), thereby gaining additional skills for their career development. $\sim 90 \%$ of our school outreach activities are with comprehensive, mixed gender/socio-economic group State schools. We run Work-Experience Programmes in the Department for Year 10 and Year 12 students (2018 8F, 6M) including sessions on research lab skills, presentation skills, advice on University applications and careers.

More female than male PGRs are involved in Outreach activities; 67 offers of help since 2015 (51F; $16 \mathrm{M})$. Action 3.5 - Ensure balanced female and male representation in outreach activities.
"I enjoyed getting an idea of the types of techniques used for research in different fields and meeting experts."

Year 10 work experience student

Figure 5-12 - In 2018 Soapbox Science came to York for the first time


Biology brought Soapbox Science to York for the first time in 2018. 11 female scientists (seven biologists) from PGRs to Professors told the public about their research and raised the profile of women in science. More than 16,000 people walked through the city centre location during the event and feedback was outstandingly positive:


PSS contribute to outreach activities, and participation in out-of-hours outreach is recognised by time in lieu, or overtime payments depending on personal preferences. Information on our outreach activities is shared with the public via our website and twitter feed @BiologyatYork.

Figure 5-13 - Biology Scientists ran activities for families from the local community at YorNight


Figure 5-14 - Examples of Outreach Activities in the Department of Biology

(ii) Visibility of role models

Describe how the institution builds gender equality into organisation of events. Comment on the gender balance of speakers and chairpersons in seminars, workshops and other relevant activities. Comment on publicity materials, including the department's website and images used.

We have successfully established a Departmental culture that ensures all aspects of our activities have gender balance, particularly those that have high visibility, and $>87 \%$ ( $89 \% \mathrm{~F} ; 82 \% \mathrm{M}$ ) of staff consider that the Department uses both women and men as visible role models.

Our action to increase the gender balance of our seminar speakers has been successful. Organisers of seminar series are sent frequent reminders to ensure gender balance in speakers; we increased the \% of female speakers during our Gold award from $25 \%$ to $39 \%$. Our prestigious Biology 'Open Lectures' included 12F and 16M speakers over the last six years. We are now aiming for gender parity. As female invitees decline invitations more often, our new action will include invitations issued earlier and a choice of dates.
Action 4.3 - Improve gender balance in seminar \& Open Lecture speakers.

All seminar programmes are timetabled between noon and 2 pm to allow staff with child-caring responsibilities to attend and speakers with caring responsibilities to make the visit as a day-trip. We have gender parity in Seminar Chairs (12F and 13M) in 2018 and our Staff Away Days aim for gender parity in speakers ( 8 M ; 6 F in 2017 and $5 \mathrm{M} ; 7 \mathrm{~F}$ in 2018). We celebrate successes of our female staff; as part of the University's 50th anniversary, we renamed the main Biology lecture theatre to honour an Emerita professor, Dianna Bowles.


Table 5.12 - Number of female and male speakers at our Biology Open lecture series.

| Year | Number of Open <br> Lectures | Male speakers | Female speakers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2013 | $4(1$ joint 1M; 1F) | 2 | 3 |
| 2014 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| 2015 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| 2016 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 2017 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| 2018 (to date) | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total (over 7 years) | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ |

We have four external examiners (currently $2 \mathrm{~F} ; 2 \mathrm{M}$ ) over-seeing our UG programmes; we have embedded practices to ensure this gender balance continues. We carry out regular gender audits of our website, posters, and promotional leaflets, and have AS banners displayed prominently throughout the Department.

During our Gold award we have had 3 HoD , two of which have been female. There are few female HoDs in science departments therefore we will share this best practice.
Action 5.7 - Improve representation of women in HoD of science Depts.
We raise the profile of female scientists through honorary degrees. Professor Helen Blau, Director of Stanford University School of Medicine's Baxter Laboratory for Stem Cell Biology was awarded an Honorary Doctorate in 2018. This was a particularly proud event because Helen graduated from the Department in 1969. At the Graduation Ceremony, Helen was recommended by Prof Nia Bryant (BASC). Helen gave a seminar in the Department attended by staff and students and was introduced by Dr Betsy Pownall who explained the seminal nature of Helen's research and inspiring the students by telling them that Helen was once "one of them".

Figure 5-15 - Professor Helen Blau receives her Honorary Doctorate (pictured with our AS Champion Professor Nia Bryant, The Chancellor Professor Sir Malcolm Grant, and Jo Horsburgh, Registrar and Secretary)

(iii) Beacon activity

Demonstrate how the department is a beacon of achievement, including how the department promotes good practice internally and externally to the wider community.

Summary: We have supported other institutions to achieve AS awards and have worked with learned societies and Ada Lovelace Day to promote equality and diversity in STEMM.

Our Beacon activities increased substantially during our Gold award;

- Prof Jane Hill gave >15 invited presentations about our AS 'Pathway to Gold' and staff from other institutions visited York; these activities have been associated with Gold (2), Silver (4), and Bronze (7) AS awards for Departments at other Universities.
- Prof Jane Hill contributed to videos sharing good practice in gender equality and STEMM.
- Through 'White Rose' and N8 links we have shared good practice among Yorkshire and Northern Universities.
- A video about York's Technician Commitment was shown at the 2018 Technician Commitment Signatory Event.

Action 5.5 - Promote our involvement with the Technician Commitment to other science departments at York and externally to institutions and support them in signing up and carrying out their self-assessment.
"We learnt a lot, and following the visit [to York] we revised our SAT, Action Plan and the ways in which we communicated with staff and gathered data. I'm very pleased that we've just received a Silver award. Thanks again for your advice and support, it made a real and lasting difference to us!" University of Warwick

Figure 5-16 - Feedback and thanks from other Institutions for our help with their Athena SWAN submissions and successes


We recognise the benefit of sharing AS activities with other universities to develop new actions both in their Departments and in UoY Biology. Action 5.1 - Act as a Beacon and share our Athena SWAN and BioEDG activities externally to the University of York

Prof Sue Hartley as President of the British Ecological Society (BES), drawing on inspiration of our AS activities, established the BES E\&D working group. The BES is now at the forefront of driving E\&D within learned societies. Initiatives include commitments to gender parity in editorships of their journals and plenary speakers at their conferences, an annual prize for an E\&D Champion, childcare
facilities at their annual conference, an LGBT+ mixer event at their AGM, and principles for disability access and inclusion at all Society events and venues. BES also provide UB training to staff and volunteers, and now embed a culture of E\&D in all their activities. We are delighted to have had an influence in supporting E\&D beyond academic institutions, and have an action to extend this work to other academics in the department and across the University.

Action 5.3 - Spread awareness of the work done with the British Ecological Society (BES) and Ada Lovelace Day so that this is adopted by other learned societies

Figure 5-17 - The BES Website E\&D Page

## BRITISH ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY

## Equality \& Diversity

> We are committed to promoting a community of ecologists which is as diverse as possible.
> One of our major goals as outlined in our Strategic Plan is to inspire, engage and recognise talent. We seek to overcome the barriers to career progression at all stages and work to address areas such as, but not limited to, gender, ethnicity, disability and socioeconomic status.

Dr Thorunn Helgason works towards widening participation in STEMM subjects at UG and PGR, and in public engagement, bringing science into the wider community through her position on the Ada Lovelace Day Advisory Council. As part of Ada Lovelace activities, Thorunn (a member of BioEDG in her role as Chair of BoS) is leading an international collaboration to investigate global fungal spore dispersal, which includes creating a global network to support women and minorities, focusing on recruiting scientists who are diverse in gender, race, geography and culture.

