## Athena Swan renewal application form for departments

## Applicant information

| Name of institution | University of York |
| :--- | :--- |
| Name of department | Department of Politics |
| Date of current application | May 2023 |
| Level of previous award | May 2018 |
| Date of previous award | Monica Brito Vieira |
| Contact name | monica.britovieira@york.ac.uk |
| Contact email | 01904 324108 |
| Contact telephone |  |


| Section | Words used |
| :--- | :--- |
| An overview of the department and its <br> approach to gender equality | 2261 |
| An evaluation of the department's <br> progress and issues | 2950 |
| Future action plan* |  |
| Appendix 1: Culture survey data* |  |
| Appendix 2: Data tables* | 5211 |
| Appendix 3: Glossary* |  |
| Overall word count | *These sections and appendices should not contain any commentary contributing to <br> the overall word limit |

Overall word limit: 5500 words

| Applicant Information | 0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Section 1: An overview of the department and its approach to gender <br> equality | 3 |
| 1. Letter of endorsement from the head of department | 4 |
| 2. Description of the department and its context | 6 |
| 3. Athena Swan self-assessment process | 10 |
| Section 2: An evaluation of the department's progress and issues | 12 |
| 1. Evaluating progress against the previous action plan | 13 |
| 2. Key priorities for future action | 21 |
| Section 3: Future action plan | 23 |
| 1. Action plan | 24 |
| Appendix 0: 2017 Action Plan | 58 |
| Appendix 1: Culture survey data | 98 |
| Appendix 2: Data table | 136 |
| Appendix 3: Snapshot of the department (2022/20223) | 161 |
| Appendix 4: Glossary | 165 |

## Section 1: An overview of the department and its approach to gender equality

In Section 1, applicants should evidence how they meet Criterion A:

- Structures and processes are in place to underpin and recognise gender equality work

Recommended word count: 2500 words

## 1. Letter of endorsement from the head of the department

Please insert (with appropriate letterhead) a signed letter of endorsement from the head of the department.

Advance HE
Innovation Way
York Science Park
York YO10 5BR
United Kingdom
Dear Advance HE Equality Charters team,
I am delighted to write in support of the application for Athena Swan Bronze Renewal from the Department of Politics, University of York. This process has provided a welcome opportunity to review our progress so far in advancing gender equality and consolidate our future efforts. The application has my enthusiastic support and the full support of the Department Management Team (DMT).

Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion is central to the Department's new strategy; it is strongly supported by both staff and students, who are often urging us to go even further; and has been put at the heart of everything we do. Our work on the Bronze submission served as a catalyst for a cultural change in the department, and we have made significant improvements since the award in 2017.

Some of the most notable achievements, which are detailed in this application, include the following:

- We have been highly successful in attracting women to senior positions in the department and supporting the promotion of women already here. As a result, we are now approaching gender parity in senior posts: the percentage of female professors rose from $33 \%$ to $43 \%$ (and will be $47 \%$ in July 2023) and the percentage of female Senior Lecturers rose from $38 \%$ to $47 \%$.
- Our management team has also become distinctly more female. The Head of Department and the Deputy Head are both women, and the Department Management Team is majority female. We have also maintained gender balance or near gender balance amongst the chairs of all departmental committees.
- In our Bronze submission we set out to enhance the post-maternity leave support offered by the University and we now offer flexible support options to women upon their return. The feedback has been overwhelmingly positive.
- One of our core aims in the last submission was to improve female PhD recruitment. This has been achieved (from 29\% to $44 \%$ this year) and we
have also improved the gender balance of our student population at both UG and PGT level.
- A final achievement worth highlighting is the reduction of women on fixedterm employment contracts. This has been achieved by moving them to open contracts whenever possible.

Despite these achievements, the work is by no means done. We need to embed and broaden these changes, and the evidence collected as part of this process has enabled us to identify new initiatives that will further improve equality, diversity, and inclusion in the Department. The Future Action plan is ambitious but, I believe, achievable and will prioritise the following core aims:

- Promote broad engagement and further embed of Athena Swan principles in all departmental activities.
- Address the impact of Covid-19.
- Embed AS principles in all aspects of the student experience.
- Address current imbalances in the composition of staff.
- Provide more targeted support to career development and progression of staff, especially female staff.
- Address concerns with workload levels
- Enhance staff's feelings of inclusion and belonging.

Besides setting out clear aims, the Future Action plan realistically establishes the actions that we will be pursuing to achieve these aims, their expected outcomes, clearcut lines of responsibility, and the most appropriate performance metrics and indicators for tracking and measuring success. This helps to provide guidance as well as support to those involved in the plan's implementation, while also allowing for a level of flexibility and constructive engagement. From our past experience, we know that the strongest results depend on cross-departmental and multi-stakeholder collaboration and we will make sure to sustain these into the future.

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

Yours sincerely,


Nina Caspersen
Head of Department

## 2. Description of the department and its context

The Department of Politics at York is an internationally-renowned centre of excellence for teaching and research. Our research takes a pluralistic and interdisciplinary approach and is oriented towards promoting values of equality, diversity, and inclusion from conception to impact. The world-leading quality of our research has been confirmed in the most recent Research Excellence Framework (REF), in which we ranked 11th (2021), ahead of 12 other Russell Group Politics Departments, including Oxford and Cambridge. Our four research clusters (Comparative Politics and Public Policy, International Studies, Political Economy and Political Theory) and five research centres (Centre for Applied Human Rights, Centre for the Comparative Study of Civil War, Interdisciplinary Global Development Centre, York Centre for Conflict and Security and York Centre for Political Theory) constitute dynamic hubs of our research activity. Over the last 5 years we have extended our research expertise on gender significantly. Our new MA on Gender and Politics is a reflection of this.

Since our last application, thanks to a sustained growth strategy and the implementation of Athena Swan, we have become a much larger and more diverse department. We now employ 99 staff (from 54 in 2016), comprising 75 academic staff (from 41), 43\% of which are women (from 42\%), and 24 PSS (from 13), 87.5\% of which are women (a snapshot of our latest staff data, with gender splits, can be found in Appendix 2, Figure DT.1). Besides the increase of the percentage of women in senior level positions (47\% at both Senior Lecturer and Professor levels), the department has also diversified along other lines: $13 \%$ of our academic staff are now BME (against 6\% in the last submission) and we have become very international in outlook, with $40 \%$ of our staff holding a first degree from countries other than the UK, including India, the US, Argentina, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Norway and Portugal.

The department is based at a single site - Derwent College - where professional services and staff offices are located, but teaching occurs across the University campus. We are home to a community of 1136 students and pride ourselves on the excellent research-leading teaching and pastoral support we offer. All staff-student relations, from the classroom to mentoring, aim at empowering students from different backgrounds and at fostering the culture of diversity, equity and inclusion that supports their flourishing.

## Coffee Morning with Women in Politics: Empowering Women, Empowering All. INTERNATIONAL WOMENS DAY - 8TH MARCH - 12:00-14:00 VANBRUGH COMMON ROOM



They were so happy to talk to me, the politics department does feel like a family. The friendliness and openness of staff is wonderful.

First Generation UG Student
We offer four undergraduate programmes in Politics, Politics with International Relations, International Relations and Global Development. We also offer joint degrees with English, History, and Economics and Philosophy. We have a UG cohort of 875 students (up from 682 in the last application), which is close to gender balance overall ( $45 \%$ F; Appendix 3, Figure 1) and gender balanced for our four undergraduate programmes (50\%; Appendix 2, Figure DT.5). Our UG cohort is also otherwise diverse, with $13.7 \%$ of our current UG students being EU and Overseas and $29 \%$ BME.

We offer nine MA programmes across three sub-disciplines: International Relations, Political Theory and Public Policy. Our PG community comprises 286 students (190 PGT and 96 PGR) and thanks to a proactive policy (ID3) the intake has been gender balanced for PGTs ( $50 \%$ and $51 \%$ ) and very nearly gender balanced for PGRs (49\%) the last two years (Appendix 2, Figure DT.6). 2022-2023 has shown a slight drop in both intakes, but we remain nearly gender-balanced at PGT level ( $45 \%$ ), with a slightly lower proportion of women at PGR level ( $43 \%$ for our current overall cohort, Years 1 to 3) (see Appendix 3, Figure1). Internationalism is deep in our PG
community, with $78 \%$ of our PGT and $49 \%$ of our PGRs being non-UK nationals, from countries including Mexico, Brazil, India, Nigeria, Germany and Greece.


Our governance and management structure is designed to advance quality, diversity and inclusion work. The EDI Committee (EDIC) lies at the heart of the department's governance structure and provides direction and coordination to our EDI strategy and policy. At York Politics, however, EDI is no longer understood as a Committee's job, but as a responsibility shared across departmental structures. Reflecting this, EDI is a standing item on the agenda of all major departmental committees and the Department Management Team (DMT), to which the EDI Chair belongs; and all key departmental officers have a seat in the EDIC. These officers form a powerful guiding coalition, responsible for embedding EDI practices in their different areas of activity (teaching, research, UG and PG student communities) as "the normal way of doing things". In our FAP we are reinforcing their structured involvement in EDIC's activities (FAP 1.1) to see further progress in the mainstreaming of EDI.

Our EDIC meets twice per term, and AS typically makes up half of the agenda. The multiple structural inequalities the EDIC seeks to address can only be adequately tackled by keeping gender at the forefront of its work.

Figure 8. Diagram of Politics Department's Governance and Management Structure


In recognition of the importance of AS to the department, in the year of the AS submission the EDIC Chair receives a workload allocation in line with the Deputy HoD and slightly lower in normal years, but still in line with Chairs of main Committees. Members of the writing team also receive workload allocations. Outstanding contributions to the advancement of the AS agenda are rewarded through our Athena Swan Initiative Award (ID1, rolled over to FAP 1.1.3).

Impact (ID 1): Since 2018, the AS Initiative Award has been given to the Chairs of EDIC, the department's LGBT officer, and our student services manager. In 2023, the award has been given ex aequo to the PhD student who has been part of our 2023 AS application's writing team and the student-lead Anti-Racism Working Group, whose work extends to the links between racialised and gender-based violence.

## 3. Athena Swan self-assessment process

Our SAT is the EDIC, which currently comprises 16 members, 10 of whom are women ( $63 \%$ ). Over the assessment period, its composition has changed, but we have always sought to: secure leadership and senior buy-in by including key departmental officers in the SAT; ensure representation of staff with gender expertise; and keep the SAT approximately representative of the department's composition, securing a balance of stage of career, type of contract, gender, race and other relevant protected characteristics.

Figure 9. EDIC/SAT Composition in 2022/2023

| Position | Sex | Academic Role | Contract Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Head of Department | Female | Professor | ART (Full-time) |
| Chair EDIC | Female | Professor | ART <br> (Full-time) |
| EDIC Deputy | Male | Lecturer | T\&S (Full-time) |
| Department Manager | Female |  | PSS <br> (Full-time) |
| Chair DRC | Male | Professor | ART <br> (Full-time) |
| Chair Teaching Committee | Female | Lecturer | ART <br> (Full-time) |
| Postgraduate Research Director | Male | Professor | ART <br> (Full-time) |
| Postgraduate Teaching Director | Male | Senior Lecturer | ART <br> (Full-time) |
| Chair of BoS | Male | Senior Lecturer | ART (Full-time) |
| BME \& LGBT Officer | Female |  | Postdoctoral Fellow |
| Disability Officer | Male | Lecturer | T\&S (Full-time) |
| Harassment Officer | Female | Lecturer | T\&S (Full-time) |


| Gender Specialist | Female | Senior Lecturer | ART <br> (Part-time) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Postdoc <br> Representative | Female |  | Postdoctoral <br> Fellow |
| PG Representative | Female |  | PhD Student |
| UG Representative | Female | UG student |  |
| Other members of staff and students have also integrated and played a significant <br> role in the SAT since 2017, notably: Alasia Nuti (SL, gender specialist and former <br> EDIC Chair); Joe Turner (SL, race and postcolonial feminist theories specialist); <br> Gyda Sindre (SL, member of the writing team); Jesse Machin (PhD student, <br> member of the writing team); Sue Leatt (Politics student services manager). |  |  |  |

While the full SAT coordinated and oversaw cross-group working, we relied on subgroups of the SAT for performance of specific tasks, recruiting members according to area of expertise and responsibility. The application was led by an AS writing team, with continuous input from the SAT to activities ranging from analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data, through the identification of key priorities, to the development of the future AS action plan.

The SAT met twice every term since the last award. To secure access to EDI policy and share good EDI practice across the department, meetings are included in the departmental calendar; minutes are made available through, and an electronic version of the action plan is updated regularly on, our Google shared drive; Athena Swan documents and EDI resources are located in the Google Drive too for anyone wanting to use them. EDIC events and initiatives are communicated to staff and students through email and the department's social media, and the EDIC Chair presents regularly at the department's Away Day.

In our self-assessment process, we drew on a variety of data: from quantitative HR data provided by the Faculty and collected within the department, through staff surveys, to staff exit interviews and student focus groups. During the Covid pandemic, our staff - many of whom with families abroad - faced mounting workload and wellbeing challenges. In response to this, we took the decision to suspend the application of staff surveys and opted instead for supporting staff through one-to-one welfare discussions and a peer support approach (ID 29). This explains why our staff surveys have all been applied in the latter part of the assessment period.
Additionally, as the lockdown lifted, and PDR meetings were resumed, we used these to systematise information about Covid-related impacts on staff. In response to our findings, we have created a funding mechanism for research recovery, which is being rolled over to our future action plan (FAP 2.1.2).

Under the transformed AS Charter, a new Culture Survey was introduced, with the original indication of a set of core mandatory questions. These included questions on actions implemented by the department to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of Covid-19 (Questions 2.5 and 2.6 in our CS survey; see Section 2, under "Covid-19",
and FAP 2.1-2.3). The adoption of the new Culture Survey lays the foundation for longitudinal analysis, but it presented some challenges for the comparison of survey results between the last submission and the current submission. Despite the costs for comparison, we are confident the new survey, which we plan to expand to include more specific questions on problem-areas (such as training and career development; Priority 5 in our FAP), will serve as a far better basis for future comparison and analysis. The next staff survey is scheduled for 2024, and we will be applying it on a biennial bias.

In the next five years, we plan to keep our SAT embedded in EDIC, as this has proved to enable better coordination of the policy-making process and implementation of the AS action plan. However, we will also be future-proofing, to embed best practices and increase capacity to support progress with the AS agenda. Namely, we will be earmarking a budget for AS activities (FAP 1.2.3) and establishing stable AS working groups responsible for different portfolios, as this proved to be the most efficient way to accelerate progress on different aspects of the AP (FAP 1.1; see also FAP 1.2). We will also be creating an AS action log to provide an audit trail of actions performed, and sending each key departmental officer involved in the FAP's implementation a summary of the specific activities under their responsibility, for tighter ownership and accountability. The EDIC Chair will ensure that the action log is updated and maintained over time by the responsible officers. The structure, processes, and activity of the SAT will be monitored annually to ensure the quality and effectiveness of its work. Progress with the FAP will be shared in an annual report to the department's community.

## Section 2: An evaluation of the department's progress and issues

In Section 2, applicants should evidence how they meet Criteria B and D:

- Progress against the applicant's previously identified priorities has been demonstrated
- Evidence-based recognition has been demonstrated of the key issues facing the applicant

Recommended word count: 3000 words

## 1. Evaluating progress against the previous action plan

Please provide a critical evaluation of your most recent action plan and any other actions you have initiated since your award.

We have made the following progress with our 2017 Action Plan (AP):

Figure 10. 2017 Action Plan Progress

- Completed

Ongoing

- Not Actioned


Our 2017 AP was highly ambitious and has enabled us to successfully carry out practical actions to deal with identified priorities. We have learnt some lessons from its implementation: a clearer prioritisation of areas of intervention, avoidance of repetition and overlaps, and tighter assignment of responsibilities would have helped implementation; some success measures were vague, making achievement difficult to demonstrate, others were unrealistic and impossible to complete; the absence of ring-fenced financial resources made the action plan more difficult to execute. Our FAP has been designed to avoid similar problems.

The three red action points in our 2017 AP refer to actions that were never undertaken, namely, earmarking a budget for EDI activities (ID1) and monitoring research grant applications and success rate by gender (ID 22); or actions that were started but discontinued, namely monitoring PhD students' progression by gender (ID4). Moving forward, we will be ring fencing a budget for AS activities (FAP 1.2.4). Lack of human capacity and PSS staff turnover were the main reasons behind gaps
in monitoring. Given the increase in our PSS, we now have the operational capacity for its successful implementation (FAP 5.3.4 and FAP 3.6.9).

We set ourselves six core priorities in our 2017 AS application:

1. To increase the number of female professors in the department
2. To continue to attract women to the department and to support their promotion
3. To increase the number of women in senior administrative posts
4. To achieve gender balance among the chairs of all departmental committees
5. To improve departmental support for women returning from maternity leave
6. To improve female PhD recruitment

We have made substantial progress across all these priorities:

1. The percentage of female professors in the department rose from $33 \%$ (2016) to $43 \%$ (May 2023) and will be $47 \%$ in July
2. $43 \%$ of the new Lecturers we hired since 2017 were women, and the percentage of female Senior Lecturers (SL) rose from 38\% (2016) to 47\% (2023)
3. Since our last submission, our Head of Department (HoD) has been a woman, and the Department Management Team comprises a majority of women ( $56 \%$; 5 out of a total of 9 members), all undertaking senior administrative posts in the department
4. Through the assessment period, the department has kept gender balance or near gender balance amongst the chairs of all departmental committees
5. The department has enhanced the University's maternity leave policy offering flexible support options to women upon their return. Feedback from returning staff has been overwhelmingly positive (Appendix 2, Table DT.18)
6. We have improved the gender balance of PhD intake cohort from $29 \%$ female in $2018 / 19$, to $44 \%$ female in 2022/2023 (with a maximum of $49 \%$ in both 20/21 and 21/22; See Appendix 2, Figure DT.6)

Progress in two other areas merits highlighting:
7. We have reduced the number of women on fixed-term employment contracts (Appendix 2, Figure DT.3) by moving them to open contracts whenever possible (4 women between 2018 and 2023)
8. We have improved the gender balance of our student population at all levels (UG, PGT and PGR; see Appendix 2, Figures DT. 6 and DT.9) and have improved female students' attainment at all levels too, with an emphasis on the \% of women earning a First Class Honours Degree, receiving a Merit grade, and successfully completing their PhD (Appendix 2, Figures DT.7, DT.8, DT. 10 and DT.10a), with women becoming our highest attainers.