Figure 5-18-Global Network to support women and minorities

Biology at York, where we can all be ourselves \#equalityatYork
Athena SWAN
Gold Award

## International collaboration to investigate global fungal spore dispersal

Posted on 2 October 2018

Researchers from the Department of Biology have secured funding for an international collaboration project.

Global network to support women and minorities
With support from universities on five continents, the project will also develop participants crosstimezone collaboration and professional networking skills to create a sustainable and truly global community. It will particularly focus on recruiting scientists who are diverse in gender, race, geography and culture with support for those from low and middle income countries.

The project will be led by York's Dr Thorunn Helgason. Senior Lecturer in Ecology, alongside Dr Pen Holland, Lecturer in Ecology. Project partners will include Dr V Bala Chaudhary. $\mathrm{S}^{\text {h }}$. Assistant Professor in Environmental Science and Studies at DePaul University and Suw Charman-Andersonct founder of Ada Lovelace Day, an annual international celebration of the achievements of women in STEM.

We have an action to extend our Ada Lovelace work to other academics in the department and across the University.

Action 5.3 - Spread awareness of the work done with the British Ecological Society (BES) and Ada Lovelace Day so that this is adopted by other learned societies

Members of BioEDG are gender equality ambassadors; during our Gold award they ran regular lunchtime sessions to promote best practice in e.g. writing references that are not gendered, and advice on applying for promotions. Following these sessions, speakers post blogs on the Biology AS website, to disseminate good practice (Action points 5.0, 5.1, 5.2)

Figure 5-19 - Following regular lunchtime sessions, we post good-practice initiatives and advice to staff on our AS website, to avoid gender biases in their activities e.g. in writing references for students.

Avoiding gender biases when writing references
At a recent lunch time 'sharing good practice' session, we discussed best-practice in writing references. It is clear from several sources of published evidence that references can reflect our unconscious biases. So it is important to understand this potential bias when writing and reading references. There is bias in:

1. types of words used. More standout adjectives tend to be used to describe male as compared to female candidates. References containing more standout words also included more ability words and fewer grindstone words. Examples of standout words are
outstanding, unique, exceptional, superb, excellent. Grindstone traits are e.g. hardworking, conscientious, dependable, meticulous, thorough, diligent, dedicoted, and careful. This implies that women are hard-working because they must compensate for lack of ability.

Athene Donald's says in her blog: "... it is important to know when someone is described as hard-working because that's the kindest thing anyone can say, and when the writer actually meant to convey an extremely positive impression but is unaware that their description is gendered and liable to be read in a very different way."

(iv) Culture

Demonstrate how the department actively considers gender equality and inclusivity. Provide details of how the Athena SWAN Charter principles have been, and will continue to be, embedded into the culture and workings of the department.

We are proud to have embedded gender equality in the culture of the Department. In a recent Staff Survey, $87 \%$ ( $91 \%$ M; $89 \%$ F) of Biology staff said that they believed the University was committed to equal opportunity for all its staff (compared to 84\% in 2011); biennial Culture Surveys for all our staff groups seek honest feedback (Table 5.13).

Table 5.13 - Staff Culture Survey Results

| Question | Agree <br> Female | Agree <br> Male |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| In the Biology Department, staff are treated on their merits <br> irrespective of their gender (e.g. staff are actively encouraged to apply <br> for promotion and take up training opportunities irrespective of their <br> gender). | $86 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| I think the Department has benefitted from holding a Gold Athena <br> SWAN award | $79 \%$ | $88 \%$ |
| In the Biology Department, work is allocated irrespective of gender | $86 \%$ | $81 \%$ |
| The Biology Department makes it clear that unsupportive language <br> and behavior are not acceptable (e.g. condescending or intimidating <br> language, ridicule, overly familiar behavior, jokes/banter that <br> stereotype or focus on appearance). | $79 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| My Department encourages people to apply for posts in areas where <br> their gender is under-represented (e.g. encouraging appropriately <br> qualified colleagues of all genders to apply for posts; including images <br> of staff of all genders in recruitment materials) | $93 \%$ | $58 \%$ |

AS is embedded in all processes of our Department, it has simply become part of the way we work. For example, Biology staff frequently call out bad practice outside the Department, demonstrating their high expectations, BioEDG drives initiatives to collect gender data, and monitoring for gender is part of all our processes. BioEDG uses our AS experience to ensure broader equality principles are applied elsewhere e.g. in relation to sexual orientation and disability. We discuss our AS initiatives at Away Days, in the weekly Biology Bulletin (read by staff and students), on the Staff Wiki (read by academics, researchers and PSS), Biology website (accessible to all), and events organised by the Postdoc society.

AS initiatives and principles are emphasized through the use of our Gold logo on the Departmental website and literature, and through posters displayed throughout the department.

Figure 5-20. We have our AS banner prominently displayed in the entrance to the Biology building, where we also display our Gold award.


Figure 5-21 - The Biology website promotes our Athena SWAN principles


Figure 5-22 - Our recent Family Social Events


The next Social Events are as follows:
Summer Social
Come and join us for an ice cream on Wednesday 11th July from 2:30 outside on the Vanbrugh Bowl.

Summer Family Event
We have discounted tickets available to York Maze on Sunday 22nd July. Tickets are priced at just $£ 7$ each and are available at Biology Stores from Monday 2 nd July. This offer is available to members of Biology/YSBL and their families only - we are unable to extend this offer to any others. More details of the activities available at York Maze can be found here: http://www.yorkmaze.com/. Please specify the number of Adults, Children and Seniors when booking your tickets, Children aged 2 years and under are free.

Figure 5-23 - Biology Bulletin


We celebrate success through termly 'Making the Difference Awards’ scheme where staff/students nominate staff who have gone the extra mile for individual and team awards (2018 awards 6F; 5M). Nominations are reviewed by a panel from across all staff groups.

The Department raises awareness of World Mental Health Day; we have trained 5 Mental Health First Aiders and ran Mental Health training for 60 staff in 2017/18, and International LGBTSTEM Day. At this event in 2018 we held our first Biology LGBTQ+ Forum for staff and students and subsequently two more forums have been held.

Figure 5-24-LGBTQ+ Forum Poster in Biology


We hold informal Disability Mixer sessions for staff and students, providing a safe space to socialise and exchange experiences:

Biosciences Disability Mixer - Friday 23 November - 2pm to 4pm - Think Tank (Biology T Block, 2nd Floor) Our next 'Biosciences Disability Mixer' session will take place on Friday 23rd November, 2-4 pm in the Think Tank (T block second floor, off the Creative Lounge). Our sessions are informal get-togethers for any bioscience students and staff with disabilities/chronic health conditions, providing a safe space to socialise and exchange experiences. Tea, coffee and biscuits will be provided, along with the opportunity to engage in wellbeing activities and games. We look forward to meeting you! Your BioEDG disability team.

Collegiality is highly valued, as demonstrated in our staff surveys (e.g. 79\%F and 88\%M think the Department has benefitted from AS); key decisions are made within committees, and feedback is invited at termly Staff Meetings. New inclusive staff meetings with academics and PSS will help raise awareness of AS activities within PSS. Action 1.0 - Increase engagement of PSS with AS

Action 5.2 - Be ambitious and innovative in our work engaging PSS in AS activities.

Our Department has a large atrium used by staff and students on a daily basis for coffee/lunch, supporting our welcoming and inclusive culture.

Figure 5-25 - One of the signs in our staff coffee area
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Figure 5-26 - Photos of our senior management team (4F; 5M) are displayed in our main communal atrium

(v) Timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings

Describe the consideration given to those with caring responsibilities and parttime staff when scheduling departmental meetings and social gatherings.

Staff surveys show that $>70 \%$ ( $72 \% \mathrm{~F} ; 73 \% \mathrm{M}$ ) of staff agree that meetings are held in core hours (10.00-13.00 and 14.00-16.00). Our seminars are held during lunch times. While teaching is timetabled between 9.00 and 18.00 it is straightforward for staff to request constraints to their teaching (e.g. for caring responsibilities, school pick-up/drop-off). In this way, our culture ensures that academic and research staff with family commitments are not excluded.

Academic Committee meetings and Staff Away Days are held on different days of the week at different times so that staff working P-T on set days can attend some events. Meetings are typically organised by poll to maximise attendance. We avoid scheduling meetings during Christmas/Easter breaks and local school holidays.

All members of the Department are invited to termly 'HoD Seminars', where staff present their research (13F, 16M speakers since 2012). These are held on Wednesday afternoons, followed by refreshments to facilitate networking. We have an action to vary the day these are held so P-T staff are not disadvantaged. (Action Point 4.3 - Improve gender balance in seminar \& Open Lecture speakers)

We hold regular staff social events within the department, organised by our Social Committee at times convenient for staff with childcare responsibilities and we advertise them well in advance. We also hold family social events at weekends, e.g. this year we held a summer event at our local 'Maize Maze' (see Figure 5-22). All events are promoted in the weekly emailed Biology Bulletin, on
information boards around the Department and at staff meetings. We plan to gain a better understanding of the gender split of staff organising and attending these events (Action Point 1.1 Create a more inclusive Departmental culture).


Our staff and students enjoying hot cross buns and hot chocolate at our Spring social event held in our atrium.
(vi) HR policies

Describe how the department monitors the consistency in application of HR policies for equality, dignity at work, bullying, harassment, grievance and disciplinary processes. Describe actions taken to address any identified differences between policy and practice. Comment on how the department ensures staff with management responsibilities are kept informed and updated on HR polices.

The AM is responsible for monitoring consistency in application of HR policies for equality, dignity at work, bullying, harassment, grievance and disciplinary processes. She is also responsible for drafting and communicating documentation where departmental guidance is required to complement central HR policy. In the 2017 Staff Survey when asked if they had been harassed or bullied at work in the last 12 months $91 \% \mathrm{M}$ and $84 \% \mathrm{~F}$ answered ' No '. The University has a Code of Practice on Bullying and Harassment with separated procedures for staff and students. We have recently updated our support in relation to bullying and harassment which includes posters signposting staff to support.

Figure 5-27 - Posters signposting staff and students to different sources of support
Are you looking for some support for yourself or others?


In TAP meetings, PGRs discuss their supervision with independent academics (in the absence of supervisors), providing an opportunity to raise any concerns. UG students can raise concerns at any time with academic supervisors or the Director for Students. Action 5-8 - Encouraging healthy working practices

The ASFC received feedback from a staff member in Biology that the University Paternity leave was too short; this was fed back through the faculty and the University are consequently
modelling the implications of providing an enhanced scheme. We have more beacon actions to promote up-take of good practice by the University. (Action Points 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.9, 5.10)

HR policies are signposted on the Department's Wiki pages and through Induction. Any updates to process are notified to staff either via HoD email, Bulletin updates, or at termly staff meetings. Any reported inconsistencies/anomalies are discussed by the Department Manager, AM and HoD at their bi-weekly meetings with the central HR Adviser responsible for our Department, who is a member of BioEDG and attends DMT.

Figure 5-28 - The HR policies page of the Biology Staff Wiki

|  | You can contact the Administration Manager for local, initial guidance, however depending on the nature of your query you may then be given a named HR expert who will be available for more complex queries. | Haperwork |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flexible working |  |  |
| The Department supports staft as far as possible with Flexible Working requests. <br> , Central Policy, documentation and guidance |  | Sickness absence, health and wellbeing |
|  | Pertormance Review | Sickness is sickness, and we all get ill HR have lots of information avaliable to stalt, as follows: <br> https://www. york ac. uk/admin/hr/browse/eave-and-absence/sicknessabsencel『 <br> Absence management information can be found here: nttps://www.york.ac.uk/admin/hrineave-and-absence/sickness-absence/managing-absence/[ $\mathbb{Z}$ |
| We also encourage staft to work flexibly where the service needs allows it (see Flexitime section), and our Biology Working from Home information is available below. | Annually, June to September is the University's Performance Review period. The following information details the Departmental process and some central resources/information you may find useful. <br> , What is the Biology PR process? |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { a }}{ }$, Working trom home |  |  |
| Flexitme | , Central information | https:/mww.york ac.uk/admin/hr/policies/eave-and-absence/sickness-and-ill-health/procedure: [5 |
| The Department supports flexitime where the service allows for this. Please read the Biology rules carefully and ensure you resolve any queries with your line manager in the first instance. <br> , Flexitime rules | Performance review is a useful process, but of course we recommend you should have regular 1:1 meetings with your line manager/PI to discuss your development needs and anything that arises during the course of the year. | You should expect to have a return to work with your line manager/supervisor upon return as per 4.3 of the central information: https://www.york ac. uk/admin/hr/policies/leave-and-absence/sickness-and-ill-heath/guidanceillscope[Z <br> , Biology process: who to notity |
| The DMT Hub has a number of different flexitime models depending on whether you are full-time, part-time, work term-time only and so on. Please email us and request a flexi sheet after your start date and we will help you set this up. | Recruitment |  |
|  | When you have a role to advertise, we can give you timely advice/support Please see below for information regarding recruitment. During the recruitment process you will be assigned a local DMT Hub team member as well as a central HR contact and either of these contacts will help you with the progression of your vacancy or in the event you have queries. <br> , Biology guidance | , Long term absence |
| Induction and probation |  | , Forms and support resources <br> , Stress support/management information |
| We are in the process of reffesting our Departmental induction materials. You can still find an induction checklist and the Health and Safety checkilst below. <br> , Induction checklist <br> , Health and Safety induction checklist <br> All new staff will be placed on probation for up to 9 months on arrival (please ask us or check your terms and conditions to confirm the period). Your manager will have the documentation required for this process and should book regular catch ups with you as per the information here: <br> , Central information | The job library is where you should look to see if a generic role fits with the role you're looking to advertise: <br> https/IMww.york ac. uk/admin/h/hecruitment/preparation/job-library/匹 <br> HR process: https./www. york.ac.uk/admin/hr/browse/recruitment © <br> HR forms: https//www.york. ac uk/admin/hr/browse/forms/recruilmentए | Training |
|  |  | Training information will be circulated via our Twitter feed and on the Learning and Development page. If you are looking for a specific course and cant find something, please contact the Administration Manager in the first instance locally, or call Leaming and Development on ext. 4888. <br> , University information <br> , Departmental information |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | Visting Associates, Summer Studentships and Work Experience |
|  |  | Any visitor to the Department who requires iT and KABA card access. should be registered as a Visiting Associate (including Summer Studentships). We ask for 5 working days notice of all VAs to allow us |

(vii) Workload model

Describe any workload allocation model in place and what it includes. Comment on ways in which the model is monitored for gender bias and whether it is taken into account at appraisal/development review and in promotion criteria. Comment on the rotation of responsibilities and if staff consider the model to be transparent and fair.