In what follows we discuss and give evidence of how goals were achieved.
To recruit, retain and promote female academic staff at all levels was a top priority of our AP (ID 8)

## External Recruitment

The department has seen considerable growth since the previous AS application with a majority of new permanent posts at Lecturer level and at Professor level (Grades 7 and 9, respectively). We have implemented all the action points aimed at increasing the number of women hired: notably, unconscious bias training of panel members; explicit invitation of female applicants in recruitment materials; gender balanced interview panels; gender balance in shortlistings, whenever possible.

Impact: We have externally recruited 21 new Lecturers since 2018, 43\% of which have been women (9). We have also successfully recruited three women at Chair level, one of whom is BME. Our reputation as an open and collegial department, which champions gender equality and supports collaboration over competition (in the 2022 Culture Survey, 87\% of staff found the department a good place to work) has been a major contributor to these successes, as well as our targeted invitations of qualified female applicants to apply to the posts. A major impact of work on recruitment is that we are now well above the RG benchmark at Professor level ( $30.3 \%$ in 2021), with $43 \%$ female professors, increasing to $47 \%$ in July (7/15).

## Promotion of Academic Staff

The department has overhauled its performance review, mentoring, CV and draft promotion application review processes to incentivise women to plan and apply for promotion (ID 14). Additionally, we nurtured a leadership pipeline for women in their mid-career, namely through a strategic distribution of administrative roles, and provided strong support for women ECRs, especially after maternity leave, to enable research acceleration and grant capture. These combined efforts had a positive effect on the gender balance of our REF 2021 submission, with women: a) representing $49 \%$ of the submitted outputs, a percentage that is higher than the percentage of women in ART staff (40\%), and b) leading on 2 out of the 4 submitted impact cases as well as comprising half of the team responsible for a third one.


#### Abstract

Impact: Growth in female academic staff applying for and becoming successful at promotion to senior roles (Appendix 2, Figure DT.4a). Since 2017/18, a greater \% of women were promoted to SL than men ( $53 \%$ F against $47 \%$ M; 10 women against 9 men) and to Professor ( $60 \%$ F against $40 \%$ M; 3 women against 2 men). A major impact of our development of women for promotion is that they now constitute 47\% of our SLs (from 38\% in 2016) and our Professoriate is very nearly gender balanced (47\%, from $33 \%$ in 2016).


Despite our success at promoting women to more senior roles, we need to continue to make sure that women are adequately mentored and supported throughout their career and do not hit the ceiling in middle grade positions. The continuing monitoring of gender differences in time between promotions is essential for this (FAP 5.4.3), since women are still taking more time to be promoted to SL than men ( 5.3 years on average for women against 4 years for men), though they have been more quickly promoted from SL to Professor (5.3 years on average, which is significantly lower than an average of 10 years for the two men who were promoted in the assessed period). Equally important are a series of measures continued or initiated in our FAP,
namely: PDRs helping plan for promotion (FAP 5.3.4-5.3.5); targeted research and impact support (FAP 5.2.6-5.2.10); work distribution ensuring that women are not overburdened with non-promotable roles or tasks (FAP 6.1.3); adequate recognition of traditionally women's activities, such as teaching and administration (FAP 6.1.2); and mentoring oriented towards developing in female staff the skills and confidence to apply for senior positions (FAP 5.4.4).

## Demographics and Retention

Between 2018 and 2022, we recruited 21 new Lecturers at Grade 7 (all permanent positions), with $43 \%$ of the new recruits (9) being women (Appendix 2, Figure DT.4). In the meantime, however, 11 women were promoted to SL and 6 women (against 3 men) at Grade 7 left the department. This resulted in an imbalance, and we now have only $29 \%$ women at Lecturer level.

Imbalances at entry level are commonly explained by gender differences in hiring or retention. Since there was no evidence of gender differences in hiring, we looked into retention by carrying out exit interviews (which we are embedding as practice, FAP 5.6). Of the women interviewed (namely, those on ART contracts, 4/6, as those on T\&S contracts presented the opportunity to move to an ART contract elsewhere as the main reason to leave), all stated that there were no gendered reasons behind their decision to leave.

We need to re-establish gender-balance at Lecturer level through future recruitments on ART open-ended contracts (women now represent $40 \%$ of ART staff, down from $42 \%$ in 2016, and $38 \%$ of open-ended contracts, down from $40 \%$ in 2016; Appendix 3 , Figures 4 and 6 ). This implies proactive measures to ensure less skewed application pools in traditionally male areas (FAP 4.2.1) and the continuance of gender-balanced shortlists (FAP 4.2.2). We also need to continue to ensure that female staff turnover does not reflect insufficient support for female ECRs and their career development (FAP 5.2.11-5.2.12).

## Maternity Leave (ID 23-28)

Maternity leave is key to the attraction, retention and development of female talent within the department. The previous action plan identified several issues, including staff's mixed experiences of the maternity leave process and lack of awareness of
how the department implemented university policy (ID 25). In 2018 we created a staff maternity, paternity and parental leave handbook explaining our policy.


To cater to specific needs and mitigate against potential negative impacts of maternity leave on career development and progression, we now offer returning women on ART contracts three options, namely: (1) one term automatic research leave; (2) two terms with reduced teaching load; or (3) research assistance for one term. Staff on T\&S contracts have a $20 \%$ workload reduction following maternity leave.

Impact: Our 2022 survey of mothers returning from maternity leave shows the positive impact of the policy, with half rating it as "good" and the other half as "extremely good". In response to the survey we have created a suitable private space to express milk and a buddy system for mothers going on or returning from maternity leave.

Being able to have a more flexible work/life balance because of reduced teaching load in the terms after coming back to work has enabled me to return to teaching with confidence and quality, well-prepared for teaching my students. It has also enabled me to reconnect with the department in a meaningful way, rather than just being harried and stressed all the time, and to get back into research.

Female Academic
Comment on Maternity Leave Survey 2022

## Reducing Precarity

Since our last AS submission, we have been working to reduce our reliance on fixedterm contracts. While some fixed-term contracts are necessary to cover buy-outs and parental leaves, we want to ensure that they lead towards career development.
contracts, with three of these women having now been promoted to Lecturer (Grade 7). We have also supported 6 other members of staff in moving on to permanent ART contracts elsewhere (3 of whom were women) and securing postdoc positions at York (5, 1 of whom was a woman).

## Career Development of Professional Support Staff (PSS)

Our PSS has almost doubled in size since 2017 (from 13 to 24). PSS is integral to the success of the department and we value them highly. However, there is a lack of career path for PSS at the University. Besides changing jobs altogether, career progression is only through role reviews and secondment opportunities. Despite this, we have actively supported our PSS in taking-up training opportunities and have successfully placed two requests for role review.

Impact: Two senior leadership roles were created in the department for our longestserving PSS, with 3 PSS in total getting to a higher grade, two of whom were women.

We will continue to support the career development of PSS into the future as well as seek a more balanced gender composition (currently PSS is $87.5 \%$ female; FAP 4.4.1-4.4.4 and 5.2.12).

## Covid-19

Throughout the pandemic the department allowed great flexibility in working arrangements to carers and reduced work and marking loads where necessary. Still lockdown brought much research to a halt (notably, planned field work) and the increase in the demands on teaching time radically reduced the time available for research. This is especially true for women, given the increase of the burden of unpaid care, and for staff with child-caring responsibilities:

Creative and concrete support needs to be put in place urgently to offer practical ways to make up for lost research time during the pandemic years. For instance, increased opportunities for research time, reduced teaching and marking loads. Without that, the effects will be felt for the next 3-5 years in terms of slower research output and no way to catch up on the lost research time.

Staff's open comment in our 2022 CS on Covid-19 impacts on carers
To mitigate against Covid-19 negative impact on research activity, in 2021 the department has created a specific research fund providing research assistantships and other forms of support to those disproportionately affected and at greater risk of seeing their career progression hindered.

Impact: 67\% of those accessing the fund have been women whose fieldwork was stopped due to Covid restrictions, and the feedback of those who were awarded the research fund - women and men with young children, who had to be schooled at home - is unequivocal as to the importance of the fund for resuming and accelerating their research.

The Politics Department's Covid-mitigation fund made a huge difference to my ability to mitigate against the negative impacts of COVID. In my own case, my research had been impacted by two separate COVID-related factors. The first were general lockdowns, which prevented me from accessing archives and field sites. The second, and by far more important, were the challenges and delays that came with caring for a partner and young infant with COVID. In the case of the former, the symptoms continued for a 6 week period, meaning previously planned research trips and interviews were cancelled. Without the COVID mitigation fund, I'm afraid these would have never been rescheduled, as they required support in the form of time and funding. In sum, the fund was extremely important to mitigating against the negative impacts of COVID on myself as a researcher with caring responsibilities.

Male member of staff who was awarded the fund in 2022
The DRC funds to mitigate the impact of Covid were of invaluable support to help carry forward plans for fieldwork that were disrupted during the Covid 19 pandemic. The funds were generous. Using them I was able to get more interviews done which will help me finalise both grant applications and academic articles in the future.

Female member of staff who was awarded the fund in 2021
We have also worked to avoid the need to offer extensions of the probationary period, likely to have a negative impact on staff's, and women's in particular, longterm earning potential. Moving forward, and in order to provide early support, we will be monitoring the effects of lockdown on publication rates and grant capture (FAP 2.1.1). We will also be implementing a combination of wellbeing and work-life balance measures: namely, reducing workloads (FAP 6.1.5-6.1.6); developing a departmental flexible working policy to secure fairness and consistency (FAP 2.3.2); and supporting the mental and social wellbeing of staff, whose decrease over the course of the pandemic has been captured by our CS (FAP 2.2).

We need to readily acknowledge that we are living through immensely tumultuous times, and that the past two years- and continuing- pandemic has been, in short, traumatic.

Staff's open comment in our 2022 CS on the mental health impact of Covid-19

## Student Recruitment and Attainment (ID 2-4)

The gender imbalance of our postgraduate community was identified as a priority in our 2017 AP. We have investigated causes, and did not find evidence of bias at the point of admission. Despite this, we have increased monitoring and taken measures to further buttress our recruitment process against biases.

Impact: Female PGR students represented 31\% of our PhD students in 2018 and rose to $43 \%$ of our overall PhD cohort in 2023, with a $49 \%$ female intake in 2020 and
2021. Female PGT students increased from 40\% in 2018 to $45 \%$ in 2023, with gender balanced intakes in 2020 and 2021 (51\% and 50\%, respectively). However, given the reduction in our intake of female PGTs and PGRs in 2022/23, and the lower number of female PhD applicants, in particular, our FAP includes actions to attract talented female applicants at both levels (FAP 3.5.5-3.5.6).

While our previous action plan did not focus on PGRs funding, it is integral to our capacity to attract talented female applicants. We actively encourage prospective PhD supervisors to mentor strong female applicants in developing PhD proposals capable of attracting competitive funding. The PGR Director monitors recruitment processes to minimise selection biases and reports on this to the EDIC. We fund departmental PhD studentships; match-fund as required by ESRC WRDTP studentships, the AHRC investment, White Rose College for Arts and Humanities (WRoCAH); and have studentships within our cross-departmental centres. To encourage female applicants, our doctoral degrees and funding are available on a part-time basis, and we have included an action point on rights to parental leave and flexible working in our FAP (3.5.7).

Impact: Improvements to our processes have resulted in 50\% of our competitive awards being secured by women.

In line with our strategy of diversification, we are now also able to apply to the ringfenced awards for Black British students from the WRDTP, in partnership with the Stuart Hall Foundation. We have been successful with one application, but want to build a pipeline of talented applicants, especially female Black applicants (FAP 3.6.6).

A combination of recruitment of higher quality PGT and PGR female students, integrating a more visible gender dimension in our taught programmes, and a more effective, often same-gender, supervisory relationship with our female PhD students has resulted in a considerable improvement over the past 5 years in terms of attainment.

Impact: A steady increase in the \% of PGT female students achieving a Distinction or Merit Grade from 2017/18 to 2021/22 (Distinction: from 10\% to 34\%; Merit: from $46 \%$ to $52 \%$ ) and a better completion rate for female PGRs than their male peers (Appendix 2, Figures DT. 10 and DT.10a).

At UG level, we are gender balanced in our four programmes (Politics, Politics and IR, IR, and Global Development), and closer to gender balance overall ( $45 \%$, up from 44\% in 2017/18; Appendix 2, Tables DT. 16 and DT.15). These gains followed the implementation of our AP on recruitment (ID 2).

As those action points were underway, we created and implemented new action points: namely, expanded our offer of modules on gender and reviewed gendered issues in assessments.

Impact: A positive improvement in attainment levels, with women being now our highest achieving graduates. In 2017/18, 14\% of our female UG students graduated with a First Class Honours or First Class with Distinction degree (the aggregate
being the same for their male counterparts); in 2020-21 25\% of our female UG students achieved a First-Class Honours or First-Class Distinction degree (against $7 \%$ of our male UG students), with the average within the assessed period being of 21.5\% (UG female) against 10\% (UG male). The percentage of female UG students obtaining a Lower Second-Class Honours degree has also been reduced steadily, from 15\% in 2017/18 to 5\% in 2020/21 (Appendix 2, Figure DT.7).

## 2. Key Priorities for Future Action

Please describe the department's key issues relating to gender equality, and explain the key priorities for action.

For the past six years, our priorities have been about attracting women to the department and seeing them through to promotion, implementing enhanced policies and initiatives, and initiating significant cultural and organisational change. Our challenge is now to embed these changes while at the same time using the evidence we have collected to identify new initiatives to enable staff and students to thrive. The priorities in our Future Action Plan are the following:

## Priority 1: Promote broad engagement and deeper embedding of Athena Swan principles in all departmental activities

We are future-proofing the operations of EDIC and improving its institutional capacity to make progress with EDI and start pressing ahead with the broadened equality agenda laid out by the new AS Charter. All the department's key officers sit on our EDIC. We are giving them greater involvement in the core activities of the EDIC as they are pivotal agents in securing uptake and dissemination of best practice across the department. We are also creating different subgroups within EDIC, focussing on different areas of responsibility. From experience gathered in the implementation of our previous AP, specialisation and definition of tasks maximises involvement, responsibility, and evidence-based advancement of EDI policy.

## Priority 2: Address the impact of Covid-19

The implications of the pandemic on wellbeing, performance and the way we work are long term and it is important to both monitor and address them. We will be reviewing Covid-19's gendered impact on grant application and publication rates so that we can support worst-affected staff. In response to staff's concerns about mental health, we will be introducing a Mental Health Champion role and replacing the Department Wellbeing Officer with a Welfare Committee, which reports to EDIC and is responsible for providing direction and oversight in three main areas: mental health wellbeing, physical health wellbeing and social wellbeing. Flexibility is a key dimension of workplace wellbeing. We will be raising awareness of flexible working options available to staff. We will also be monitoring flexible working requests at an organisational level, to ensure greater consistency and fairness in access to flexible working.

## Priority 3: Embed AS principles in all aspects of student experience

Over the next 5 years our goal is to design and launch a Student EDI Strategy, aimed at improving student - especially female student's - experience from an EDI perspective. Our FAP includes action points to improve students' awareness of Athena Swan and our evidence-based knowledge of student EDI experience, so that we can introduce new and reflect upon existing actions to improve student wellbeing and gender equity. We will also seek to increase recruitment of female students from underrepresented groups.

## Priority 4: Address current imbalances in the composition of staff

The 2022 CS has shown that staff's support for positive action as required to promote equality across different protected characteristics is very high (95.6\%, CS Q5.8), while it evidenced some concerns with the fairness of appointment decisions (CS Q5.7). We will continue to work on the latter, while seeking to address the underrepresentation of women at Lecturer level (29\%), on ART contracts (40\%), and open-ended contracts (38\%); and their overrepresentation amongst PSS (87.5\%). We will also seek to recruit and promote more female BME academic staff.

## Priority 5: Provide more targeted support to career development and progression of staff, especially female staff

Despite our success at promoting women to SL and Professor level, the 2022 CS helped us identify the need to still better support career development and progression of staff in a department that has seen rapid change and growth. To devise actions targeting staff's needs, we are holding focus groups with staff on different contracts and at different stages of their career. We will also be reinforcing skills training and development in-house and reviewing our PDR and mentoring processes for more effectively assisting staff - especially female staff - in working towards their objectives.

## Priority 6: Address concerns with workload levels

Unsustainable high workloads was an issue identified in our 2017 AP, and it continues to require attention in our FAP. We will be working towards a new hoursbased workload model, providing greater detail on the range of tasks performed by staff and greater acknowledgement of traditional women's activities, such as teaching and administration. As we pilot the model, we will be monitoring the impacts of semesterisation and modularisation (starting from 2023/24) on workloads and collecting (through PDRs) staff's perceptions of persistent gender inequalities and pressure points. Workload allocation will also seek to eliminate gender differences in the distribution of promotable and non-promotable tasks and to remove unnecessary or non-added value tasks.

## Priority 7: Enhance staff's feelings of inclusion and belonging

Our 2022 CS staff's sense of belonging and inclusion was high. However, it also showed that we can do more in valuing people's distinctive contributions. Growth can
bring dissolution or even fracturing of a community. For ours to continue to thrive, we need to nurture staff's involvement, engagement and ownership of the change process, and there is no better way of doing this than recognising their unique roles in it.

## Section 3: Future action plan

In Section 3, applicants should evidence how they meet Criterion C:

- An action plan is in place to address identified key issues


## 1. Action plan

Please provide an action plan covering the five-year award period.

Priority 1: Promote broad engagement and deeper embedding of Athena Swan principles in all departmental activities

| Area to be addressed | Rationale | Action(s) | Responsibility | Timescale | Success Measure |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



- Achieve gender parity for UG, PGT and PGR students
- Increase staff's satisfaction with support for career development, performance review and mentoring to at least $=>75 \%$, and awareness of flexible working opportunities to $100 \%$ as determined by staff CS
- Increase uptake of E\&D and UB training to 75\%
- Achieve gender parity in grant applications and increase the number of women applying as Pls and for larger grants

|  |  | - Outreach activities <br> - Report on departmental seminar speakers <br> - Issues raised by other committees, given that EDI is a standing item in the agendas of the department's main committees <br> Reports will be scheduled so as to minimise burden on staff | Admissions Tutor <br> Seminars Organiser <br> EDIC Chair |  | from 2024 <br> benchmark <br> Improve gender <br> balance in Politics <br> and Global <br> Development <br> degrees <br> - Ensure gender balance and diversity of departmental seminar speakers <br> Issues feed into EDIC planning and strategy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | standing item in all major departmental Committees where | HoD, Committee Chairs | continued from ID1 | Main committees <br> annually <br> assess progress with AS action plan in their |


|  |  | EDIC is represented by <br> EDI Chair |  | area of activity to <br> ensure timescales and <br> milestones are met and <br> provide feedback to <br> EDI on how action <br> plans might be <br> updated |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  |  | 1.2.2. Continue to ensure adequate workloading for EDI Chair | HoD with DHoD | 2024-2029, continued from update to our 2017 AP | EDI Chair workloaded comparable to other Committee Chairs in the Department |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.2.3. Create a separate EDIC budget | HoD | From 2024 and after that annually until 2029, continued from ID1 (action not undertaken) | DI has its own ringfenced budget from beginning of academic year |
| 1.3: Enhance provision of EDI and UB training | EDI training and UB training are already offered online on an annual basis. But EDI training uptake (the only for which we have data) has been low for academic staff (never > $36 \%$ in one year) and very uneven over the years. <br> To enhance provision, online training monitoring must be combined with structured, reflexive, and interactive workshops, focussing, amongst other aspects, on inter-personal | 1.3.1. Closely monitor EDI and UB training uptake and send reminders to staff to complete their training on a regular basis | Chair of EDI, DHFO, training working group | 2023-2029 | EDI and UB training uptake increases to $75 \%$, with $100 \%$ of members of EDIC having been trained, as assessed via new monitoring system |
|  |  | 1.3.2. EDIC's staff training working group organises bespoke inhouse E\&D and UB workshops funded by EDIC budget | EDIC Chair, EDIC training working group | At least two training sessions between 2024-2029 | Levels of satisfaction with EDI training = > 70\% <br> Training events attended by at least 30 people and satisfaction monitored to improve events through attendee feedback <br> Include specific question on EDI |


|  | relations in the peerreview and mentoring processes, as well as in the classroom and supervision |  |  |  | training in CS to monitor \% improvement in satisfaction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.4: Broaden EDI agenda by placing more emphasis on intersectionality | Concerns with complex and compound inequalities resulting from the intersection of gender with other inequalities are central to the transformed Athena Swan Charter. EDIC must drive a more intersectional approach to its equality and diversity work | 1.4.1. EDIC regularly monitors staff and student data split by gender and ethnicity and gender and disability (including mental health) | DHFO, Admissions Tutor, Disability Officer, EDIC Chair | Start from availability of reliable quantitative data from Strategic Insights and Analysis Team, and annually afterwards | Data monitored annually. Identify any trends in the data and revise AP accordingly |
|  |  | 1.4.2. EDIC deepens understanding of how intersectional issues affect staff's experience and career development by working closely with peer reviewers and mentors | Performance reviewers group and mentors group report to EDIC | Starting 2025 until 2029 | Identify at least two measures to address how intersectionality may affect career development |
|  |  | 1.4.3. EDIC deepens understanding of how intersectional issues affect students by leading on discussions with female Student Ambassadors who selfidentify as belonging to | EDIC Chair with EDI Champions | From 2025 | Report on impact of intersectional inequalities on female student experience and attainment presented at BoS in 2026. Conclusions and |


|  |  | under-represented groups and are involved in codesigning equality initiatives |  |  | student input inform two action points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.4.4. Revise Athena <br> Swan webpages to draw more attention to intersectionality | EDIC Chair with Web coordinator | From 2025 | Two case studies on web by 2027 |
| 1.5: Broaden EDI agenda by placing more emphasis on staff gender equality issues beyond the sexbased gender binary | The gender categories used in this report are binary (male and female). We recognise that this does not reflect the self-identity and experience of all staff and students in the department, nor does it allow us to analyse gender equality issues beyond the sex-based genderbinary. EDIC needs to align its agenda with the new AS Charter by looking beyond the sex-based gender binary | 1.5.1. Use <br> departmental-based events during LGBT History Month (Feb) to recognise and value diversity of gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics | EDIC Chair, LGBTQ+ Champion | From 2024, and then annually | At least one departmental-based event organised per academic year. Monitor satisfaction with event and ways to improve similar events through attendee feedback |
|  |  | 1.5.2. Take active steps to ensure that trans, non-binary and intersex staff and students feel welcome in the department, notably by providing information about support structures both in the recruitment process and once they | HoD, with EDIC Chair | From 2025, and then annually | Information on trans and non-binary staff support available from induction. <br> Maternity, Paternity, Parental and Adoption Policy and Staff Handbook revised |


|  |  | become part of the department (e.g., maternity, paternity and adoption leave explicitly recognises and supports the many different ways in which people may become parents; support for students transitioning gender, including leave of absence for gender reassignment) |  |  | Student induction includes discussion of student-focussed EDI policy seeking to advance gender equality issues beyond the sex-based gender binary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.5.3. Provide specific gender identity \& expression training (see 1.3) | EDIC Chair | 2025 | Monitor satisfaction with event and ways to improve similar events through attendee feedback |
| Priority 2: Address the | act of Covid-19 |  |  |  |  |
| Area to be addressed | Rationale | Action(s) | Responsibility | Timescale | Success Measure |
| 2.1. We need to provide support for those especially affected by Covid-19 and its long-term effects | In our 2022 Culture Survey, the percentage of staff positively assessing the department's measures mitigating | 2.1.1. Review long term Covid impact on publication rates and research grant applications by gender and (where possible) | DRC Chair, Research Facilitator | From 2024 until 2029 | Data collected and reviewed. Interventions identified and actioned |


|  | against Covid-related gendered impacts and impacts on carers was $60 \%$ and $53.3 \%$, respectively. Female academic staff showed lower levels of satisfaction with the measures (the questions receiving 3.5 out of 5 on average; with 3.6 M and 3.3F) | caring responsibilities split |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2.1.2. Continue to secure pump-priming funds to mitigate against negative Covidrelated impacts on research productivity of women and carers | HoD, Chair of DRC | Action started in 2021 as update to our 2017 AP and to be continued for as long as Covid impacts are tracked by monitoring system | Fund helps accelerate research of affected women and carers. Continue to monitor the gendered uptake of the fund, its impact on research acceleration, and obtain feedback from recipients to assess its usefulness and whether amendments are required |
| 2.2. Improve support for mental health and wellbeing of staff with particular focus on the gendered impact of the Covid-19 pandemic | The mental wellbeing of staff was negatively impacted by the pandemic. In the 2022 Culture Survey the question on mental health and wellbeing support received amongst the lowest scores (only $57.8 \%$ of positive answers). Scores especially low for academic staff (an average of 3.5 out of 5 , | 2.2.1. Line managers and mentors continue their regular check-ins with staff | Line managers, mentors | Action initiated during the pandemic and to be continued until 2029 | Improvement in Culture Survey results on mental health support from $57.8 \%$ to 70\% positive answers |
|  |  | 2.2.2. Introduce <br> Mental Health <br> Champion role, to highlight issues relevant to their area of responsibility | HoD | From 2024 | Mental health communication campaign in place and staff engagement levels monitored |
|  |  | 2.2.3. Replace <br> Department Wellbeing | Wellbeing Committee (reports to EDIC) | From 2024, and then annually | An established, annual wellbeing review |


|  | and for women than men: 3.4 F vs 3.5 M ) | Officer with Welfare Committee, to conduct a wellbeing needs assessment and support staff's mental, physical and social wellbeing in an integrated manner |  |  | process with results informing interventions and actions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2.2.4. Promote awareness and informal, supportive discussion of mental health issues commonly experienced by academics, such as anxiety, impostor syndrome, psychological distress, depression, and burnout | Mental Health <br> Champion with Wellbeing Committee |  | Number and diversity of staff participating in mental health discussions, feedback on improved awareness of mental health issues affecting academics and reduction of stigma |
|  |  | 2.2.5. Create a wellbeing route map, i.e., a visual representation of sources of help available to academic staff within the department and the University (including | Mental Health <br> Champion with Wellbeing Committee | 2026, then reviewed annually | Feedback on route map helping staff find support for their mental health and wellbeing needs and increase usage of mental health and wellbeing resources |


|  |  | occupational health services, peer support, counselling and support for carers) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2.2.6. Create a multifunctional quiet room for staff wanting to take time out, religious practice, and returning mothers needing to express breastmilk in a private setting | Wellbeing Committee | 2024 | Room created and regularly used by staff and PhD students, with feedback collected on its impact on wellbeing |
| 2.3. Implement the departmental flexible working policy and ensure a consistent and fair approach | Covid-19 has expanded flexible working practices. Our 2022 Culture Survey showed that $75.5 \%$ of staff is satisfied with the department's flexible working practices. However, female academic staff are less satisfied than male counterparts (3.9 vs 4.1). We need to better implement the flexible working policy, | 2.3.1. Raise awareness of flexible working policy and range of options available to staff | HoD | Starting 2024 to 2029 | $100 \%$ awareness of opportunities for flexible working as measured by survey |
|  |  | 2.3.2. Monitor impact of flexible working and home working arrangements on individuals, teams, and community through flexible working survey | HoD with EDIC surveys subgroup | From 2024, and then biennially | Examples of flexible working offered in staff handbook and taken up <br> Formal record and monitoring of uptake of flexible working |


|  | ensuring our approach is consistent and fair |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Priority 3: Embed AS principles in all aspects of student experience |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area to be addressed | Rationale | Action(s) | Responsibility | Timescale | Success Measure |
| 3.1: Increase awareness of and engagement in Athena Swan amongst UG, PGT and PGR students | Athena Swan is designed to advance gender equality amongst staff and students. Exploratory evidence, collected from student reps, shows need to raise awareness about AS means and what it means for them | 3.1.1. Introduce annual presentation to UG, PGT and PGR students about Athena Swan and actions being taken to enhance gender equality and diversity in the student body and their impact(s) | EDIC Chair working with Chair of BoS | From 2024, annually afterwards | Talk attended by all student reps, members of the student-led Politics Society and other student groups, and at least 30 students |
|  |  | 3.1.2. Produce article about Athena Swan in student magazine Vox and in liaison with Politics Society Press \& Publicity Officer | EDIC Chair | Each year from 2024 in autumn edition | Article published |
|  |  | 3.1.3. Regularly hold EDI get-togethers, involving both staff and students | EDIC Chair and events subgroup | First get-togethers in 2024, and then held every six months until 2029 | At least two gettogether a year, attended by at least 10 people |
|  |  | 3.1.4. Organise at departmental level | EDI Champions organise and host | From 2024, and then annually | A departmental event organised for at least |


|  |  | public celebration events for Black History Month, LGBTQ+ History Month, World Women's Day, International Day of Persons with Disabilities, Mental Health Awareness Month, raising awareness about the intersection of gender with other disadvantaged statuses | events, with EDIC events subgroup |  | one of these celebration per year, on rotating basis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3.1.5. Involve staff and student representatives in the selection of topics for discussion in these events and speakers | EDI Champions organise and host events, with support of EDIC events subgroup | From 2024, and the annually | Staff and students select topics for discussion and speakers for events. Diverse representation of speakers recorded |
|  |  | 3.1.6. EDIC budget to provide funds for the organisation of these events | HoD, Chair of EDIC | From 2024, and then annually | EDIC funding provided for one event per year |
| 3.2: Gather data about student EDI experience in the department | We know little about students' lived experience of EDI in the department, therefore lacking the | 3.2.1. Organise focus groups with UG, PGT and PGR students to discuss their EDI experience and specific | Chair of EDIC, working with EDIC data subgroup, Admissions officer, PGTC and PGRC Chairs, and students | 2025-2026 | Each focus group with at least 10 participants, data examined, and student feedback used |


|  | knowledge necessary to develop new actions and adapt EDI policy to their needs | needs, with especial attention to variation across gender. Secure diversity of student representatives to provide voice to women and underrepresented groups |  |  | as basis for at least 1 new policy from 2027 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3.2.2. Conduct annual student experience review drawing together monitoring activities (data review, External Examiner Reports, student surveys, like NSS, and focus groups qualitative data) and accounting for variation across gender | BoS with Teaching Committee | From September 2026, with annual "health check" afterwards | At last one action per year in response to problem-areas |
|  |  | 3.2.3. Develop Student EDI Strategy, to improve EDI culture from student perspective | EDIC Chair with BoS Chair, Chair of Teaching Committee and PGT and PGR Directors | From Autumn 2026 | Student EDI Strategy in place by 2027 |
| 3.3: Ensure gender equity in student experience | Reviewing our curriculum, assessment and marking practices for potential gender | 3.3.1. Monitor awarding gaps by gender | BoS, Chair of Teaching Committee, Chair of Board of Examiners, PGT Director | From 2024 until 2029 | No gender differences in degree outcomes |


|  | biases has improved female students attainment across UG, PGT, and PGR levels. We need to continue monitoring to sustain results | 3.3.2. Monitor student drop-out, withdrawal and non-completion by gender | BoS, Chair of Teaching Committee, PGT and PGR Directors | From 2024 until 2029 | No gender differences in student drop-out, withdrawal and noncompletion |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3.3.3. Monitor gender split in student performance by type of assessment at UG and PGT level | BoS, Chair of Teaching Committee, PGT Directs, Chair of Board of Examiners | From 2024 until 2029 | No gender differences in student performance by type of assessment at UG and PGT level |
|  |  | 3.3.4. Continue monitoring potential gender biases in our marking schemes and practices | Teaching Committee Chair, PGT Director | From 2026, continued from update to our 2017 AP | No gender biases in our marking schemes and practices |
|  |  | 3.3.5. As we move to Modularisation \& Semesterisation, and seek to decolonise and diversify our curriculum, ensure that our efforts take into account the diverse backgrounds and lived experiences of your students, notably female students | Teaching Committee and BoS Chairs | From 2023, and afterwards reviewed annually | Our teaching offer is reframed and reconstructed to make it more inclusive, through gender mainstreaming. Positive impact on learning experience of female students assessed against feedback from UG focus group |


| 3.4: Promote wellbeing and mental health in students | Poor mental health amongst students is an increasing concern, with a higher \% of female students recording a mental health related disability. Academic underperformance, reduced engagement, and increased risk of dropping out of university are amongst poor mental health's likely consequences. Loneliness and isolation due loss of support networks poses serious mental health risks. | 3.4.1 Work with student representatives to organise coursework and assessment in ways that minimise stressors | Teaching Committee working with student representatives and Politics Student Services Manager | New initiatives disseminated to students from 2025 | Feedback from students involved in the initiatives showing that they made a difference to mental health and wellbeing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3.4.2. Introduce first generation and BME peer mentoring scheme, with $2^{\text {nd }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ year students to peer mentor $1^{\text {st }}$ year students | EDIC, with Student Community Officer | From 2026 | Mentoring scheme in place with positive feedback from beneficiaries |
|  |  | 3.4.3. Develop initiatives designed to foster a sense of belonging, such cake and a chat, mentor and buddy programs | Student Community Officer | From 2024-2029, continued from update to our 2017 AP | Weekly cake and chat staff-student gathering at the department |
|  |  | 3.4.4. Work on improving student's mental health literacy by utilising resources (e.g., on stress and anxiety management) produced by the University ED Office | Mental Health Champion | From 2026 | Work with focus group to monitor level of access and usage of mental health and wellbeing resources promoting positive mental health and behaviours |


|  |  | 3.4.5. EDIC funds are allocated to the pursuit of these sub-actions | HoD, EDIC Chair | 2024-2029 | Allocate EDIC funds to the pursuit of these sub-actions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.5: Ensure gender balance in student recruitment at all levels and through our degrees | The student cohort of our three core degrees (Politics, IR, Politics with $I R$ ) is nearly gender balanced (45\%; see Appendix 2, DT.6). However, the Politics degree remains predominantly male (63\%). Although we have increased offers to female applicants, we are historically more likely to convert male students than female students from applications to acceptances, with conversion rate for female students dropping slightly in 2022/2023 | 3.5.1. Ensure gender neutrality in undergraduate materials and events | Admissions Tutor with Web coordinator | From 2024 to 2029, continued from 2017 Action Plan ID2 | UG cohort in our core degrees is gender balanced (50/50) in the next 5 years |
|  |  | 3.5.2. Provide aspirational view of women in Politics in recruitment, outreach and careers advice | Admissions Tutor with Web coordination | From 2024 to 2029, continued from 2017 Action Plan ID2 |  |
|  |  | 3.5.3. Department Open Days for prospective students involve female teaching and research staff in stands and talks | Admissions Tutor | From 2024 to 2029, continued from 2017 Action Plan ID2 |  |
|  | Our joint degrees are far less gender balanced, with all degrees under the | 3.5.4. Provide visible student and staff role models for degrees where there is | Admissions Tutor | From 2024 to 2029 | Gender imbalance in joint degrees is reduced by at least 5\% |


|  | School of PEP (Politics, <br> Economics and <br> Philosophy) being <br> predominantly male, <br> and the degree in <br> Global Development <br> being predominantly <br> female (74\%) (See <br> Appendix 2, Figure <br> DT.5) | considerable gender <br> imbalance, through <br> images, testimonials <br> and case studies in <br> promotion materials <br> and our website, and <br> through choice of <br> student and staff <br> ambassadors in Open <br> and Visit Days |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Although we have <br> made substantial <br> improvements in our <br> recruitment of women <br> at PGT and PGR levels, <br> the risk of <br> underrepresentation <br> still exists given the <br> lower number of <br> applications by women <br> and the slight decline <br> of the \% of women at <br> both levels in 2022/23. | 3.5.5. Provide <br> aspirational view of <br> gender in Politics and <br> International Relations, <br> by building portfolio of <br> images and <br> testimonials showing <br> career trajectories of <br> female PGT and PhD <br> students as well as the <br> career trajectories and <br> research of senior <br> female academic staff | PGT and PGR Directors, <br> working with Web <br> coordinator | 2024-2029, continued <br> from ID2 and ID3 of <br> our 2017 AP |
|  | 3.5.6. Encourage our <br> best female MA <br> students and high- <br> quality external <br> prospective female <br> doctoral candidates by | PGT and PGR Directors, <br> balance (50/50) in PGT <br> and PGR cohorts <br> working with MA <br> dissertation <br> supervisors and staff <br> teaching in our MAs | 2023-2029, continued <br> from ID21 in our 2017 <br> AP | Talent pipeline for PhD <br> students in place and <br> women being awarded <br> $50 \%$ of our competitive <br> scholarships |