The Department has had a transparent workload allocation model (WAM) for $>20$ years, including lectures, practicals, and field courses, as well as module co-ordination, project supervision, tutorials, UG supervision, internal PhD examinations, and exam marking/assessments. Academic citizenship is also incorporated, including internal committee membership/chairing at

Departmental and University levels, UCAS admissions roles, and outreach activities. Following staff consultation in 2015, we further revised the model to capture more activities, and to more fairly represent different teaching activities. More recently, in line with University requirements, our WAM incorporated research and academic citizenship beyond the Department, such as sitting on external funding panels (e.g. UKRI).

The WAM is updated annually, is fully transparent (accessible by all academic/senior support staff in the Department), and is shared with the Dean of the Faculty of Science for cross-comparison with other Departments.

A list of academic staff administrative (citizenship) roles is circulated annually, and staff are encouraged to highlight (at their annual PDR) roles they would like to take-up. Two meetings each year are chaired by HoD where both DHoDs and the Chair of Teaching discuss academic roles for the following year. Roles have a 3-4 year term, before rotating, ensuring balance of stability and introduction of fresh ideas. Key committees have deputy chairs facilitating continuity.

The WAM is used in PDR discussions and provides evidence in promotion applications. DHoD and Chair of Teaching Committee act to reduce the loads of staff in the upper quartile, increase the loads of staff in the lower quartile, and protect reduced workloads of new lecturers, those returning from a career break or finishing a large citizenship role (eg. HoD). There is no statistically significant difference in the loads of male and female staff (2017/18 data; Mann-Whitney U test, $p>0.05$ ).
"The workload model makes the work allocation within the department seem fairer. It makes me feel my outreach activities are valued and helps me understand the allocation of my overall workload." - (Female member of BioEDG)
(viii) Representation of men and women on committees

Provide data for all department committees broken down by gender and staff type. Identify the most influential committees. Explain how potential committee members are identified and comment on any consideration given to gender equality in the selection of representatives and what the department is doing to address any gender imbalances. Comment on how the issue of 'committee overload' is addressed where there are small numbers of women or men.

Table 5.14 - Current Committee Chairs \& Membership by Gender

| Committee/Meeting | Chair | Total no. of females | Total no. of males | Attendees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Departmental Management Team | Female | 4 | 5 | Academic/PSS |
| Departmental Research Committee | Female | 7 | 10 | Academic |
| Biology-Chemistry Planning Group | Male/Female | 4 | 7 | Academic |
| Biology-HYMS Planning Group | Male/Female | 6 | 6 | Academic |
| Academic Staff Meeting | Male | OPEN | OPEN | Academic |
| Biology Staff Meeting | Male | NA | NA | Research/PSS |
| Recruitment and admissions Committee | Female | 7 | 9 | All staff groups |
| Ethics Committee | Female | 6 | 7 | All staff groups |
| Staff Committee | Female | 4 | 3 | All staff groups |
| Environmental Performance Group | Male | 6 | 7 | All staff groups |
| Health and Safety Committee | Male | 16 | 11 | All staff groups |
| Biology Equality and Diversity Group | Male | 14 | 7 | All staff groups and students at all stages of study |
| Teaching Committee | Male | 7 | 10 | Academic |
| Teaching Quality Group | Male | 4 | 4 | Academic |
| Biology Examinations Committee | Female | 7 | 9 | Academic |
| Board of Studies | Male | 43 | 65 | Academic |
| Biology Graduate School Board | Male | 9 | 9 | Academic |

Table 5.15 - Changes in Committee Membership over the last 5 years

| Committee/Meeting | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F (\% F) | F (\% F) | F (\% F) | F (\% F) | F (\% F) | F (\% F) |
| Departmental Research Committee | 4 (30\%) | 3 (23\%) | 5 (33\%) | 5 (33\%) | 6 (35\%) | 7 (41\%) |
| Biology Chemistry Planning Group | 5 (55\%) | 1 (17\%) | 1 (20\%) | 1 (20\%) | 1 (20\%) | 4 (36\%) |
| Ethics Committee | 4 (50\%) | 3 (50\%) | 1 (20\%) | 2 (33\%) | 2 (33\%) | 6 (46\%) |
| Staff Committee | 6 (31\%) | 6 (66\%) | 6 (66\%) | 6 (66\%) | 6 (75\%) | 4 (57\%) |
| BioEDG | - | - | 6 (55\%) | 6 (55\%) | 5 (50\%) | 7 (34\%) |
| Environmental Performance Grp | 10 (66\%) | 2 (66\%) | 2 (100\%) | 1 (33\%) | 1 (33\%) | 6 (46\%) |
| Teaching Committee | 3 (20\%) | 3 (33\%) | 3 (33\%) | 3 (30\%) | 3 (27\%) | 7 (41\%) |
| Teaching Quality Grp | 3 (50\%) | 2 (33\%) | 2 (33\%) | 2 (33\%) | 2 (33\%) | 4 (50\%) |
| Exams Committee | 5 (36\%) | 4 (27\%) | 6 (38\%) | 6 (38\%) | 6 (38\%) | 7 (44\%) |
| Graduate School Board | 6 (60\%) | 6 (30\%) | 6 (54\%) | 6 (54\%) | 6 (54\%) | 9 (50\%) |

The majority of our decision-making committees have appropriate gender balance, include staff from different career stages, and female staff hold $37 \%$ of Chair positions. To ensure transparency, membership of committees is available to all staff and appropriately redacted agendas and committee minutes are published on the staff Wiki.

We increased the number of committees with $40 \%$ or more female representation from 5/9 in 2013 to $8 / 10$ in 2018. One committee needs more female members (BCPG) and one needs more men (BioEDG). Action Point 2.5 - Improve gender balance of Biology-Chemistry Planning Group and BioEDG.

Our relatively high numbers of female staff mitigates against "committee overload". Professionally qualified staff for Departmental administration relating to e.g. H\&S (male), Finance (female, previously male), and Operations/Facilities (female, previously female) and a Departmental Manager (female, new role) chair several decision-making committees, lightening the load for academics and increasing visibility of PSS role models.

During our Gold award, we had one female (Prof Deborah Smith) and one male (Prof lan Graham) HoD during this time. We currently have a female HoD (Prof Jennifer Potts). The HoD nominates staff for University committees, taking gender and career progression into account. Two members of academic staff were voted onto University Senate in 2017 (2F).
(ix) Participation on influential external committees

How are staff encouraged to participate in other influential external committees
and what procedures are in place to encourage women (or men if they are
underrepresented) to participate in these committees?
Staff participation on external committees is an important mechanism that raises both the individual's and the Department's profile, and contributes to promotion. Furthermore, the influence that such committees exert over policy makers, enable us to promote our AS-led inclusivity approach and impacts, e.g. our staff are contributing to E\&D actions at UKRI through their role as panel chairs.