\(\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \& \& \& \& <br>
offering mentoring in <br>
developing research <br>
proposals for <br>
competitive <br>
scholarship <br>
applications and raising <br>
awareness about <br>
existing PhD <br>

scholarships\end{array}\right]\)|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |


|  | To tackle intersectionality, we need to improve our numbers of BME and especially Black PhD students, with an emphasis on BME and especially Black female PhD students | 3.5.9. Active <br> recruitment (internally and externally), mentoring in developing research proposals, and ringfenced funding from Stuart Hall Foundation (SHF) in conjunction with White Rose Doctoral Training Partnership | PGR Chair, working with prospective supervisors | From 2024 | At least one Black PhD student applicant per year for SHF scheme |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Priority 4: Address current imbalances in the composition of staff |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area to be addressed | Rationale | Action(s) | Responsibility | Timescale | Success Measure |
| 4.1. Ensuring fairness in decision-making in academic appointments | Athena Swan is designed to advance gender equality amongst staff and students. Exploratory evidence, collected from student reps, shows need to raise awareness about AS means and what it means for them | 4.1.1. Check job specs for unconscious bias and gender-coded language | HoD, EDIC Chair | From 2024 until 2029 | 70\% positive answers to question about fairness of appointment process |
|  |  | 4.1.2. Monitor EDI and unconscious bias training of recruitment panel members | Departmental Manager | From 2024 until 2029 | 100\% uptake on EDI and UB training |
|  |  | 4.1.3. Diversify composition of recruitment panels, along lines of gender, | HoD | From 2024 until 2029 | Enhanced diversity of the composition of recruitment panels |


|  |  | race, ethnicity, grade, <br> etc. |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4.1.4. Define the role <br> carefully and adhere to <br> that guidance <br> throughout the <br> selection process | HoD |  | From 2024 until 2029 | Adherence to guidance <br> throughout selection <br> process |  |
| 4.2. Address current <br> underrepresentation <br> of women at Lecturer <br> level and on ART <br> contracts | Only 29\% of our <br> Lecturers are women, <br> and women represent <br> only 40\% of our ART <br> contracts and 38\% of <br> our open-ended <br> contracts. These <br> imbalances need <br> correction. | 4.2.1. Improve <br> proportion of female <br> applicants to ART <br> open-ended positions <br> in subjects where they <br> are traditionally <br> minority through <br> encouraging pro-active <br> head-hunting by <br> members of staff | HoD asks academic <br> staff to approach <br> promising female <br> applicants in those <br> areas | From 2024, every time <br> Lecturer positions are <br> approved | In 5 years, at least 40\% <br> of Lecturers on ART <br> contracts are women |


|  | action as required to promote equality across different protected characteristics was very high (95.6\%). Currently, 13\% of our academic staff are BME, matching the average in Politics and IR departments (12.9\%, according to Hanretty, 2021 Report of Political Studies Association, 16). Attracting talented BME candidates to our posts has however historically been a challenge, but to tackle intersectionality we need to address the underrepresentation of BME women in our academic staff | - Include commitment to anti-racism in job advertisement <br> - Head-hunt and encourage staff to proactively approach BME academics, especially talented female BME academics, working on advertised fields <br> - As much as possible, include BME panel members, while mindful of risks of overburdening |  |  | academic staff (from current 2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4.3.2. Increase support for career progression for all existing BME staff and especially female BME staff (e.g., through mentoring, PDR, and BME support staff networks) | EDIC, HoD, mentors, performance reviewers | From 2023-2029 | Evidence of BME moving up the career ladder over the next 5 years |


| 4.4. Address the gender imbalance of PSS staff | Women comprise 87.5\% of our PSS staff. Despite the high levels of satisfaction amongst PSS staff shown in the 2022 Culture Survey, the gender imbalance can "naturalise" PSS labour as "women's labour" and entrench gendered power relations. Also, male PSS staff's responses showed far less satisfaction across the board, with an emphasis on representation in departmental committees (3.0 for men against 4.4. for women) and career support ( 3.0 for men against 4.1 for women) | 4.4.1. Seek to attract male applicants to new posts | HoD with DHFO | 2024-2029 | Men comprise > 12.5 \% of PSS staff within 5 years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4.4.2. Confer visibility to current PSS staff's work by regularly celebrating it alongside academic work in the departmental newsletter | HoD with DHFO | 2024-2029 | PSS staff's satisfaction levels remain as high as in 2022 Culture Survey, and gap between male and female satisfaction levels is reduced |
|  |  | 4.4.3. Secure representation of male PSS staff in departmental committees | HoD | 2024-2029 | PSS male staff represented in departmental committees |
|  |  | 4.4.4. Secure career support for male PSS staff | DHFO | 2024-2029 |  |
| Priority 5: Provide support in targeted ways to ensure career development and progression of staff |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area to be addressed | Rationale | Action(s) | Responsibility | Timescale | Success Measure |


| 5.1. Gain better understanding of issues in career development for different groups of staff | In our 2022 Culture Survey, we had only 62.3\% positive answers to the question on departmental support for career development. To be able to offer targeted support we need to know more about the specific challenges faced by different groups of staff | Hold focus groups and collate data from PDRs to gain better understanding of challenges faced by T\&S, ART, Postdocs and PSS staff | DHoD, DRC Chair, Postdoctoral Officer, and DHoD | 2024-2025 | Improved understanding of challenges informs at least 4 new targeted measures implemented between 2026 and 2029 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.2. Ensure support for career development to different groups of staff in known problem-areas | T\&S Staff: <br> The department has $15 \%$ T\&S staff, 12 of which in permanent positions, 7 on fixedterm contracts. In the 2022 Culture Survey, the question about support for career development got a slightly lower score for T\&S staff (3.5 against 3.8 for ART staff). We | 5.2.1. Promote teaching leadership by using the department's scholarship fund to support teachingrelated research that informs the department's teaching \& learning strategy and practice | Teaching Committee Chair, BoS Chair | 2024-2029 | Question on support for career development scores on average $=$ or > than 3.8 for T\&S staff <br> Feedback from T\&S shows scholarship fund to be helpful in promoting their ability to lead current and future best practice in teaching and learning in the department |


|  | need to ensure that we <br> are fully supporting <br> their long-term career <br> development | 5.2.2. Allocate <br> teaching-related <br> administrative roles in <br> ways that allow T\&S <br> staff to build a track- <br> record of leadership <br> and maximise chances <br> of promotion | HoD | 2024-2029 | T\&S staff as successful <br> at promotion as ART <br> staff |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | 5.2.3. Better integrate <br> T\&S staff with our <br> research community | Cluster Convenors | 2024-2029 | T\&S staff attends and <br> participates in Cluster <br> events and initiatives |
|  | 5.2.4. Teaching <br> feedback and teaching <br> awards are especially <br> relevant for T\&S career <br> progression, so we <br> need to work with <br> students to raise their <br> awareness of <br> unconscious bias in <br> teaching assessments <br> and prize nominations | EDIC Chair, Teaching <br> Committee and BoS <br> Chairs, working <br> alongside teaching <br> representatives | 2024-2029, continued <br> from update to our <br> 2017 AP | Reduction of gender <br> differences in teacher <br> feedback and gender <br> balanced nomination <br> lists for teaching prizes |  |
| 5.2.5. Besides career <br> development advice <br> through PDRs, offer CV <br> review session to T\&S <br> staff on fixed-term <br> contracts | DHoD |  |  |  |  |

## ART Staff:

The mean of the response to the 2022
Culture Survey question on career development support was almost the same for female and male ART staff. However, preliminary evidence shows that career development through grant funded work remains less accessed by women

The impact agenda can be especially onerous for women and those

| 5.2.6. Monitor gender <br> split of staff applying <br> for departmental and <br> Faculty pump-priming <br> and amounts <br> requested | Research Facilitator | $2024-2029$ | 5 year of data available <br> by 2029 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5.2.7. Encourage <br> eligible women to <br> apply for departmental <br> and Faculty pump <br> priming | Research Facilitator, <br> DRC Chair, <br> performance reviewers | 2023 -2029 | Increase of \% of <br> women applying for <br> pump priming from <br> 2023/2024 benchmark |
| 5.2.8. Monitor gender <br> breakdown for external <br> research grant <br> applications PI and co-I <br> applications, including <br> amount requested and <br> success rates | Research Facilitator | $2023-2029$, continued <br> from ID22 of 2017 AP <br> (action not <br> undertaken) | 5 years of data <br> available by 2029 |
| 5.2.9. Encourage <br> eligible women to <br> apply for external <br> grants, to apply as Pls <br> and to apply for larger <br> grants | Research Facilitator, <br> Chair of DRC, Centre <br> Directors, Cluster <br> Convenors, <br> performance reviewers | 2023-2029 |  |
| 5.2.10. Support women <br> and those with caring <br> responsibilities in | HoD, Impact Lead | 2023-2029 | Increase of \% of <br> women applying for <br> external grants, <br> applying as PI, and <br> requesting > than 150K <br> from 2023/24 <br> benchmark |


|  | with caring responsibilities | identifying and pursuing REF impact cases (e.g., through DRC funding and workload allowances) |  |  | developing their impact cases as assessed by questionnaire. Reports to DRC showing progress suggest support needs are being met |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ECRs: | 5.2.11. Encourage | DRC Chair | Starting 2025 | ECR Forum organises at |
|  | We need to embed ECRs - and especially postdocs - in departmental life and give them a stronger voice in what might enhance their employability and career development | creation of an ECR Forum, designed to act as supportive network for ECRs, enhancing connectedness as well as career and skills development |  |  | least one career workshop per year, attended by at least 10 ECRs |
|  | PSS Staff | 5.2.12. Encourage PSS | DHFO with HoD | 2023-2029 | New monitoring |
|  | Career progression is limited for PSS staff, which is $87 \%$ female | staff to regularly take up training and career development opportunities |  |  | system in place showing increase in uptake of training from 2023 benchmark |
| 5.3. Use PDRs to discuss actionable steps for career development | In the 2022 Culture Survey, 71\% of staff positively valued feedback received in PDRs. However, the | 5.3.1. Career development and potential future training becomes core part of PDRs | DHoD, performance reviewers | From 2024, annually afterwards | Average level of satisfaction with feedback from PDRs and encouragement to take up career |

average score from academic staff for feedback received was 3.7 out of 5 and decreased to 3.2 for encouragement to take up career development opportunities. Valuable feedback is key to professional development.

Gender bias in performance reviews can reinforce an institution's glass ceiling
5.3.2. Training needs identified as part of PDRs inform priorities in organising at least one bespoke, in-house training initiative per annum
5.3.3. Administrative roles are discussed in PDRs to secure reviewees' input into HoD's decisions
5.3.4. Performance reviewers receive training to ensure consistent high quality feedback, including training on how to identify and face potential gender biases
5.3.5. Performance reviewers are encouraged to preempt a leaky pipeline by preparing female reviewees to apply for promotion

Performance reviewers, Cluster Leaders, DRC and Teaching Committee Chairs

DHoD, with EDI Chair

HoD, with EDI Chair and performance reviewers

HoD, with EDI Chair and performance reviewers

From 2024, annually afterwards

From 2024, annually afterwards

From 2024, biennially afterwards

From 2024, annually afterwards
development rises
from 3.7 and 3.2, respectively, to 4 and at least 3.5.,
respectively

Annual training initiative with at least $40 \%$ of staff attending

Women as satisfied with performance reviews and career development support as men

Evidence of successful promotion of midcareer women

| 5.4. Ensure support and continuing gender equity in promotion | Over the period of assessment, we have proactively addressed the fact that some staff - especially women may not put themselves forward for promotion even if they have a strong CV. This work needs to be continued as the 2022 Culture Survey showed that women more than men find their progress to be affected by gender (3.6 against 3.9) and find themselves less encouraged to apply for promotion (3.9 against 4.1) | 5.4.1. Continue to monitor via short survey whether the options offered in the maternity leave policy to returning staff are adjusted to their needs | EDIC Chair | Survey applied 1.5 years after staff's return | Evidence of continuing high level of satisfaction with support when returning to work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5.4.2. Reinforce <br> linkages between Promotions Committee and performance reviewers so that women who performance reviewers identify as likely to be ready for promotion are actively encouraged also by the Committee to submit CVs for review | HoD, performance reviewers | From 2023, and then annually, partly continued from 2017 AP, ID14 | Evidence of increasing number of eligible women engaging in the CV review process <br> Women feel as encouraged as men to apply for promotion in CS, with responses reaching a mean of $=$ or > to 4.1, and feel their progression to be less affected by gender (with a mean $=$ or > 3.9) |
|  |  | 5.4.3. Monitor gender differences in time between promotions | Promotions Committee | 2023-2029 | No significant gendered differences in time between promotions by 2029 |
|  |  | 5.4.4. Taking advantage of the rise in the number of women | HoD, Chair of EDIC | 2023-2029 | Reinforcement of women-to-women |


|  |  | Professors, reinforce women-to-women mentoring, as a form of providing strategic advice to facilitate the professional and personal development of other women in the department |  |  | mentoring in the department |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.5. Sustain our progress in terms of gender parity at SL and Professorial Level | We now stand very close to gender parity at both SL and Professorial level and want to ensure that these gains are not lost and, where possible, improved to achieve parity | 5.5.1. Monitor percentage of women at SL and Professor levels | HoD, EDIC | From 2024 and after that every year | No retrogress from our current 47\% female SLs and $47 \%$ women professors |
|  |  | 5.5.2. Proactively see women through to promotion (see 5.4.) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 5.5.3. Continue to proactively headhunt women for Professor positions | HoD with HR |  |  |
| 5.6. Analyse the motivation of staff members leaving the department through exit interviews | In the assessment period 6 women (against 3 men) at Grade 7 left the department, with leavers not entering exit interviews with HR | Devise at departmental level an exit survey to be issued to all outgoing staff members to assess whether lack of opportunities for career development | HoD, EDI Chair |  | Use survey to identify reasons for staff leaving as well as gender, grade, number of years in employment and number of years in grade |


|  |  | and/or progression are reasons behind exit |  |  | Use data to devise retention measures, if/where required |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Priority 6: Address concerns about workload levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area to be addressed | Rationale | Action(s) | Responsibility | Timescale | Success Measures |
| 6. Ensure that academic staff's workload is manageable and fairly distributed | In our 2022 Culture Survey, although perception of fairness of workload allocation was high (73.3\%), the question whether workload is manageable received the lowest score of the survey (with only 44.4\% of staff agreeing). The sense of overload was greater amongst academic staff, with ART responses reaching an average of 3.4. out of 5 , and T\&S staff of 3.2. out of 5 . Concern about excessive workload was higher | 6.1.1. Introduce hoursbased workload allocation model, ensuring that workloads match the roles, responsibilities, and time tasks should take | HoD, Deputy HoD, DM, Workloads Committee | 2023-2029, continued from ID31 of 2017 AP | Culture Survey indicates increased satisfaction with level of workload experienced by staff, with an overall percentage of $70 \%$ positive answers by 2029 |
|  |  | 6.1.2. Ensure recognition of traditional women's activities (such as teaching, pastoral care and admin.) in the workload model | Workloads Committee | 2023-2029 | Evidence of workload reduction in the assessed period |
|  |  | 6.1.3. In distribution of workload ensure that female ART staff members are not overburdened with | DHoD | 2023-2029 |  |


|  | amongst female academic staff (3.1 F vs 3.6 M, and especially low - 3.0 - by female ART staff). Workload issues have major impact on work-life balance, wellbeing, and job satisfaction. They are also likely to negatively impact the quality of work and capacity to engage with professional training. | roles and tasks with lower "promotion return" than time used for research <br> 6.1.4. Workload model reviewed annually, also for gender bias <br> 6.1.5. Regular <br> monitoring and elimination of nonadded value administrative and management tasks <br> 6.1.6. Promote a work culture of fewer and more effective meetings <br> 6.1.7. Projected workload individually discussed with each member of staff at the end of the first semester and in PDRs | Workloads Committee <br> HoD, Committee Chairs, Workloads Committee <br> HoD <br> DHoD and performance reviewers | 2023, and then annually afterwards <br> 2023, and then annually afterwards <br> 2023-2029 <br> 2023, and then annually afterwards |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Priority 7: Enhance Staff's feelings of inclusion and belonging |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area to be addressed | Rationale | Action(s) | Responsibility | Timescale | Success Measures |


| 7.1. Recognise and celebrate staff's achievements, making sure that staff's distinct contributions to the department are covered | In our 2022 Culture Survey, only $66.7 \%$ of staff felt their contributions were valued in the department. The average score for academic staff feeling valued by and cared for the department was 3.8 and 3.9, respectively. The department has grown considerably in recent years. In a large department, where many members of staff are new, it is harder to sustain a strong community where people feel cared for and recognised | 7.1.1. Ensure that the department's recently introduced newsletter celebrates the full variety of staff's accomplishments and contributions to the department, including publications, research grand awards, impact, significant contribution to education programme development, significant contribution to student support development, contributions to the profession, EDI, etc. <br> 7.1.2. Changes to workload model to recognise fuller range of staff's contributions (see 6.1.1 and 6.1.2) | DHFO with Chair of EDI | 2023-2029, continued from update to our 2017 AP, two newsletters per semester | In Culture Survey, staff's feelings of being valued and cared for are at least at 4.0 on average by 2029 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.2.: Ensure female academics feel they have an equal power to take part in | In our 2022 Culture Survey, staff felt comfortable in speaking up and expressing opinions. | 7.2.1. Committee Chairs take EDI and UB training | DHFO | 2023-2029, continued from ID8 of 2017 AP | 100\% compliance |
|  |  | 7.2.2. Continue to ensure 50\% of women | HoD | 2023-2029, continued from ID31 of 2017 AP | 50\% women Chair Departmental |


| departmental and <br> committee meetings | However, female <br> academic staff felt less <br> so (3.9 W against 4.1 <br> M) | Chairs of departmental <br> committees and \% of <br> female departmental <br> officers matching \% of <br> women in the <br> department | Committees and officer <br> roles reflecting <br> proportion of women <br> in the department |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7.3. Ensure social <br> connections at work <br> and community- <br> building | 62.2\% of staff <br> considered timing of <br> social events to be <br> compatible with caring <br> responsibilities | 7.3.1. Ensure that all <br> social events continue <br> to be timetabled <br> between 10AM and <br> $4 P M$ | DHFO |  | 2023-2029, continued <br> from ID32 of 2017 AP |
| 4Place between 10AM <br> and 4PM |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Covid-19 and remote <br> working had a negative <br> impact on social and <br> organisational <br> connectedness | 7.3.2. Organise social <br> events to boost staff <br> health, team work, and <br> mental wellbeing | Wellbeing Committee | From 2024 |  |