All staff are encouraged to participate in influential external committees as part of our PDR process during which discussions around 'development needs and goals' and 'citizenship' take place. We
are cognizant of the time that serving on these committees takes and have an action to reflect this in our workload model.

Action Point 4.1 - Ensure transparency of Staff teaching, admin and marking workloads and improve Workload model to capture activity on external committees

Figure 5-29 Biology female staff participation in external committees
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## 6. CASE STUDIES: IMPACT ON INDIVIDUALS

Recommended word count: 1500 words
Three individuals working in the department should describe how the department's activities have benefitted them.

The subjects of the case studies should include a member of the self-assessment team and a member of professional or support staff. The case studies should include both men and women.

More information on case studies is available in the awards handbook.

## CASE STUDY 1:

## CASE STUDY 2:

Word Count: 941

## FURTHER INFORMATION

Recommended word count: 500 words
Please comment here on any other elements that are relevant to the application.

Since our Silver award in 2006, we have had a successful track record of impacts from our actions. Some actions have been harder to implement, or have not resulted in impacts, and we have learnt from reflecting on our success and failure. We have made progress but recognise there is still more to do, and have ambitious plans for the four years, building on our successes.

We are especially proud of the following impacts:

1. Sustained success in increasing the number of female academics. Since 2014, our AS activities have increased female academic staff from $28 \%$ to $35 \%$. Increases are most pronounced for lecturers, where female lecturers have increased from $28 \%$ to $41 \%$, associated with our actions to increase the number of applications from women, e.g. through revised candidate briefs (resulting in a 7\% increase in applications from women for lectureships), having observers at shortlisting meetings (Smith et al. BioScience (2015) 65: 1084-1087), and a culture of regularly assessing the gender split of shortlists.
2. Successfully supporting women's careers and stemming the leaky career pipeline. Our actions to proactively encourage staff to apply for promotion, revised PDRs, and greater transparency in the promotions process, has resulted in more women being promoted. Our actions have resulted in $89 \%$ of females successfully applying for promotion in the last 7 years compared to $27 \%$ previously, and we have removed gender bias in higher success rates that previously favoured men. We have stemmed the career pipeline leak of females from UG to PGR (both now ~60\%F), and from Researcher (48\%F) to L ( $41 \%$, was $28 \%$ ), that we had recognised as a crucial career pinch point, through our actions to support PDRA careers, and improved recruitment practices.
3. Beacon activities to share best-practice. We have hosted and given seminars at other Institutions to discuss our Athena SWAN journey 'going for gold', resulting in 13 Institutes getting AS departmental awards (including two 2 Gold awards - Liverpool and John Innes Centre). We also spread good practice internally, via the BioEDG website, e.g. content from BioEDG training sessions, such as (1) avoiding gender biases when writing (and reading) references (Schmader et al. Sex Roles (2007), 57:509-514), and (2) helping seminar organisers achieve gender equality in speakers (based on Martin (2014) PLoS Comput Biol 10:e1003903), resulting in gender ratio of speakers at Departmental seminars rising from $25 \%$ to $39 \%$. We have also supported Learned Societies develop E\&D initiatives.
4. Raising the profile of women in Biology at York. We are immensely proud of our successful women: our former HoD, Professor Deborah Smith OBE, became Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research in 2014. Maggie Smallwood, a member of our PSS, was given an international accolade in 2016, and featured in II Bioeconomista as one of eight women who have distinguished themselves in the bioeconomy. We hope these successes will inspire the next generation of women scientists.

But there is more to do, and we look forward to implementing our ambitious new Gold action plan which will continue to drive forward our gender equality agenda and AS principles.

## 7. ACTION PLAN

The action plan should present prioritised actions to address the issues identified in this application.

Please present the action plan in the form of a table. For each action define an appropriate success/outcome measure, identify the person/position(s) responsible for the action, and timescales for completion.

The plan should cover current initiatives and your aspirations for the next four years. Actions, and their measures of success, should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound (SMART).

See the awards handbook for an example template for an action plan.
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Athena SWAN is a community trademark registered to Equality Challenge Unit: 011132057.
Information contained in this publication is for the use of Athena SWAN Charter member institutions only. Use of this publication and its contents for any other purpose, including copying information in whole or in part, is prohibited. Alternative formats are available: pubs@ecu.ac.uk

## Gold Application Action Plan - Department of Biology, University of York

We have held an Athena SWAN award since 2006 (Silver) and are immensely proud to have achieved Gold in 2014. Most of the initiatives we have instigated over the past 12 years are now embedded within our Departmental culture. We have developed ambitious new actions and targets to address the next challenges we have identified, based on our data analyses and our reflections on our progress and successes. High-priority actions that we addressed successfully during our Gold award include:

- Maintained gender balance in senior management team - our second female HoD was appointed in 2018
- Increased the number of women applying for academic jobs
- Increased the number of women applying for promotion
- Raised the profile of AS, and $>85 \%$ of our staff recognise that the Department has benefitted from our AS activities
- Expanded our AS Self-Assessment Team (BioEDG) to include a wider representation of staff and students

Raised the visibility of female role models by publicising the career paths of our staff

- Research leave embedded in Departmental practices, and gender parity in take-up
- WAM updated, and maintained gender parity in workloads
- Instigated maternity leave mentors
- Increased uptake and visibility of flexible working
- Increased notification of formal paternity leave



## ACTION PLAN

BioEDG will closely monitor progress of actions, assess success against targets and consider what further support or actions are needed.

ENGAGE: raise the profile of Athena SWAN within the Department and embed gender equality throughout all Departmental activity

| Action No. | Planned Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.0 | Increase engagement of PSS with AS | Evidence in staff surveys of less awareness of AS amongst PSS | Focus groups run with PSS to develop ideas \& increase engagement | Admin Manager | Dec 18- <br> March23 | Three focus groups run with PS staff at all grades and involving $>90 \%$ of staff, at least 1 new AS action developed from each focus group. |
|  |  |  | 'Career trees' activity extended to include PS staff | PSS Rep on BioEDG | Dec 18-Sept20 | 20 career trees produced and posted on our web pages |
|  |  |  | Regular culture surveys of PS staff to get honest feedback and ideas for new actions <br> Utilise anonymised google form for staff to provide feedback/ideas on AS throughout year | Dept Manager | Bi-annually from 2019 onwards <br> Ongoing from Feb 2019 | Survey results show continued increase in recognition of AS activities, with $90 \%$ of PSS reporting they benefit from AS by 2022. At least 1 new AS action developed from each survey |


| Action No. | Planned Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1.1$ | Create a more inclusive Departmental culture | Concern that lack of variation in timing of social events may detrimentally impact specific groups of staff | New mechanisms developed to monitor gender balance at events. <br> Guidance produced and publicised on Wiki regarding arrangement of events to ensure inclusivity so that all staff can attend | Social Committee | Monitoring <br> Dec18-Dec19 <br> Guidance <br> developed <br> and agreed by <br> Social <br> Committee <br> February 2020 | Data are available on gender split for attendance at social events. <br> If data reveal gender imbalance new actions incorporated into guidance. <br> There is gender balance at social activities. <br> Social committee membership has higher profile. |
| $1.2$ | Reduce Unconscious Bias | Widespread recognition that UB has the potential to infiltrate all Departmental activity. | Highlight online UB training via Biology Bulletin <br> Targeted emails sent to encourage compliance by staff in post prior to introduction of compulsory training. | Training Officer | Dec18-Dec19 <br> Regular <br> monthly <br> reminders <br> throughout <br> 2019 | $>80 \%$ of staff have completed UB training online by end 2019 |
| $1.3$ | Produce more comprehensive understanding of PDRA career destinations | Current limited knowledge of career destinations of PDRAs reduces ability to provide appropriate career advice | Student Employability Team review LinkedIn data from PDRA leavers and analyse by gender. <br> Careers pages updated | Employability <br> Manager <br> Employability <br> Manager, BASC and | Annual report to BioEDG data meeting. <br> Annual updates | Data on next destinations by gender are available <br> Staff survey demonstrates |
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PROGRESS: In removing barriers to equality to achieve new impacts.

| Action No. | Planned Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2.0$ | Support career progression of PDRAs <br> Understand factors affecting gender balance of 'Named Researchers' on research applications | We wish to stem the leakiest point in our career pipeline for women, which is from PDRA to Lecturer | Focus group of PDRAs to discuss their input to research applications and better understanding of factors influencing naming of PDRAs on applications. <br> Potential reasons for gender imbalance of named researchers identified. <br> Actions developed. | Research Facilitator <br> DRC (postdoc rep) | Jan19-Sept19 <br> Oct 2019 | Improved gender balance (by $10 \%$ ) in named researchers by 2021 <br> Data on gender of named researchers reported annually to BioEDG data meeting. <br> Focus group is attended by >20 PDRAs and leads to one new action to support career development |
| $2.1$  | Maintain gender balance in PGT | Recognition of potential coursedependent gender imbalance in PGT. | Promotional material for PGT courses, Open Day and website reviewed with a gender audit. <br> Gender balance in PGT applications \& intake broken down by individual programme | Student <br> Engagement <br> Manager <br> PGT Admissions Tutor | Complete by end 2019 <br> Review annually following recruitment cycle | Gender balance reflects our UG cohort (64\%F:36\%M) over next 3 years as PGT programmes increase their intake. <br> Reduced (10\%) imbalance between programmes. |


| Action No. | Planned Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.2 | Reduce gender disparity across PSS grades and support PSS careers | Data in figure 5.9 reveals gender imbalance at specific PSS grades. | Data analysed by gender for roles within grades. | Admin Manager | August 2019 | Career stages graph for PSS staff moves closer to gender parity across all grades by 2022 |
|  |  |  | Hold focus groups for PSS staff to explore any barriers to applying for specific posts. | Dept Manager/Admin Manager | February 2020 | Focus group attended by $50 \%$ of PSS, and one action developed and taken forward. |
|  |  |  | Develop action plans from feedback | Admin Manager | Annually |  |
|  |  |  | Review secondment /temporary responsibility opportunities | PDR Reviewers \& HoD Oversight | Brief PDR <br> Reviewers annually June/July and | Maintain gender balance in staff taking up opportunities. |
|  |  |  | Disseminate information and encourage mentoring/coaching/job shadowing via PDR process | PDR Reviewers \& HoD Oversight | monitor in PDR's through HoD oversight | At least 20 people take up opportunities annually |
|  |  |  | Encourage women to apply for Leadership training through PDR discussions \& targeted emails recognising drop-off of women at grade 7 | PDR Reviewers \& Training Officer |  | $10 \%$ increase in staff taking up leadership training by 2021, and positive feedback /case studies used to encourage others |


| Action No. | Planned <br> Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2.3$  | Ensure there are no barriers to male representation in specific PSS grades. | Data in figure 5.9 reveals gender imbalance at specific PSS grades. <br> Recognition that certain PSS roles are gender stereotyped | Case studies of men/women currently in PSS roles are produced. <br> Career trees to demonstrate progression in PSS roles are produced. <br> Language in PSS adverts is reviewed through a gender audit (working with UoY HR) <br> Shortlisting of previous PSS posts reviewed to identify any gender bias <br> Promote PSS job adverts through the AUA <br> Monitor engagement of PSS with IST by gender and promote take up if there is gender inequality. | Admin <br> Manager/Dept <br> Manager <br> Admin <br> Manager/Ops <br> Manager <br> Admin Manager <br> Dept Manager <br> DMT Admin Team <br> Operations <br> Manager | By end 2019 <br> December <br> 2020 <br> January 2020 <br> March 2020 <br> March 2019 <br> Onwards <br> Annually from 2019 | Male/female split in PSS improved by $10 \%$ each year to $40 \% \mathrm{M} ; 60 \%$ F by 2021 <br> Ten career trees produced <br> 15\% improvement in gender balance of applications. |
| $2.4$  | Ensure PDR meetings are useful for all staff | In the Staff Survey only $62 \%$ said their PDR was useful in providing constructive feedback on areas for development. | Staff surveys to examine if the new form (introduced in 2018) resulted in improvements, <br> Assess effect of the new PDR process on training/development and promotion applications | HoD/Dept Manager <br> Admin <br> Manager/HoD | January 2020 <br> January 2019 | Staff surveys show $>80 \%$ positive responses, <br> Gender balance in satisfaction maintained. <br> 10\% improvement annually in uptake |


| Action No. | Planned Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.5 | Improve gender balance of Biology-Chemistry Planning Group (BCPG) and BioEDG | Gender split on BCPG is currently $36 \%$ female; $64 \%$ male <br> Gender split on BioEDG is currently ~66\% female; $33 \%$ male | Biannual "jobs group" led by HoD addresses disparity through encouraging new volunteers. | Biology"jobs group" | February 2019 | Gender balance on BCPG and BioEDG in 2019 |
| $2.6$ | Improve visibility/understanding of career progression pathways for PDRAs to reduce perceived insecurity. | The number of research-only staff on fixed-term contracts is high. | Engage with Concordat and Postdoc society <br> Career trees and non-linear career paths highlighted (see 1.3) <br> Opportunities for: <br> Bridging funding <br> Postdoc summer studentship scheme <br> (~30k annually) <br> Redeployment <br> Fellowships <br> highlighted | Deputy <br> HoD/Research <br> Facilitator/Admin <br> Manager/Chair DRC <br> DRC/Post-doc Soc | March 2019 <br> May 2019 | Website hits demonstrate usefulness of career trees. <br> Increased applications to these schemes. 10\% increase annually. |


| Action No. | Planned Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2.7$ | Increase BME student, academic staff and PSS population in the department | Our analysis of intersectionality reveals number of BME students is below UK benchmark <br> Our analysis of intersectionality reveals \% of BME academic staff and PSS is below UK benchmark | Department will engage with (and help drive) widening participation strategy and Race Equality Charter at University level <br> Monitor attendance at Open Days in relation to ethnicity <br> Ethnicity audit of marketing materials (student and staff) performed. <br> Collect data on application \& offer rates for BME students and staff to identify whether there is any bias in the student recruitment process | BioEDG BME Rep <br> Admissions Team <br> BME rep with University SRA <br> BioEDG BME rep | 2018/19 <br> Academic year <br> 2019/20 <br> Academic Year <br> 2019/20 <br> Academic Year <br> 2019/120 <br> Academic Year | Number of BME students increased to $15 \%$ by end 2021. <br> Number of BME academic staff and PSS increased to $10 \%$ by end 2021. |

ENHANCE our well-established record of activity, which recognises that the Biology Department cannot reach its full potential unless it can benefit from the talents of all.