## Appendix 0: 2017 Action Plan

| ID | Issue identified | Planned actions to address issue | Person responsible (include job title) | Success criteria and outcome | Start | End | Action taken since action plan created in 2017 | RAG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Continue to promote and support our AS and E\&D activities internally and within the University | Develop and maintain an E\&D section on the Politics home page | AS lead and E\&D officer, with web support | Build the section with core documents and information on Departmental and staff activities in the E\&D arena. Introduce quarterly checks and updates | Nov 2017 | 2018, updated annually | Webpage established and regularly updated |  |
|  |  | Set up «Athena Initiative Award» to reward staff for the best Departmental Athena-related activities. <br> Mainstream all AS work within our everyday teaching and administration, by making AS a standing agenda item on all major committees |  |  |  |  | AS Award established and has been awarded in 2018 and 2019 to staff who have made significant difference. Award was put on hold between 2020 and 2022 due to Covid, but has been reinstated for 2022/23 <br> AS is a standard item on all major committees |  |
|  |  | Create Athena Swan Action Log in order to oversee implementation of action plan. Review / audit workings of SAT on an annual basis to ensure it | HoD, DMT, AS lead, SAT | Annual agenda item for discussion at SAT and DMT and follow up of any action points arising. <br> Continued high engagement by SAT | Summer <br> 2018 <br> November <br> 2017 | Summer 2018 and then annually <br> Spring 2019 | AS Action Login, showing progress with implementation, was annual agenda item for discussion at SAT and DMT, and any delays in progress or |  |


|  |  | remains a high functioning team |  | members - measured by 90\% favourable score on 2019 CS regarding AS and SAT impact |  |  | unsuccessful measures were followed up <br> Engagement by SAT members, as divided in specialised subgroups, was continuously high, but question on AS and SAT impact not included in new mandatory survey |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Set up annual rota for routine monitoring of different data sources from Bronze award and provide feedback to both staff and students | SAT lead and SAT | Routine systems in place to review data, continued high engagement from staff in our activities, reach out to students at all levels in our AS activities. <br> Aim to achieve minimum $80 \%$ response rate on future Culture Surveys | November $2017$ | Ongoing | Rota systems for reviewing data only partly established (FAP 1.1.1). AS activities secured staff engagement, but only partly communicated and/or extended to students (FAP 3.1). Response rate of Culture Survey from academic staff $51 \%$ (following common trend for online surveys and downtrend in responses after Covid). |  |
|  |  | Raise our profile on our AS activities internally and externally, using the website, Departmental social media, and an increase in discussions and presentations by SAT members over the next 4 years | SAT lead and SAT | Members of SAT enabled and encouraged to promote our activities, internally and externally | November $2017$ | Reviewed annually | Created AS section on the departmental website: <br> https://www.york.ac.uk/politics/ equality-diversity-and-inclusion/ <br> Social media regularly used to disseminate AS initiatives and activities. SAT members regularly presenting work on gender inequality in the department and at Faculty |  |


|  |  | Establish an annual Departmental budget for AS activities. To be used for example for: training for SAT members, Athena Initiative Award, travel costs to regional and national AS events/workshops | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HoD, DM, SAT } \\ & \text { lead } \end{aligned}$ | Gain approval for $£ 500$ <br> budget per year, use budget towards supporting Politics initiatives to promote equality activities | January 2018 | Annual | Budget has not been earmarked (FAP 1.2.4), but funds have been made available for activities upon application |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Department has attracted a slightly lower number of female undergraduate students than male students, seen in 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 academic years. | - Maintain gender balance in online and visual materials for prospective students <br> - Maintain gender balance in speakers at Open/Visit Days <br> - More actively recruit female students in our marketing materials, via the Politics website, at Open Days, Visit Days, and with other interactions with female students (phone interviews and online conversations), by emphasising cases of previous female students that have been successful in the | Admissions <br> Director, PEP <br> Admissions <br> Director, and <br> Deputy <br> Admissions <br> Director | Gender balance in UG student cohort is achieved by 2021 | November $2017$ | October 2021 and then annually | We have achieved $50 \%$ intake of female students in our four core programmes, i.e., those in which we are in charge of recruitment (Politics, International Relations, and Politics \& International Relations). 45\% of our overall UG students (including joint degrees therefore) are female. |


|  |  | academy or the professional world <br> - Monitor gender balance of students coming in through clearing (as this is where a significant number of students are incoming) by adding a gender column to the clearing tracking data. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | Department has attracted almost equal numbers of female and male PGT students over the past five years, but has a slightly lower average percentage (48\%) than the national average of (49\%). | - Maintain current recruitment practices for female students via Open Days, Visit Days, recruitment from current students, interactions with prospective female students (phone interviews, online conversations) <br> - Maintain gender balance in online and visual materials for prospective students to ensure it is balanced and relevant | Taught <br> Graduate <br> Director, with <br> Graduate <br> Administrator | Gender balance in PGT student cohort is improved to 50\% female | November $2017$ | October $2021$ | In the application data, there are no major discrepancies or patterns by gender at PGT level: percentage has risen steadily, from 42\% (2018/19), to 46\% (2019/20), and 51\% (2020-21), with a marginal decline in recent years, $50 \%$ (2021/22) and 45\% (2022/23). The average is $47 \%$, only marginally lower than in 2016, but still lower than the aspired 49\%. <br> However, we have carried out the proposed actions and their impact seems to have made itself felt in 2020/21 and 2021/22. |  |


|  |  | - Maintain gender balance of speakers at Open/Visit Days <br> - More actively seek female students via the following means: <br> (i) Offer targeted events at UG level, to specifically raise interest and awareness of women students (eg seminars, leading women speakers) (ii) Consider wording of funding materials offered to potential students to ensure women students are targeted |  |  |  |  | Offer rate has been consistently higher for female applicants. <br> Materials regularly monitored for gender balance and events with speakers gender balance. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | Between 2010 and 2016, more men than women entered the PhD programme (45\% female compared to national average of 50\% female) | Research the causes of lower female uptake of PhDs within current PhD cohorts, via FGDs and online survey <br> Research the causes with relevant funders White Rose/ESRC/main government funders, via | PGR, CR, <br> Graduate office <br> AS Lead | Report on gender dynamics in PhD recruitment produced and shared with Department | January 2018 | January $2020$ | Student hired to conduct a research project on gender balance in the PhD cohort. Report on gender dynamics in PhD recruitment produced and shared with Department. Research ruled out bias at point of admissions and suggested need look at recruitment. Dissertation topics examined but |  |


|  |  | phone interviews (and where possible email surveys) <br> Analyse dissertation topics of applicants to see whether there is correlation between gender and areas of research <br> Research on PhD enrolment data from comparative Politics Departments in RG (Exeter, Warwick) to see if there are any concurrent declines <br> Re-write funding and other scholarship adverts to more explicitly recruit female applicants (with guidance from HR) <br> See also Action Point 21 (Section 5.3.iv) |  |  |  |  | no clear correlation between gender and areas of research found. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Monitor current and future applications by gender, to ensure that women do not drop off disproportionately to men, following offers being made | Graduate <br> Research <br> Director, and <br> Graduate <br> Administrator | Gender balance in PhD student intake is improved, aiming for an increase in $F$ applications by $5 \%$ | January $\mid 2018$ | January 2020 | There was a significant drop in female PGRs the year of our Bronze Award, to 29\% (2018/19), but since then there has been steady improvement: to 34\% (2019/20), 49\% (both in |  |


|  |  | Actively seek to recruit and <br> identify suitable female <br> PhD applicants, among our <br> UG and PGT female <br> students, via existing <br> networks in the White <br> Rose, across disciplinary <br> networks |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Careers Coaching in the department to students. <br> Students from underrepresented groups are supported in accessing York Futures Scholarship specifically for employability- related development |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staff Data (Find detailed assessment in the report) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | An informal strategy among Senior Management has been developed to recruit, promote and retain female staff, but this strategy has not yet been formalised, or widely advertised in the Department. | Implement the strategies developed via this Bronze Submission in order to actively recruit, retain and promote female staff <br> See further details in Action Points 11 and 14 (Sections 5.1.i and 5.1.ii). | Head of Department, Deputy Head, AS lead | Formalise gender equality strategy by advertising, implementing and monitoring progress on this Action Plan over 4 years, by making Athena Swan a standing issue on all management committees (DEC, DMT) | November $2017$ | Annually | Formalised mechanisms established to recruit, promote and retain female staff and advertised to the department <br> Athena Swan has been standing issue on all management committees |
| 7 | Department has few members of staff from BME background | SAT to conduct research into low recruitment of BME staff, in consultation with York's E\&D team <br> SAT to produce a report within two years, with an appropriate action plan, in liaison with York's E\&D | AS lead, ED officer | Department report on BME staff prepared and shared with Department <br> Outcoming action points acted on over remaining two years | Nov 2017 <br> Nov 2019 | October 2019 <br> Nov 2021 | The staff percentage of BME has improved, with $13 \%$ of our academic staff belonging in the group (it was 6\% in our last submission) <br> BME recruitment and support is now a standing topic at the EDI committee meetings and the |


|  |  | team (to work towards Silver) |  |  |  |  | direct responsibility of the EDI Deputy Head <br> Action plan on recruitment strategy produced for 2022/23 departmental Away Day and is to inform FAP 4.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | The percentage of female staff has dropped from $43 \%$ to 40\% among open contract (OC) staff between 2012 and 2016 (with a low of $35 \%$ in 2015) | See also Action Points 11, 1, 13 and 14 (Sections 5.1.i, ii and iii) <br> Actively recruit, retain and promote female staff to all levels of posts: <br> 1. Ensuring advertising is appropriate and indicates encouragement of female applicants (highlight in adverts that the Department seeks to recruit from underrepresented groups, and is encouraging of flexible working) <br> 2. Targeted recruitment for Chair posts (see | Head of Department, Deputy Head of Department Departmental Manager | Four key indicators will be used to measure progress in this area: <br> 1. Increase numbers of $F$ staff at Chair level by 2 <br> 2. Ensure $50 \%$ of current F SLs apply for promotion to Chair <br> 3. Increase numbers of $F$ staff at SL level by 4 <br> 4. Ensure all appointment panels have gender parity | Nov 2017 <br> Nov 2017 <br> Nov 2017 <br> Nov 2017 | Nov 2021 <br> Nov 2021 <br> Nov 2021 <br> Ongoing | The department has worked strategically with formalising processes in line with the action points <br> Significant progress has been made on these indicators especially with regard to number of female staff at Grade 8 and 9 3 new women Chairs via promotion and another 3 through external recruitment. 11 women in total have been promoted to SL, 2 of whom have since promoted to Chair <br> Also, targeted recruitment of women for Chair posts has been successful with three women hired at this level in 2022, all starting in 2023 |


|  |  | details in Action Point 11, Section 5.1.i) <br> 3. Developing more active promotions support work among female staff (see details in Action Point 14, Section 5.1.iii) <br> 4. Ensure that all appointments panels for open contract staff have gender parity (see details in Action Point 12, Section 5.1.i) <br> 5. Require all members of appointments panels to undergo the University's unconscious bias training before sitting on panels, and review this training on an annual basis. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | In 2015-16, 33\% (4/12) of teaching- only staff were women | As with Action Point 8 (Section 4.2.ii, points 1, 4, 5); plus: | Head of <br> Department, <br> Deputy Head <br> of <br> Department/ | Achieve greater gender parity for teaching-only staff, aiming for a $10 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { November } \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { September } \\ & 2018 \end{aligned}$ | Considerable improvements have been made, with $47 \%$ of female teaching-only staff in 2023 |


|  |  | 6. Ensure recruitment and appointment of teaching only contracts concluded by end of summer term. <br> 7. Seek overall to reduce our reliance on shortterm fixed contract teaching posts over the next four years, via raising this issue with Faculty and University management. | University Planning | increase in women staff at this grade <br> Reduce reliance on oneyear fixed term teaching posts by building more flexible budgeting into medium term plan. | November $2017$ | Ongoing | Reliance on fixed term teaching posts has been reduced to $10 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | Only two academic staff members (6\%) have chosen to work part-time as of 2015-16 - both are Grade 7 women | Add additional questions to the next CS on part-time working: If the CS reveals that more people would like to be part-time, but have chosen not to do so, identify reasons for this and develop solution for this (encouraging part-time working, job-shares, supporting promotion for part-time staff, sharing role-model stories, etc, as appropriate). | HoD, AS lead | If CS reveals more people would like to be part-time, encourage part-time takeup via greater information dissemination <br> Present comparative national research to the Department | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Spring } \\ 2019 \end{array}$ | Present report on part-time working Autumn 2020 | The 2022 culture survey showed that $75.5 \%$ staff think that the department is very good at enabling flexible working <br> There is no evidence from PDRs of more people would like to work part-time, rather than explore flexible work arrangements <br> Information on part-time options is sent out annually |


|  |  | Conduct comparative national research on the discipline (and similar disciplines) on part-time staff uptake. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | Training data (see Section 5.3.i) shows most staff have not completed the University's E\&D training, even though many serve on recruitment panels | All staff on recruitment panels required to take E\&D training <br> All staff encouraged to take E\&D training on an annual basis <br> See also Action Point 8 (Section 4.2.i) and Action Point 16 (Section 5.3.i) | HoD and Department Manager, with AS lead | Email sent to all staff to request they take online E\&D training (uptake monitored by DM) <br> Do not allow staff who have not taken E\&D training on job panels <br> Organise in-house E\&D training on an annual basis for all staff, with HR | December <br> 2017 <br> January <br> 2018 <br> For Spring <br> 2018 | January 2017 <br> Ongoing <br> Annually in Spring term | Email sent out, E\&D training uptake increased significantly in 2019 and 2022, but in 2018 and 2020 uptake was very low. Monitoring was not consistent (FAP 1.3.1) <br> Completed and implemented: staff on panels took EDI training, though not necessarily that year <br> HR are working on developing new E\&D training programme and have not offered in-house training before this is available. In-house training resumed in FAP 1.3.2. |  |
| 12 | Most job panels have gender representation, but they have not yet all achieved gender parity | HoD to ensure all job panels have gender parity <br> See also Action Point 8 (Section 4.2.i) | HoD and Department Manager | Gender parity achieved on all appointment panels, for all grades/ jobs | November $2017$ | September $2018$ | Completed and implemented, all appointment panels for all jobs had gender parity |  |


| 13 | The annual induction process has not previously been reviewed with staff, and no specific gender and diversity component has been included in the induction process | From academic year 201819 onwards, we will: <br> - monitor provision and review annually with staff <br> - provide E\&D session <br> - Include post-doc research staff in the process | HoD, DM, AS <br> lead and G\&D <br> officer | Annual monitoring of induction - results fed back to DMT and DM <br> AS lead and E\&D officer to provide E\&D session to the induction process | October $2018$ | Annually | EDI has been included in induction and regularly monitored <br> AS lead and E\&D Chair provided E\&D induction sessions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | The 2017 staff culture survey revealed uncertainty about promotions processes and criteria, with only $38 \%$ agreeing that they felt fully informed about promotions. <br> The qualitative feedback in the survey also highlighted the desire for greater clarity on how the University's criteria are to be interpreted. <br> Female staff were also more likely to disagree/strongly disagree with the | Overall, we plan a more proactive approach to support women for promotion, via the following mechanisms: <br> 1. improved mentoring scheme, to encourage all eligible staff to apply <br> 2. appointing deputies to major administrative roles, to enable more junior and mid-career staff to train up to more senior roles, and to enable wider career development and promotion prospects <br> 3. holding annual promotions seminars | HoD, Deputy HoD, <br> Promotions <br> Committee, <br> Mentors | Improved response rate on CS on promotions awareness and support mechanisms to 90\% favourable <br> Mentors put in place for all mid-career staff | Started <br> 2016-17 <br> Spring <br> 2018 | Annually updated <br> Annually updated | In the 2022 AS survey, there was no question on promotions awareness, but only $68.9 \%$ of respondents agreed that staff is actively encouraged to apply for promotion (FAP 5.3.5, 5.4.2, 5.5.2) <br> A mentorship survey developed by ED\&I lead was applied earlier that year to ascertain staff's expectations from mentoring and promotion-related advice featured amongst the principal expectations. Expectations communicated to mentors and PDR reviewers to inform departmental practice |