| Action No. | Planned <br> Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3.0$ | Support career progression of female academics \& Researchers. | Female academics apply for less funding in their grant applications <br> Recognition of reticence of women in considering promotion. <br> Recognition of the effectiveness of a proactive approach to encouraging applications for promotion. <br> We have recruited a number of new lecturers and promotion should be timely. | Mentor female applications to submit larger grant applications <br> Continue with lunchtime information sessions. <br> Promotion readiness discussion with line manager and coaching encouraged. <br> HoD mentors specific staff toward promotion. <br> Examples of successful promotion CVs (from different grades) are shared with permission <br> Staff encouraged to take up University mentoring and coaching opportunities | RFLs <br> BASC <br> HoD | Dec 2018 <br> Ongoing <br> Termly <br> Annually during summer | Level of funding applied for by female academics increases $10 \%$ by 2021 <br> Lunchtime sessions have >20 attendees (gender balance). Feedback indicates greater understanding of process <br> Female applications to increase $5 \%$ annually to gender balance. <br> One example CV for each grade available. <br> Staff survey shows $15 \%$ increase in female staff stating mentoring/coaching is useful |
| $3.1$ | Collect role review data for PSS staff by grade | No data currently available on HERA requests for grade review. | Include staff grade information in database of role reviews | Admin Manager | From 2019 | New action developed if data reveals gender disparity. |
| $3.2$ | Review selection of postdoctoral Tutors | Recognition of lack of gender balance in PDRA tutors. | Working group to be set up to review the selection process for Tutors | DHoD (teaching) | 2019/20 <br> Academic year | Gender parity in PDRA tutors by 2021. |


| Action No. | Planned <br> Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3.3$  | Expand Departmental AS activity to include more protected characteristics to better promote under-represented groups | Sharing good practice from AS to other protected characteristics is an effective way to promote Equality and Diversity. | Publish links to factsheets about protected characteristics on the Biology E\&D webpage. <br> Review signage on gender neutral facilities in Department <br> Biology LGBTQ+ forum for staff \& students to run bi-monthly <br> Disabilities Network in department (staff \& students) | BioEDG /DMT <br> Admin Team <br> Operations <br> Manager <br> BioEDG LGBTQ+ <br> Reps <br> BioEDG Disability Reps | Spring term 2019 <br> Before end 2019 <br> Bi-monthly <br> Twice a term | Successful integration of events around protected characteristics into department activities and attendance rates similar to other activities. <br> Staff survey $5 \%$ annual improvement in recognition of inclusive culture in Dept. |
| $3.4$ | Increased awareness \& uptake of maternity/ paternity/shared parental/adoption leave and flexible working. Increased formal reporting of such leave | Many male staff don't request formal paternity leave. <br> Many academic staff do not request flexible working formally. Women value additional advice in preparing for maternity leave. | Inclusion of information on different types of leave in refined induction process <br> All managers to be briefed on the types of leave /flexible working available and the reporting processes (through updated Wiki) <br> Work with the University to improve effectiveness of KIT days | Admin Manager <br> Admin Manager <br> Maternity mentors | During 2018/19 <br> March 2019 and ongoing. Fit with University review | Increase in \% of eligible staff formally taking paternity leave by end 2020. <br> Mentors report staff taking maternity leave have made more effective use of their KIT days. |


| Action No. | Planned Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | in outreach activities <br> Improved gender balance on BioEDG and BCPG | Women disproportionately contribute to outreach and Equality and Diversity activities. | Highlight case studies to improve awareness of male PGR students of the contribution of outreach activities to career development. | Outreach Manager | Updated annually | Gender balance amongst staff/student groups participating in outreach activity and committee representation by 2021. |
|  |  |  | Encourage more male PhD students to take part in outreach activities by promoting development/CV enhancement and encourage academic supervisors to promote these opportunities to all supervisees | BioEDG PGR rep | Annual PGR <br> Symposium |  |
|  |  |  | Provide outreach training opportunities. | Outreach Manager | Advertised annually in March |  |
|  |  |  | Jobs group (chaired by DHoD) to target gender balance on all committees. | DHoD | Annually <br> January and July |  |


| Action No. | Planned <br> Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Continue to improve the \% of female ART applications | Fewer women apply for advertised posts particularly at higher grades. | Work with central HR to trial the use of software to improve the wording of adverts. <br> Only use bank of standardised and approved candidate briefs at all grades that are updated regularly | Admin Manager <br> Admin Manager | Project completed by June 2020 \& assess impact on job applications at end 2020 | Increase in \% female applicants for academic posts to $45 \%$ by 2022 <br> Increase in \% female applicants for Research posts to PGR levels by 2022 |
|  |  |  | Target advertising to STEMM networks and women in science groups using social media (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn) | BioEDG Members | Targeted advertising when vacancies arise | Analytics show peaks in website traffic coinciding with social media postings |
|  |  |  | Use google analytics data to track website traffic following social media postings | Admin Manager | Review of analytics data Mid 2021 |  |

SUSTAIN: Recognising that there are more improvements to make, put in place ambitious new actions to SUSTAIN this culture and best practice to ensure we do not become complacent.

| Action <br> No. | Planned Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4.0$ | Reduce career pipeline leak from PDRA to lecturer <br> Raise \% of female PDRAs to Benchmark | 4.11 and 4.13 show drop-off from UG to PDRA to lecturer <br> Figure 4.14 shows we are below benchmark | Promote Linkedln for PGT, PGR and add PDRAs to help understand destinations-to other universities, industry? <br> Promote Coffee and Career and Gradshare events to PGR to raise awareness of academic careers. <br> Promote female role models at careers events and on our website | Employability <br> Manager | Ongoing from 2019 <br> Termly <br> Annually | Better understanding of destinations of leavers. Reduced female drop off from UG-PGR-lecturer (5\%per annum to 60\% by 2022). <br> Meetings attended by more than 20 and gender balanced. <br> Speakers gender balanced at careers events. <br> Annual refresh of web page |
| 4.1 | Ensure transparency of staff teaching, admin and marking workloads and improve WAM to capture activity on external committees | Female staff feedback that WAM does not reflect their full workload. | Annual analysis of WAM by gender and action taken where necessary. <br> Explore best practice of incorporation of influential external committee membership into WAM | DHoD(T\&S)/BioEDG Chair <br> BASC | Annually prior to start of academic year By end 2019 academic year | Workload model includes external committee activity and transparency recognised by $80 \%$ of academic staff in 2020 culture survey. |
| $4.2$ |  <br> Management training and DACS Assessment Centres (DACS) | Lack of gender parity in take-up of training opportunities | Hold focus groups with previous participants to review effectiveness and utilise previous participants in promotion of schemes. | Dept Manager | July 2019 | Focus groups attended by > 20 staff. Increased uptake of courses and gender parity in applicants by 2022 |


| Action No. | Planned Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4.3$ | Improve gender balance in seminar \& Open Lecture speakers | Present our inclusive reputation both internally and externally. | Provide speakers with more notice of invitations, and greater flexibility in timing/day or week <br> BioEDG to provide support for seminar/lecture organisers in achieving gender balance (e.g. by sharing good practice from learned societies about the increased likelihood of women declining invitations) <br> Ask for speakers who decline to identify underlying reasons | Seminar Organisers <br> BASC/Seminar Organisers <br> Seminar organisers | Spring 2019/ and ongoing <br> Spring 2019/ and annually <br> Report to BioEDG annually | Target 50\% female speakers by 2021 |
| 4.4 | Maintain career pipeline between UG \& PGR for female students | Progress has been made in stemming the loss of women from UG to PGR and we wish to sustain this. | Add female case studies to UG and PGR recruitment materials <br> Annually review admissions procedures and applicant data with gender (and other protected characteristic) audit | PGR BioEDG Rep BGSB \& BoS | By end 2019 <br> Annually December | Sustained gender parity throughout Gold award period |


| Action <br> No. | Planned <br> Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.5 | Review induction to include opportunity for new starters to meet other new starters in Department | New staff report it can be hard to meet other new staff to share experiences | Induction meetings for groups of new staff to meet each other -including signposting to key E\&D policies \& AS information <br> Feedback data will be monitored to assess effectiveness of new briefings; feedback sheets will be handed out after each session. | Administration Manager <br> Administration Manager | Start July 2019 and every six months | High attendance (>80\% of new starters) at 6 monthly induction briefings. <br> Feedback sheets/surveys report >90\% positive responses in relation to these induction events. |