| question concerning being fully informed about promotions (53\% compared to $20 \%$ of male staff). | in order to improve communication about requirements and opportunities for promotion <br> 4. including information on promotion in the staff handbook <br> 5. annual CV reviews in order to provide support for staff on how to develop their cv for promotion <br> 6. mid-career mentorship to provide additional support in relation to developing careers in relation to Professorial promotions; <br> 7. ensure all mid-career women undertake leadership training to support them in undertaking senior roles within the Department and the University, to prepare them for the next stages of their careers. |  |  |  |  | Mentors are in place for all early and mid-career staff with meetings once per term <br> Deputy director roles have been appointed to major administrative roles. This is in fulfilment of offering leadership training to staff <br> Annual promotion seminars organised but interrupted during the pandemic. They have been resumed Spring 2023 <br> Information on promotion included in the staff handbook <br> Annual CV reviews are held by Promotions Committee comprised of all Professors at the department. HoD emails all staff with a date for submission and an internal committee reviews the CV. Feedback is provided to support decision whether and when to submit application for promotion <br> Mid-career mentoring reinforced through bespoke pairing with mentors and active approach for |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  |  | 8. Sharing of relevant cvs <br> across staff <br> See also Action Points 6, 8, <br> 9 and 18 for further details <br> (Sections 4.2, 4.2.i, 4.2.ii. <br> and 5.3.ii.) |  |  |  | submission of CVs to the <br> Promotion Committee |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ( |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | The Department does not monitor the uptake of training or consider the implications of this, for example in relation to patterns of attendance from male and female staff. | Starting in 2017/18, the DMT will receive an annual report on training uptake by all staff, also to be shared with SAT <br> Identify collective training needs within the Department, and, in particular, sessions which would advance the careers of women and address their low participation. <br> The Department Training Officer will collect the data, monitor uptake, share with the AS lead, who will share it with the relevant committees. | Department <br> Manager and SAT lead | Create annual report on training uptake to be shared with DMT and SAT | October $2018$ | Annually | Annual report has not been created, but some training activities organised and uptake was reported (e.g., workshop on mid-career research grants, especially for women, were organised by DRC prior to the pandemic and annually reported to DMT and SAT) <br> With Covid-19 all training activities were suspended, with the exception of those relating to moving teaching online <br> They are now being resumed in 2022/23 and Priority 5 of our FAP includes several actions design to identify training needs of staff and provide for them also inhouse |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | Low attendance by staff at staff development courses, especially by women | To investigate further the reasons for low attendance, via a female staff FGD ( with email follow up) in the first instance, and then to add this to the staff culture survey in 2019. <br> At each PDR, reviewers to signpost training that is | HoD, <br> Department <br> Manager, <br> Deputy HoD, <br> Performance <br> Reviewers | FGD with female staff on training needs and constraints <br> Remind PRD reviewers and follow up after review on take up <br> Training information circulated at DM each term | October 2018 <br> Academic <br> year 2018- <br> 19 <br> January <br> 2018 | Annually <br> Annually <br> Termly | Training needs and constraints discussed in PDR reviews, reviewers instructed to actively signpost suitable training, training information circulated to DM, though not always systematically <br> In the culture survey, only 48.9\% of staff were happy with level of |


|  |  | available, and, where this is of interest, to be assured that they will be supported to attend subject to normal constraints (e.g. teaching timetable). <br> Relevant training opportunities circulated more widely via information provision at key meetings (e.g. the DM). |  |  |  |  | encouragement for taking up training opportunities. An additional $28.9 \%$ were reasonably satisfied with level of encouragement. Satisfaction among support staff was significantly higher than amongst academic staff, showing that there is significant room for improvement (hence, FAP Priority 5). There was no significant difference in the average level of satisfaction per gender |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | Need for wider support - outside the PRD process - for midcareer staff, especially women | Introduce mid-career mentors to advise on promotion and development strategy. <br> See also Action Point 14 (Section 5.1.iii). | HoD, Deputy HoD | Improved results in the CS on mid-career support to 90\% | Spring <br> 2018 | Spring 2019 | New Culture Survey followed set mandatory questions, which did not include question on midcareer support <br> However, all mid-career staff are appointed a mentor and mentors instructed on major obstacles faced by mid-career staff <br> Insofar as possible, mid-career female staff are assigned a female Professor as mentor |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mentors encouraged to actively advice on development and promotion strategy <br> A mid-career peer-to-peer support group was initiated in 2019 by the Chair of Research Committee, but attendance has been sporadic and was discontinued during Covid <br> Action points to support midcareer staff are included in our FAP under 5.3.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | Need for more formalised support for post-doctoral staff on FTC | Provide a more formalised support system to postdocs | HoD, Deputy <br> HoD | Improved results in the CS on mid-career support and post-doc support to $90 \%$ | Spring $2018$ | Spring 2019 | Mandatory set of questions in new CS did not include these questions and postdocs response rate was too low to allow inferences <br> However, the role of Post-doc officer has been created to attend to and design policy for post-doctoral staff specific needs <br> Despite having formalised a support system for postdocs, we want to further integrate postdoctoral staff, alongside other career researchers, in the department (FAP 5.2.11) |


|  | Lack of awareness among female staff regarding the promotions process identified in CS (50\% of female staff did not feel informed, compared to $20 \%$ male staff) | See Action Point 14 on promotion (Section 5.1.iii), Action Point 17 (Section 5.3.i) on training and Action Point 18 on career development support (Section 5.3.ii) |  |  |  |  | Given the modifications introduced by AS to the Culture Survey, the question on promotion was about support to apply for promotion in specific. $72 \%$ of female staff felt positively encouraged to apply for promotion, with another 14\% feeling reasonably supported. While level of satisfaction is still slightly lower for female staff, considerable improvement seems to have been made, especially with T\&S staff <br> The department has organised workshops on promotion and the Promotions Committee regularly reviews staff's CVs to assess readiness for promotion and help plan towards it |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | Both male and female UG students saw increases in the positive destination score between 2011 and 2016, but the female leavers' score was $2 \%$ lower in 2015/16. | Politics has recently hired an employability Support Officer to work across this area from 2017-18. <br> 1. Over the short-term, the Department will compile data on participation in employability and | UG <br> Placements <br> Officer, <br> Placements <br> Support <br> Officer, Chair <br> of UG TC, <br> Chair BoS | Strategy to better support female UG employability strategies developed by September 2019 <br> Reduction of female unemployment ratio on graduation to less than 2\%, on average | $\begin{aligned} & \text { September } \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { September } \\ & 2019 \end{aligned}$ | A strategy to better support female UG employability strategies has been developed by our Careers Consultant, number of career talks by female professionals increased, but target not reached and found unrealistic. Job prospects under |



|  |  | students, with a focus on female postgraduation employment, via increasing numbers of female speakers, and more targeted careersupport activities <br> See also Action Point 5 (Section 4.1.v) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | Not all relevant MA programmes have work placement options and career planning sessions, although two of our MA programmes have these specific components <br> No specific programme in place to support students to pursue a PhD, and no specific activities to encourage applications from women in place. | See also Action Point 4 (Section 4.1.iv) Extend work placement options to all relevant MA programmes by 2019. <br> Provide workshops on career planning at the programme level <br> Setting up a forum within the Department Research Committee and/or Clusters to discuss practical ways of encouraging more female students to pursue a PhD <br> Making female academic role models more prominent in the | PGT Chair, PGT Director, PGT Support Officer, Research Chair | All relevant MAs have work placement options in place by Academic year 20192020 <br> Workshops on career planning, forums in Clusters, and profiles of female academics raised/established by Academic year 2018-19 <br> Gender balance in PhD student intake is improved, aiming for an increase in $F$ applications by $5 \%$ | Spring <br> 2017 <br> Spring <br> 2017 <br> January <br> 2018 | October 2019 October 2018 January 2020 | Work placements for relevant MA programmes (Public Policy; Peace \& Conflict; Applied Human Rights) in place <br> Careers workshops and events have been introduced for PGT students <br> Best female PGT students actively encouraged to apply to PhDs at York <br> Active pursuit of ESRC DTP funding for talented female applicants <br> Gender balance in PhD intake nearly achieved in 2020/21 (49\%), 2021/22 (49\%), |  |


|  |  | Department to PGT students <br> Raise awareness about PhD grants/ scholarships among women on our PGT programmes |  |  |  |  | decreasing slightly in 2022/23 (44\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PGR: <br> The Department has not had a specific policy to support PGR students on their career progression over the past five years, and nor has it had a femalefocused academic career advice strategy. | See Action Point 4 (Section 4.1.iv). |  |  |  |  | Several training and career's workshops have been put in place for PGRs that now run on an annual basis since 2019. These include sessions on: <br> - Conference participation <br> - Job market applications <br> - Career opportunities <br> - Research ethics and fieldwork planning <br> Female-focused academic career advice secured through mentoring by female academics |  |
| 22 | No mechanism to identify any trends and gender imbalances in the numbers of staff applying for and being awarded research grants. | Monitor success rates by gender via Department Research Committee, reporting to the DMT, SAT and DM. <br> Consider additional mechanisms at DRC to support mid-career to | DRC, <br> Research <br> Support <br> Officer, <br> mentors, HoD | Report on success rates by gender on an annual basis <br> DRC to discuss mid- career support mechanisms and plan activities | $\begin{aligned} & \text { January } \\ & 2018 \\ & \\ & \text { Spring } \\ & 2018 \end{aligned}$ | Monitor annually <br> For academic year 201819 | No report produced (FAP 5.2.8) <br> However, mid-career workshop organised and more women than men were successful in securing prestigious early career grants in the period (two ESRC Early Career fellowships secured by women grade 7; two British Mid- |  |


|  | The success rate by value has been comparatively lower for women in senior positions, but the numbers are very small (only two female professors applying in this period) so it is hard to draw conclusions from this. | senior women to apply for larger grants, including: <br> - Running sessions on applying for larger grants for all relevant staff, and female staff will be particularly encouraged to attend these by DRC, HoD and mentors <br> - Adding large grant applications as a specific point for career development in the PRD process for relevant staff |  |  |  |  | Career Fellowships secured by women at grade 8 vs 1 by a man). <br> Support for grant applications by academic staff at all levels provided via Research Facilitator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | HoDs recommended that a more formal Departmental mat leave process would benefit all staff, both for clarity and to ensure the correct support for staff was provided. | 1. Develop a <br> Departmental <br> Maternity, Paternity and Parental Leave Handbook - a policy document that builds on the University policy, but is specific to the Department and needs of our staff. <br> 2. Formally confirm and communicate the maternity-research | HoD, all PRD staff, AS lead, SAT | Improve communications on maternity leave via: <br> Updating existing Staff Handbook; <br> Producing new Maternity, Paternity and Parental Leave Handbook; <br> Making leave policies a standing item on core meetings under the AS agenda. | January 2018 | September 2018 then updated annually every Autumn | All action points implemented. See report for details and Table DT.18. for results of parental leave survey to staff who have benefited from maternity leave since changes to its implementation introduced |


|  |  | leave policy through publication of the information in the Staff Handbook, and by providing information at induction, key meetings, and at key points in the yearly cycle, e.g. during PDR and PRR <br> 3. Hold workload meetings pre-leave to improve planning for workloads in light of changing circumstances (see also Action Point 25, Section 5.5.iii) <br> 4. Offer a range of further options to provide greater support on return from leave (see also Action Point 25, Section 5.5.iii) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | As with 5.5.i, further clarification and communication to staff | See Action Point 23 (Section 5.5.i) Record KIT days in the Department | HoD, DM, AS lead | Update Department records | June 2018 <br> Spring <br> 2019 | Annually <br> Bi-annually | Maternity leave policy communicated to all new staff in |  |


|  | needed on Departmental policy <br> No records kept of academic staff KIT days in Department |  |  | Measure via improved results in 2019 CS, increasing positive responses by 50 \% <br> See Action Point 23 (Section 5.5.)i for main activities |  |  | their induction and explained in Staff Handbook <br> KIT days recorded <br> New culture survey has no specific question on maternity leave information, but bespoke policy is well known at the department and very positively assessed by staff (Table DT.18) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | Lack of overall staff knowledge about how the Department implements University policy in practice. Staff reported mixed experiences of the maternity leave process. | Action Point 23 (Section <br> 5.5.i): Develop Maternity, Paternity and Parental Leave Handbook <br> Plus: <br> 1. Senior staff (HoD, Deputy HoD) to follow up with the University level E\&D team for advice regarding further processes that should be in place in the Department. <br> 2. Improve Departmental support for women returning from maternity leave, offering three options: (i) one term's | HoD, <br> Department <br> Manager, <br> DMT, AS lead, SAT | Action Point 23: New Handbook prepared and Staff Handbook updated for September 2018 <br> Plus: <br> 1. HoD to meet with E\&D team from Spring 2018, to feed into new handbook on leave <br> 2. Start from academic year 2018/19, but consultations start in Summer 2018 during workload meetings. <br> 3. Conduct via next CS <br> 4-6. Recorded in the Department | January <br> 2018 <br> January <br> 2018 <br> Summer <br> 2018 <br> Spring <br> 2019 <br> January <br> 2018 | September 2018 <br> September 2018 <br> Annually As needed <br> Biannually <br> September 2018 and | General Staff Handbook prepared and updated annually. <br> Maternity, Paternity and Parental Leave Handbook developed after consultation with E\&D team, and available online: <br> https://www.york.ac.uk/media/p olitics/equalityanddiversity/Mate rnity,\%20paternity\%20and\%20pa rental\%20leave\%20(Department al\%20Handbook).pdf <br> Three options offered to women upon return <br> Maternity leave survey conducted in 2021, showing a very high level of satisfaction with the bespoke departmental |



|  |  | improve how we do so over the next 4 years. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5. Create a formal record of meetings between the HoD, administrative support and staff, before, during, and returning from maternity leave, and monitor this on an annual basis. <br> 6. Record completion of the "ML2 (Risk Assessment for Pregnant and Breastfeeding Employees)" forms for staff returning from maternity leave, and store in the Department. <br> 7. Conduct comparative research on University maternity (and paternity) leave policies at comparative Russell Group Universities. Lobby the E\&D team at York to create |  |  |  |  | Formal record of meetings created <br> ML2 forms stored in the department <br> Maternity leave policy regularly monitored for comparison with RG and department now extending policy to alternative ways of parenthood (FAP 1.5.2) |  |


|  |  | change at York to improve University policies. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No problems recorded regarding maternity return rate |  |  |  |  |  | Similarly, no problems observed. |
| 26 | University Paternity Leave provides one week on full pay. | See also Action Point 23 (Section 5.5.i). <br> 1. Further comparative research on paternity pay provision across Russell Group Universities with appropriate lobbying to improve UoY's policy <br> 2. Set up a system to record paternity leave data at the Department level. <br> 3. Communication of clear information about paternity leave policy in the Staff Handbook, and in the new Maternity and Paternity leave handbook, at staff induction, and at key | HoD, <br> Department <br> Manager, AS <br> lead, SAT <br> team | 1. See Action Point 25 report on both maternity and paternity leave to be prepared for Sept 2018 Away Day <br> 2. Set up by January 2018, and then review each September <br> 3. New Leave Handbook developed, plus updates to Staff handbook by start of academic year 2018/19 <br> 4. Conduct via CS 2019 <br> 5. Start consultation in Spring 2018, and take to University E\&D team in Summer 2018 | January <br> 2018 <br> January <br> 2018 <br> Spring <br> 2018 <br> Spring <br> 2019 <br> Spring <br> 2018 | September 2018 <br> Update every September September 2018 <br> Bi-annually Summer 2018 | Maternity and Paternity leave prepared for January 2018, report prepared for September Away Day, and Staff Handbook updated <br> Comparative analysis of maternity, paternity and parental leave conducted with RG and within University of York and report produced <br> Members of staff entitled to two weeks of paternity leave on full pay and encouraged to discuss with HoD alternative opportunities to take time off |


|  |  | points in the yearly <br> cycle where relevant <br> (for example, during <br> the PRR and PDR <br> processes), and <br> ensuring this includes <br> all staff groups. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



|  |  | of the academic year, and as part of a regular standing item on core meetings under AS. <br> 5. Keeping a record of case studies of individuals who have taken different kinds of leave and their experience of it in the Departmental AS folder on the shared drive |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28 | Lack of clarity among staff over flexible working policy already in place, in relation to all staff, e.g.. the teaching constraints request process, maternity leave, and flexible working policies. | 1. Add to the staff handbook the full range of University and Departmental practices and support systems available in relation to flexible working. <br> 2. Run annual awareness session for all staff on flexible working (eg at the annual Away Day, at the first DM of the year, under AS standing item at core meetings). | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HoD, DM, AS } \\ & \text { lead, SAT } \\ & \text { team } \end{aligned}$ | Improved knowledge of flexible and leave arrangements in the Department, demonstrated by improved awareness and positive response score in the 2019 Culture Survey, by 50 \% | September <br> 2018 | Then annually/ termly as relevant | There is improved knowledge about flexible working opportunities and 2022 CS showed that $75.5 \%$ of staff is satisfied with the department's flexible working practices <br> Existing teaching constraints process allows for concentrated working hours. Within the process of modularisation and semesterisation, to be implemented from 22/23, new possibilities will be explored, including working closely with Timetabling to cluster teaching |



|  | Lack of awareness about flexibility for FTC staff | To discuss flexible working with staff on point of appointment in order to make necessary arrangement in academic year | DM | New staff having awareness of flexible working, as measured improvement of 50\% rates in 2019 CS | 2017 | 2019 | In 2022 Culture Survey there is no direct "awareness" question, but $75.5 \%$ of staff positively assess the department's offer of flexible working opportunities |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Staff unaware of informal processes for flexible working in case of emergency/ acute caring responsibilities | To formalise acute/emergency flexibility and put process into handbook and induction day | HoD, DM, AS lead | Increased number of staff discussing flexible arrangements with HoD, improved responses by 50\% to these questions in 2019 CS | 2017 | 2019 | In 2022 Culture Survey 75.5\% of staff shows awareness of possible flexible arrangements to be discussed with HoD. However policy to be developed under FAP 2.3 should explicitly refer to the possibility of flexible working in case of emergency/acute caring responsibilities |  |
|  | There have been no cases of this in the Department in the last five years. |  |  |  |  |  | There have been cases since the last submission and flexible working arrangements have been agreed on a one-to-one basis with HoD |  |
| 29 | Awareness on the importance of a diverse and inclusive workplace has already started, but we seek to improve on this and to mainstream gender and diversity into all our activities | On wider culture, see Action Points 14, 17, 18, $23,34,25,26,27,28,3,31$ and 32 (Sections 5.6.ii-viii) | All members of DMT and DEC | Achieve 80\% return on the 2019 CS <br> Achieve 75\% staff satisfaction that the Department is a diverse and inclusive workplace on the 2019 CS | January $2018$ | Spring 2019 | Due to the pandemic, the 2019 CS was not applied. The only CS was applied in 2022 and had a return of $51 \%$ amongst academic staff and $47 \%$ amongst all staff. The return on the survey has been far lower than the one we proposed ourselves to achieve, but there are two main reasons: |  |


| 1) we had a significant numbers |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| of new staff, both academic and |
| PSS, who did not feel they knew |
| the departmental enough to |
| participate; |
| 2) the return on surveys has |
| been very low across the |
| University post-Covid due to staff |
| fatigue. In our case, survey |
| activity resumed after lockdown |
| lifted, with both a mentoring and |
| a research impact survey being |
| applied shortly before the CS, in |
| addition to the CS. |


| 30 | Most committee members and committee chairs have been majority male between 2012-16 | See also Action Points 14 and 18 (Sections 5.1.iii and 5.3.iii) <br> Plus: <br> - Reviewing committee membership annually <br> - Aiming for gender balance on committees for 2018-19 <br> - Aiming for gender balance among committee chairs by 2018-19 <br> - Actively encouraging women to go for committee roles via the PDR process, and also via targeted meetings and improved mentoring of mid-career staff.) <br> - Development of Deputy roles in key committees in order to allow for more opportunities and career progression. | HoD, DHoD, <br> Workload <br> Committee, <br> PRD <br> reviewers, DM | Gender balance among committee chairs by 201819 <br> Gender balance among committee members by 2018-19 <br> Appointment of Deputy roles to key committee chairs by 2018-19 | January 2018 | Academic year 201819 and then annually reviewed | Achieved gender parity among committee chairs <br> Approximate gender balance between committee members reached (50/50 would impose an excessive burden on women, given that only $43 \%$ of our academic staff are women) <br> Deputy Chairs were created for all major committees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Only $27 \%$ of female academic staff who responded to the CS 2017 had been asked to serve on or elected to | See Action Points 14, 17, and 18 : <br> HoD to encourage female staff to apply for membership of Committees | HoD, DHoD, PRD reviewers | At least $50 \%$ of female staff respond positively to this question in the 2019 CS | January 2018 | Spring 2019 <br> Culture <br> Survey then reviewed annually | 2022 Culture Survey followed pre-given questions and did not include question. However, PDR reviewers and mentors have been routinely briefed to |


|  | University-wide committee, versus 53\% of male respondents | and to encourage their nomination (Action Point 14) <br> Staff to be encouraged to take leadership training to support greater participation on University Committees (Action Point 17) <br> PDR process used to highlight and encourage women to apply for University Committee Representation (Action Point 18) |  |  |  |  | encourage female members of staff to take on roles at University-level and uptake of such roles has increased |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | On a scale of 1 through 9 (with a higher number indicating a higher perception of unfairness of the workload process) the mean response from female staff was 4.8 versus 2.7 from male staff. | Run a focus group discussion (FGD) with female staff to investigate further the causes of the perception of workload unfairness <br> Make workload fairness a standing item under the Athena Swan agenda item at DMT and DEC. | HoD, DHoD, DM and AS lead. | Increase in perceptions of workload fairness to a mean of under 3.00 out of 9 in the 2019 CS | January 2018 | Spring 2019 <br> Reviewed <br> annually | In the 2022 culture survey, 81\% of female staff agree or strongly agree that workloads are allocated on a clear and fair basis (against 71\% of male staff). This constitutes a substantial improvement from perceptions in the last submission |  |


|  |  | Ensure more consistent <br> communication of <br> workload criteria at DM. <br> By these steps, aim to <br> increase the perception of <br> workload fairness to a <br> mean of under 3.00 out of <br> 9 in the 2019 CS. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 34 | The 2017 CS highlighted the perception that men speak more than women in the DM. 12/34 respondents commented that this meetings' gender dynamics were unequal | Focus on better chairing <br> Smaller group work to encourage greater participation and more diverse speakers <br> Improved awareness of gender bias in discussions, by tracking speakers at major meetings and in small groups, and reporting back to DM to raise awareness of any bias <br> Improvement in speaker gender balance should also take place via changes to Committee Chairs and membership, see Section 5.6.iii | HoD, Deputy HoD, AS lead, DM | Improved response rate to this question in the CS 2019 to $75 \%$ <br> Improvement of female speakers - including in small groups) at DM to at least 40\% female speakers per meeting by 2018-19 | Already <br> started in <br> Autumn $2017$ | Review termly at DMT under AS standing item CS 2019 | Although question not repeated in the 2022 culture survey, a similar question was included on how comfortable staff felt on speaking and expressing opinions. $81 \%$ of female staff felt positively comfortable in expressing opinions against 76\% of male staff. <br> This constitutes evidence of significant improvement of deliberative culture. Results for female academic staff were marginally lower (78\%) but still higher than $75 \%$. Although the difference is not significant we have sought to reinforce and expand our healthy deliberative culture in our FAP 7.2. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35 | The Department does not keep a single log of invited speakers, so there is no consistent set of data on the gender breakdown of external speakers | For Departmental Research Seminars, the Departmental (or research cluster, as appropriate) convenor maintains a log of all invited speakers over the next four years <br> A gender-balanced rotation of chairs is ensured for | Seminar Convenor, Research Cluster Convenors, PGR Chair and Director | Gender parity on all external speakers is achieved by end of academic year 2018-19 <br> Chairs of all research workshops are gender balanced by end of academic year 2018-19 | Spring $2018$ | Summer 2019 <br> Reviewed annually | Log of invited speakers kept, but some lapses in updating <br> However, requirement has been embedded in our culture and organisers keep a close eye on gender distribution. In result of this, there has been gender parity in invited speakers in the period |


|  |  | research workshops (such <br> as postgraduate student <br> presentations) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 36 | No formal records kept <br> in the Department <br> around external <br> outreach activities by <br> gender. | Formal records of outreach <br> activities by gender kept in <br> the Department. | HoD and DM | Records of outreach <br> activities monitored by <br> gender | January <br> 2018 | Annual <br> review in <br> September | No formal records of outreach <br> activity have been kept <br> However, efforts have been <br> made to keep gender parity in <br> outreach activities in <br> representation of the <br> department (rather than simply <br> in representation of individual <br> research projects) |

## Appendix 1: Culture survey data

Please present the results of the core culture survey questions, and if desired, the results of any additional survey questions or consultation.

Our CS had a response rate of $47 \%$ overall and $51 \%$ for academic staff (we were 96 members of staff when the survey was applied). Although this is a good return for an online survey, especially in light of the decline of response rates during and in the immediate aftermath of Covid-19, it is lower than we would have wished. It also means that we need to be careful in interpreting the survey findings. Although overall variation between gender was higher than variation between contract types, responses showed little variation by gender, there being only three questions where women's average response was lower than men's: Q.2.4. ("The rate people progress in my department is not affected by their gender"); Q3.2 ("My workload is manageable"), and Q4.2 ("My department makes it clear that unsupportive language and behaviour are not acceptable").

In the survey, we used a 1 to 5 rating scale (with 1 meaning "strongly disagree", and 5 "strongly agree") as a simple and effective way to rate staff satisfaction with specific dimensions of the department's EDI action. The responses were disaggregated and analysed according to gender, staff role, and academic contract type.

The treated data includes average ratings, expressed as a decimal and percentage of the maximum ' 5 ', followed by count of ratings (with percentage count) for each graded response question. The mode response is highlighted in the count data. Responses from those who chose not to disclose their gender are omitted from the averages. Where included for count, open question responses, and respondent demographics, they are shown either as ' $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{a}$ ' or 'Prefer not to say'.

Question 3.3 is absent from the results owing to a typo in the numbering of the survey questions.

Table CS.1. Average response per question, by gender, staff role, and academic contract type

|  |  | Q1.1 |  | Q1.2 |  | Q1.3 |  | Q1.4 |  | Q1.5 |  | Q1.6 |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section 1 | $\mathrm{n}=$ | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 |
| Female | 21 | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.6 | 92\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 4.3 | 86\% |
| Academic Staff | 14 | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Research and Teaching (ART) | 10 | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 4 | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.8 | 96\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.3 | 86\% |
| Professional Support Staff | 7 | 4.7 | 94\% | 4.9 | 98\% | 4.9 | 98\% | 4.6 | 92\% | 4.6 | 92\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.7 | 94\% |
| Male | 21 | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 80\% |
| Academic Staff | 19 | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.9 | 78\% |
| Research and Teaching (ART) | 17 | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.0 | 80\% |
| Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 2 | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.4 | 68\% |
| Professional Support Staff | 2 | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.5 | 90\% |
| Section 1 Total | 42 | 4.2 | 84\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.2 | 84\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gran | tal |
| Section 2 | $\mathrm{n}=$ | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 |
| Female | 21 | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Academic Staff | 14 | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.6 | 72\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.2 | 64\% | 3.9 | 78\% |
| Research and Teaching (ART) | 10 | 4.2 | 84\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.4 | 68\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.3 | 66\% | 3.8 | 76\% |
| Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 4 | 4.8 | 96\% | 4.8 | 96\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Professional Support Staff | 7 | 4.6 | 92\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.6 | 92\% | 4.4 | 88\% |
| Male | 21 | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.6 | 72\% | 4.0 | 80\% |
| Academic Staff | 19 | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.6 | 72\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Research and Teaching (ART) | 17 | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 2 | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 2.5 | 50\% | 2.5 | 50\% | 3.4 | 68\% |
| Professional Support Staff | 2 | 3.5 | 70\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.7 | 74\% |
| Section 2 Total | 42 | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.6 | 72\% | 4.0 | 80\% |


| Section 3 | $\mathrm{n}=$ | Q3.1 |  | Q3.2 |  | Q3.4 |  | Q3.5 |  | Q3.6 |  | Q3.7 |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 |
| Female | 21 | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.3 | 66\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.9 | 78\% |
| Academic Staff | 14 | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.1 | 62\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.4 | 68\% | 3.7 | 74\% |
| Research and Teaching (ART) | 10 | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 3.6 | 72\% | 3.8 | 76\% |
| Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 4 | 4.3 | 86\% | 3.3 | 66\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 3.6 | 72\% |
| Professional Support Staff | 7 | 4.6 | 92\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.9 | 98\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.3 | 86\% |
| Male | 21 | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.6 | 72\% | 3.8 | 76\% |
| Academic Staff | 19 | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.6 | 72\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.6 | 72\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.7 | 74\% |
| Research and Teaching (ART) | 17 | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.8 | 76\% |
| Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 2 | 3.0 | 60\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 3.3 | 66\% |
| Professional Support Staff | 2 | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.3 | 86\% |
| Section 3 Total | 42 | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.9 | 78\% |


| Section 4 | $\mathrm{n}=$ | Q4.2 |  | Q4.3 |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 |
| Female | 21 | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 80\% |
| Academic Staff | 14 | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.9 | 78\% |
| Research and Teaching (ART) | 10 | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.8 | 76\% |
| Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 4 | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.2 | 84\% |
| Professional Support Staff | 7 | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.4 | 88\% |
| Male | 21 | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Academic Staff | 19 | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Research and Teaching (ART) | 17 | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 2 | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.3 | 86\% |
| Professional Support Staff | 2 | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.8 | 76\% |
| Section 4 Total | 42 | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.1 | 82\% |


|  | Q5.1 |  |  | Q5.2 |  | Q5.3 |  | Q5.4 |  | Q5.5 |  | Q5.6 |  | Q5.7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section 5 | $\mathrm{n}=$ | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 |
| Female | 21 | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 3.9 | 78\% |
| Academic Staff | 14 | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.2 | 64\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 3.7 | 74\% |
| Research and Teaching (ART) | 10 | 4.1 | 82\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.3 | 66\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 3.6 | 72\% |
| Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 4 | 4.3 | 86\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.0 | 80\% |
| Professional Support Staff | 7 | 4.6 | 92\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.6 | 92\% | 4.6 | 92\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.6 | 92\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Male | 21 | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.3 | 66\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.7 | 74\% |
| Academic Staff | 19 | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.2 | 64\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.7 | 74\% |
| Research and Teaching (ART) | 17 | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.6 | 72\% | 3.2 | 64\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.8 | 76\% |
| Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 2 | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.0 | 60\% |
| Professional Support Staff | 2 | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 3.5 | 70\% |
| Section 5 Total | 42 | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 3.8 | 76\% |


|  |  | Q5.8 |  |  | Grand Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Section 5 (cont.) | $\mathrm{n}=$ | Av. | $\% / 5$ | Av. | $\% / 5$ |  |
| Female | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ |  |
| Academic Staff | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 \%}$ |  |
| $\quad$ Research and Teaching (ART) | 10 | 4.5 | $90 \%$ | 4.5 | $90 \%$ |  |
| Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 4 | 4.3 | $86 \%$ | 4.3 | $86 \%$ |  |
| Professional Support Staff | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 4 \%}$ |  |
| Male | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ |  |
| Academic Staff | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ |  |
| $\quad$ Research and Teaching (ART) | 17 | 4.4 | $88 \%$ | 4.4 | $88 \%$ |  |
| $\quad$ Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 2 | 5.0 | $100 \%$ | 5.0 | $100 \%$ |  |
| $\quad$ Professional Support Staff | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ |  |
| Section 5 Total | $\mathbf{4 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ |  |

Table CS.2. Average response per question, by staff role and academic contract type

|  | Research and Teaching (ART) ( $\mathrm{n}=27$ ) |  | Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) ( $\mathrm{n}=6$ ) |  | Acad | c Staff <br> Total (n=33) | Professional Support Staff |  |  | Total $n=42)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Question | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 | Av. | \%/5 |
| Section 1 | 4.0 | 81\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 81\% | 4.6 | 93\% | 4.2 | 83\% |
| Q1.1 | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.2 | 83\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.7 | 93\% | 4.2 | 85\% |
| Q1.2 | 4.4 | 87\% | 4.3 | 87\% | 4.4 | 87\% | 4.8 | 96\% | 4.5 | 89\% |
| Q1.3 | 3.9 | 77\% | 3.7 | 73\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 4.8 | 96\% | 4.0 | 80\% |
| Q1.4 | 3.9 | 79\% | 3.8 | 77\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.6 | 91\% | 4.0 | 81\% |
| Q1.5 | 4.0 | 81\% | 3.8 | 77\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.6 | 91\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Q1.6 | 4.0 | 79\% | 4.2 | 83\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.4 | 89\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Section 2 | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.8 | 77\% | 4.0 | 79\% | 4.2 | 85\% | 4.0 | 81\% |
| Q2.1 | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.4 | 88\% | 4.3 | 87\% | 4.4 | 88\% |
| Q2.2 | 4.4 | 89\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.5 | 89\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 4.4 | 88\% |
| Q2.3 | 4.1 | 83\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Q2.4 | 3.7 | 75\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 4.3 | 87\% | 3.9 | 78\% |
| Q2.5 | 3.7 | 75\% | 3.2 | 63\% | 3.6 | 73\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.7 | 74\% |
| Q2.6 | 3.6 | 71\% | 2.8 | 57\% | 3.4 | 68\% | 4.4 | 89\% | 3.6 | 73\% |
| Section 3 | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.7 | 75\% | 4.3 | 86\% | 3.9 | 77\% |
| Q3.1 | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.8 | 77\% | 4.0 | 79\% | 4.6 | 91\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Q3.2 | 3.4 | 69\% | 3.2 | 63\% | 3.4 | 68\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.5 | 70\% |
| Q3.4 | 4.0 | 81\% | 3.8 | 77\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.8 | 96\% | 4.2 | 83\% |
| Q3.5 | 3.7 | 75\% | 3.8 | 77\% | 3.8 | 75\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.8 | 76\% |
| Q3.6 | 3.9 | 79\% | 3.3 | 67\% | 3.8 | 76\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.9 | 78\% |
| Q3.7 | 3.6 | 71\% | 3.0 | 60\% | 3.5 | 69\% | 4.4 | 89\% | 3.7 | 73\% |
| Section 4 | 3.9 | 79\% | 4.2 | 83\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 4.0 | 81\% |
| Q4.2 | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.2 | 83\% | 4.0 | 81\% | 4.3 | 87\% | 4.1 | 82\% |
| Q4.3 | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.2 | 83\% | 3.9 | 79\% | 4.1 | 82\% | 4.0 | 80\% |
| Section 5 | 3.9 | 78\% | 3.9 | 77\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.3 | 87\% | 4.0 | 80\% |
| Q5.1 | 4.1 | 83\% | 4.2 | 83\% | 4.2 | 83\% | 4.6 | 91\% | 4.2 | 85\% |
| Q5.2 | 3.8 | 76\% | 3.5 | 70\% | 3.8 | 75\% | 4.2 | 84\% | 3.9 | 77\% |
| Q5.3 | 3.7 | 73\% | 3.8 | 77\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 4.4 | 89\% | 3.9 | 77\% |
| Q5.4 | 3.2 | 64\% | 3.2 | 63\% | 3.2 | 64\% | 4.4 | 89\% | 3.5 | 70\% |
| Q5.5 | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.0 | 80\% |
| Q5.6 | 4.3 | 86\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 4.2 | 85\% | 4.6 | 91\% | 4.3 | 86\% |
| Q5.7 | 3.7 | 74\% | 3.7 | 73\% | 3.7 | 74\% | 4.0 | 80\% | 3.8 | 75\% |
| Q5.8 | 4.4 | 89\% | 4.5 | 90\% | 4.5 | 89\% | 4.7 | 93\% | 4.5 | 90\% |
| Grand Total | 3.9 | 79\% | 3.8 | 77\% | 3.9 | 78\% | 4.4 | 87\% | 4.0 | 80\% |