INSPIRE objectives: Through our beacon activities, that we promote the benefits of our activities - both internally and externally - to disseminate gender equality and INSPIRE others to reach their Athena SWAN ambitions.

| Action <br> No. | Planned Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.0 | BioEDG committee members are beacons of good practice within the University | We will recognise the benefits of sharing good practice with other Departments. | Act as "critical friends" for other Departments in the Faculty. | BASC | Ongoing | Become a critical friend on two more <br> Departmental SATs <br> Departments which are supported by us will receive AS <br> Gold/Silver/Bronze status <br> At least one new initiative developed by Biology through critical friendship. <br> Selected actions disseminated to University E\&D committee to reach the other two faculties. |
| $5.1$ | Act as a Beacon and share our Athena SWAN and BioEDG activities externally to the University of York. | We recognise the benefit of sharing AS activities with other universities to develop new actions both in their Departments and in UoY Biology. | Invite teams from other institutions to visit York <br> Reinvigorate the WR network for AS activities and extend to N8. | BASC <br> BASC | Ongoing | At least one team per year visits York. <br> At least one new action in Biology developed from each visit and publicised on our website. <br> Feedback after the visit suggests our innovative activities and events are adopted by others. |


| Action <br> No. | Planned Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $5.2$ | Be ambitious and innovative in our work engaging PSS in AS activities. | Data collection demonstrated weaker understanding of AS issues amongst PSS | Recruit PSS to BioEDG to act as ambassador for AS activities. <br> Understand where new actions are needed and develop two foci of activities. | BioEDG Chair <br> BioEDG PSS <br> ambassador | March 2019 <br> March 2020 | Successful recruitment demonstrating interest from PSS in AS <br> Staff survey shows >80\% of PSS staff recognise benefits of AS. |
| 5.3 | Spread awareness of the work done with the British Ecological Society (BES) and Ada Lovelace Day so that this is adopted by other learned societies | Our work with the BES has demonstrated how we can positively influence the work of learned societies in the area of Equality and Diversity. | Agenda item at next staff meeting to engage staff working with other learned societies <br> Promote good practice with other learned societies through sharing lessons learned with the BES and Ada Lovelace | Sue <br> Hartley/Thorunn Helgason <br> BASC | Spring term 2019 <br> Spring term 2020 | At least three staff volunteer to gather information on E\&D activities from learned societies. <br> At least one action developed volunteer in Biology (or the learned society) by end 2021. |
| $5.4$ | Promote our use of the apprentice levy to other departments within the University and externally to other Institutions who have not yet taken this approach. | We recognise that we can share our positive experience with other Departments and institutions to encourage employment of an apprentice. <br> We recognise that many school leavers are not aware of the varied career paths within Universities. | To promote our activity at Faculty level meetings and via AS Champions in other departments and institutions. <br> When she has gained more experience we will encourage the apprentice to provide comments (potentially short video) on our website about her experience. | BASC and <br> Operations <br> Manager <br> DMT Hub and apprentice | By end 2021 <br> End 2020 | Two more departments in the University recruit apprentices via the levy. <br> Information on website and evidence of "hits". |


| Action No. | Planned <br> Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $5.5$ | Promote our involvement with the Technician Commitment to other science departments at York and externally to institutions and support them in signing up and carrying out their selfassessment. | We recognise that UoY and Biology are at the forefront of this initiative and thus have an opportunity to disseminate best practice more widely. | Promote the Technician Commitment via updates on our website and at staff meetings <br> Promote externally via Beacon activities during visits from other universities. | Operations Manager <br> Operations Manager | During 2020 <br> During 2021 | Increased membership of IST by technicians. <br> Lobby faculty to cover some costs of memberships. <br> Other institutions visit and provide positive feedback. |
| $5.6$ | Working with the University to improve candidate briefs | We have done lots of work in this area which has impacted positively on the number of applications from female candidates. We wish to use this experience to support the University | Regularly review the bank of candidate briefs with central HR | Administration Manager | March 2019 and annually | Continued increase in applications from underrepresented groups. |
| $5.7$ | Improve representation of women in HoD of science Depts | Few females HoDs in science Depts. As we have a current female HoD we can share good practice. | Feed into the University review of HoD application process based on our recent experience. | HoD | Fit with University review | Increase in number of female HoDs of science Depts. |


| Action No. | Planned Action/Objective | Rationale | Key outputs and milestones | Ownership | Timeframe | Success criteria and outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $5.8$ | Encouraging healthy working practices. | We recognise staff report stress and that a long-hours culture is detrimental to health and wellbeing. <br> We want to demonstrate healthy life-long working practices that students will take forward into their careers. <br> We suspect that academic staff, in particular, do not take their full allowance of leave. <br> In the 2017 Staff Survey only 84\% F answered ' No ' when asked if they had been harassed or bullied at work in the last 12 months. (Compared to 91\% men) | Agree Departmental communications and email strategy and ensure staff and students understand the benefits of the strategy and appropriate working practices. <br> Focus group to understand if other institutions have good strategies and discover any barriers to taking leave. <br> Ask for a volunteer from a member of staff to be trained as Harassment Advisor. <br> Raise awareness of University expectations around dignity and respect. <br> Highlight mechanisms for raising issues at Staff Meeting. | HoD, Chair BoS, Director for students and Departmental Manager <br> BioEDG <br> HoD | June 2019 <br> Dec 2020 <br> March 2019 | Staff survey reports improved emailing practices by students. <br> Student surveys show the practice has been well understood and appreciated. <br> Focus groups report back with at least two ideas. <br> Harassment Advisor trained. <br> Staff survey shows higher of both men and women answering "no" to bullying and harassment question and gender parity. |
| 5.9 | Work with University to achieve continuity of research cover during maternity leave. | Female PIs and PDRAs are adversely affected by lack of research cover funding during maternity leave. | Lobby for research cover to be funded at University level as it is for teaching cover | BASC | July 2019 | University funds research cover similarly to teaching cover. |
| $5.10$  | Work with the University to address the gender pay gap | Wide pay-gap for senior academics | Work with University AS team to better understand reasons for gender pay-gap, and regularly analyse pay-gap data across all staff grades | BioEDG | Annually aligned with University analyses | Reduce current gender pay-gap of $\sim 8 \%$ for senior academics in Biology by a half by 2021, and maintain no pay-gap at lower grades |