Table CS.3. Average response to Q2.6, by gender and caring responsibilities

| Q2.6 My department has taken action to impact |  |  |  |  | espon | ilities |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| of the Covid-19 pandemic on those with |  |  | No |  |  | Yes |  |  |  |
| caring responsibilities | $\mathrm{n}=$ | Av. | \% / 5 | $\mathrm{n}=$ | Av. | \% / 5 | $\mathrm{n}=$ | Av. | \% / 5 |
| Academic Staff | 7 | 3.3 | 66\% | 26 | 3.5 | 69\% | 33 | 3.4 | 68\% |
| Research and Teaching (ART) | 5 | 3.4 | 68\% | 22 | 3.6 | 72\% | 27 | 3.6 | 71\% |
| Female | 1 | 3.0 | 60\% | 9 | 3.3 | 67\% | 10 | 3.3 | 66\% |
| Male | 4 | 3.5 | 70\% | 13 | 3.8 | 75\% | 17 | 3.7 | 74\% |
| Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) | 2 | 3.0 | 60\% | 4 | 2.8 | 55\% | 6 | 2.8 | 57\% |
| Female | 2 | 3.0 | 60\% | 2 | 3.0 | 60\% | 4 | 3.0 | 60\% |
| Male | 0 | - | 0\% | 2 | 2.5 | 50\% | 2 | 2.5 | 50\% |
| Professional Support Staff | 3 | 5.0 | 100\% | 6 | 4.2 | 83\% | 9 | 4.4 | 89\% |
| Female | 2 | 5.0 | 100\% | 5 | 4.4 | 88\% | 7 | 4.6 | 91\% |
| Male | 1 | 5.0 | 100\% | 1 | 3.0 | 60\% | 2 | 4.0 | 80\% |

Table CS.4. Average response per question according to ethnicity, caring responsibilities, and contract function

| Question | BME White Ethnicity |  |  | Caring Responsibilities |  |  | Full-time/Part-time Contract |  |  |  | Open/Fixed Term Contract |  |  | Grand <br> Total <br> ( $\mathrm{n}=45$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { BME } \\ (n=3) \end{gathered}$ | White $(n=40)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (n=43) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Yes } \\ (n=32) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { No } \\ (n=10) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ (n=42) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { FT } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{array}$ | FT flexi ( $\mathrm{n}=3$ ) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PT } \\ (n=4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ (n=42) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Open } \\ (n=43) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { FTC } \\ (\mathrm{n}=1) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ (n=44) \end{array}$ |  |
| Section 1 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.1 |
| Q1.1 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.1 |
| Q1.2 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| Q1.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 |
| Q1.4 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Q1.5 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Q1.6 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Section 2 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.9 |
| Q2.1 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 4.3 |
| Q2.2 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 4.3 |
| Q2.3 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Q2.4 | 2.7 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Q2.5 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| Q2.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Section 3 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Q3.1 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.1 | 4.0 |
| Q3.2 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.4 |
| Q3.4 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 5.0 | 4.1 | 4.1 |
| Q3.5 | 4.3 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| Q3.6 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 3.8 |
| Q3.7 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 3.5 |
| Section 4 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 3.9 |
| Q4.2 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Q4.3 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| Section 5 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| Q5.1 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 4.1 |
| Q5.2 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 3.7 |
| Q5.3 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 3.7 |
| Q5.4 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 4.7 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| Q5.5 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| Q5.6 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 4.2 |
| Q5.7 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| Q5.8 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Grand Total | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.9 |

Table CS.5. Count of responses per question and rating, by gender


| Response | N/a | Female |  |  | Male |  | Section 3 Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Q3.1 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 19\% | 1 | 5\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 3 | 2 | 67\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 24\% | 7 | 16\% |
| 4 | 1 | 33\% | 5 | 24\% | 8 | 38\% | 14 | 31\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 12 | 57\% | 7 | 33\% | 19 | 42\% |
| Q3.2 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 14\% | 3 | 14\% | 6 | 13\% |
| 3 | 2 | 67\% | 11 | 52\% | 4 | 19\% | 17 | 38\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 19\% | 7 | 33\% | 11 | 24\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 14\% | 6 | 29\% | 9 | 20\% |
| Q3.4 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 1 | 2\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 3 | 2 | 67\% | 3 | 14\% | 3 | 14\% | 8 | 18\% |
| 4 | 1 | 33\% | 4 | 19\% | 9 | 43\% | 14 | 31\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 12 | 57\% | 8 | 38\% | 20 | 44\% |
| Q3.5 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 33\% | 1 | 5\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 5 | 24\% | 7 | 33\% | 13 | 29\% |
| 4 | 1 | 33\% | 9 | 43\% | 8 | 38\% | 18 | 40\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 24\% | 5 | 24\% | 10 | 22\% |
| Q3.6 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 1 | 2\% |
| 2 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 5 | 24\% | 4 | 19\% | 10 | 22\% |
| 4 | 1 | 33\% | 8 | 38\% | 13 | 62\% | 22 | 49\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 38\% | 2 | 10\% | 10 | 22\% |
| Q3.7 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 2 | 67\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 3 | 7\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 10\% | 3 | 14\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 7 | 33\% | 3 | 14\% | 11 | 24\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 29\% | 11 | 52\% | 17 | 38\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 29\% | 3 | 14\% | 9 | 20\% |


| Response | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{a} \\ & \mathrm{n}= \end{aligned}$ | Female |  | Male |  |  | Section 4 Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Q4.2 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 7\% |
| 3 | 2 | 67\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 10\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 10 | 48\% | 13 | 62\% | 23 | 51\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 33\% | 6 | 29\% | 13 | 29\% |
| Q4.3 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 1 | 33\% | 2 | 10\% | 1 | 5\% | 4 | 9\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 2 | 10\% | 4 | 19\% | 7 | 16\% |
| 4 | 1 | 33\% | 10 | 48\% | 12 | 57\% | 23 | 51\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 33\% | 4 | 19\% | 11 | 24\% |


| Response | N/a$\mathrm{n}=$ | Female |  | Male |  |  | Section 5 Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Q5.1 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
| 2 | 1 | 33\% | 1 | 5\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 3 | 14\% | 2 | 10\% | 6 | 13\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 29\% | 13 | 62\% | 19 | 42\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 11 | 52\% | 6 | 29\% | 17 | 38\% |
| Q5.2 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 2 | 67\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 2 | 1 | 33\% | 3 | 14\% | 1 | 5\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 3 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 19\% | 6 | 29\% | 10 | 22\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 24\% | 11 | 52\% | 16 | 36\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 9 | 43\% | 3 | 14\% | 12 | 27\% |
| Q5.3 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 2 | 67\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 3 | 7\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 10\% | 3 | 14\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 3 | 14\% | 1 | 5\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 9 | 43\% | 12 | 57\% | 21 | 47\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 33\% | 4 | 19\% | 11 | 24\% |


| Response | N/a | Female |  |  | Male |  | Section 5 (cont.) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Q5.4 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 3 | 100\% | 1 | 5\% | 1 | 5\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 10\% | 3 | 14\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 3 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 29\% | 7 | 33\% | 13 | 29\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 29\% | 9 | 43\% | 15 | 33\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 29\% | 1 | 5\% | 7 | 16\% |
| Q5.5 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 7\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 3 | 14\% | 6 | 29\% | 10 | 22\% |
| 4 | 1 | 33\% | 6 | 29\% | 10 | 48\% | 17 | 38\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 9 | 43\% | 5 | 24\% | 14 | 31\% |
| Q5.6 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 3 | 14\% | 2 | 10\% | 6 | 13\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 29\% | 10 | 48\% | 16 | 36\% |
| 5 | 1 | 33\% | 12 | 57\% | 8 | 38\% | 21 | 47\% |
| Q5.7 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 14\% | 2 | 10\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 3 | 2 | 67\% | 4 | 19\% | 7 | 33\% | 13 | 29\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 33\% | 8 | 38\% | 15 | 33\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 33\% | 4 | 19\% | 11 | 24\% |
| Q5.8 | 3 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 3 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 38\% | 9 | 43\% | 17 | 38\% |
| 5 | 3 | 100\% | 12 | 57\% | 11 | 52\% | 26 | 58\% |

Table CS.6. Count of responses per question and rating by staff role and gender

| Section 1 | N/a n= | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | Academic Staff Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | Professional Support Staff Total |  |  |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Q1.1 | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1234Q1.2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
|  | 2 | 67\% | 2 | 14\% | 6 | 32\% | 10 | 28\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 10 | 22\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 29\% | 6 | 32\% | 10 | 28\% | 2 | 29\% | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 33\% | 13 | 29\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 57\% | 6 | 32\% | 14 | 39\% | 5 | 71\% | 1 | 50\% | 6 | 67\% | 20 | 44\% |
|  | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 12344Q1.3 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
|  | 2 | 67\% | 1 | 7\% | 3 | 16\% | 6 | 17\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 13\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 6 | 43\% | 7 | 37\% | 14 | 39\% | 1 | 14\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 22\% | 16 | 36\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 50\% | 9 | 47\% | 16 | 44\% | 6 | 86\% | 1 | 50\% | 7 | 78\% | 23 | 51\% |
|  | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1234Q1.4 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 2 | 14\% | 2 | 11\% | 5 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 11\% |
|  | 2 | 67\% | 3 | 21\% | 5 | 26\% | 10 | 28\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 10 | 22\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 21\% | 8 | 42\% | 11 | 31\% | 1 | 14\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 22\% | 13 | 29\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 43\% | 4 | 21\% | 10 | 28\% | 6 | 86\% | 1 | 50\% | 7 | 78\% | 17 | 38\% |
|  | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1234Q1.5 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 1 | 7\% | 1 | 5\% | 3 | 8\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 7\% |
|  | 2 | 67\% | 1 | 7\% | 5 | 26\% | 8 | 22\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 9 | 20\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 50\% | 7 | 37\% | 14 | 39\% | 1 | 14\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 22\% | 16 | 36\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 36\% | 5 | 26\% | 10 | 28\% | 5 | 71\% | 1 | 50\% | 6 | 67\% | 16 | 36\% |
|  | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1234Q1.6 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 7\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 2 | 14\% | 4 | 21\% | 7 | 19\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 8 | 18\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 8 | 57\% | 7 | 37\% | 16 | 44\% | 1 | 14\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 22\% | 18 | 40\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 21\% | 7 | 37\% | 10 | 28\% | 5 | 71\% | 1 | 50\% | 6 | 67\% | 16 | 36\% |
|  | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
| 3 | 3 | 100\% | 3 | 21\% | 4 | 21\% | 10 | 28\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 10 | 22\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 50\% | 9 | 47\% | 16 | 44\% | 4 | 57\% | 1 | 50\% | 5 | 56\% | 21 | 47\% |


| Section 2 | Academic Staff Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Professional Support Staff Total |  |  |  |  |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N/a $n=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | n= | \% |
| Q2.1 | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 1 | 33\% | 1 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 3 | 2 | 67\% | 2 | 14\% | 1 | 5\% | 5 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 11\% | 6 | 13\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 14\% | 8 | 42\% | 10 | 28\% | 3 | 43\% | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 44\% | 14 | 31\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 9 | 64\% | 10 | 53\% | 19 | 53\% | 4 | 57\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 44\% | 23 | 51\% |
| Q2.2 | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 1 | 33\% | 1 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 4 | 1 | 33\% | 4 | 29\% | 11 | 58\% | 16 | 44\% | 3 | 43\% | 2 | 100\% | 5 | 56\% | 21 | 47\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 9 | 64\% | 8 | 42\% | 17 | 47\% | 3 | 43\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 33\% | 20 | 44\% |
| Q2.3 | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 11\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 1 | 7\% | 1 | 5\% | 3 | 8\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 4 | 9\% |
| 4 | 1 | 33\% | 9 | 64\% | 13 | 68\% | 23 | 64\% | 2 | 29\% | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 33\% | 26 | 58\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 21\% | 5 | 26\% | 8 | 22\% | 4 | 57\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 44\% | 12 | 27\% |
| Q2.4 | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 33\% | 3 | 21\% | 1 | 5\% | 5 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
| 3 | 2 | 67\% | 2 | 14\% | 4 | 21\% | 8 | 22\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 9 | 20\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 21\% | 6 | 32\% | 9 | 25\% | 3 | 43\% | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 44\% | 13 | 29\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 43\% | 7 | 37\% | 13 | 36\% | 3 | 43\% | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 44\% | 17 | 38\% |
| Q2.5 | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 7\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 3 | 3 | 100\% | 2 | 14\% | 6 | 32\% | 11 | 31\% | 1 | 14\% | 2 | 100\% | 3 | 33\% | 14 | 31\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 43\% | 9 | 47\% | 15 | 42\% | 3 | 43\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 33\% | 18 | 40\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 21\% | 3 | 16\% | 6 | 17\% | 3 | 43\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 33\% | 9 | 20\% |
| Q2.6 | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 2 | 1 | 33\% | 2 | 14\% | 2 | 11\% | 5 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 3 | 2 | 67\% | 3 | 21\% | 7 | 37\% | 12 | 33\% | 1 | 14\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 22\% | 14 | 31\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 36\% | 7 | 37\% | 12 | 33\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 13 | 29\% |


| Section 3 | N/a n= | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Academic Staff Total |  |  |  |  |  | Professional Support Staff Total |  |  |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | n= | \% |
| Q3.1 | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1234Q3.2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 29\% | 1 | 5\% | 5 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 11\% |
|  | 2 | 67\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 26\% | 7 | 19\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 16\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 2 | 14\% | 7 | 37\% | 10 | 28\% | 3 | 43\% | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 44\% | 14 | 31\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 57\% | 6 | 32\% | 14 | 39\% | 4 | 57\% | 1 | 50\% | 5 | 56\% | 19 | 42\% |
|  | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 2345Q3.4 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 14\% | 3 | 16\% | 5 | 14\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 6 | 13\% |
|  | 2 | 67\% | 9 | 64\% | 3 | 16\% | 14 | 39\% | 2 | 29\% | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 33\% | 17 | 38\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 21\% | 7 | 37\% | 10 | 28\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 11 | 24\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 26\% | 5 | 14\% | 3 | 43\% | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 44\% | 9 | 20\% |
|  | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 234Q | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
|  | 2 | 67\% | 3 | 21\% | 3 | 16\% | 8 | 22\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 18\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 3 | 21\% | 8 | 42\% | 12 | 33\% | 1 | 14\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 22\% | 14 | 31\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 43\% | 7 | 37\% | 13 | 36\% | 6 | 86\% | 1 | 50\% | 7 | 78\% | 20 | 44\% |
|  | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1234Q3.6 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 2 | 4\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 7\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 4 | 29\% | 7 | 37\% | 12 | 33\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 13 | 29\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 6 | 43\% | 7 | 37\% | 14 | 39\% | 3 | 43\% | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 44\% | 18 | 40\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 21\% | 4 | 21\% | 7 | 19\% | 2 | 29\% | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 33\% | 10 | 22\% |
|  | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 12345Q3.7 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 4 | 29\% | 4 | 21\% | 9 | 25\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 10 | 22\% |
|  | 1 | 33\% | 5 | 36\% | 11 | 58\% | 17 | 47\% | 3 | 43\% | 2 | 100\% | 5 | 56\% | 22 | 49\% |
|  | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 36\% | 2 | 11\% | 7 | 19\% | 3 | 43\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 33\% | 10 | 22\% |
|  | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 2 | 67\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 3 | 8\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 7\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 14\% | 3 | 16\% | 5 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 6 | 43\% | 3 | 16\% | 10 | 28\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 11 | 24\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 29\% | 10 | 53\% | 14 | 39\% | 2 | 29\% | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 33\% | 17 | 38\% |
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| 3 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 43\% | 7 | 37\% | 13 | 36\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 13 | 29\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 21\% | 7 | 37\% | 10 | 28\% | 3 | 43\% | 2 | 100\% | 5 | 56\% | 15 | 33\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 14\% | 1 | 5\% | 3 | 8\% | 4 | 57\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 44\% | 7 | 16\% |
| Section 5 |  |  |  |  |  | Aca | ic St | f Total |  |  | Profe | onal Su | t St | f Total | Gra | Total |
| (cont.) | N/a n= | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Q5.5 | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 3 | 7\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 2 | 14\% | 4 | 21\% | 7 | 19\% | 1 | 14\% | 2 | 100\% | 3 | 33\% | 10 | 22\% |
| 4 | 1 | 33\% | 5 | 36\% | 10 | 53\% | 16 | 44\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 17 | 38\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 36\% | 5 | 26\% | 10 | 28\% | 4 | 57\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 44\% | 14 | 31\% |
| Q5.6 | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 3 | 1 | 33\% | 2 | 14\% | 2 | 11\% | 5 | 14\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 11\% | 6 | 13\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 36\% | 9 | 47\% | 14 | 39\% | 1 | 14\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 22\% | 16 | 36\% |
| 5 | 1 | 33\% | 7 | 50\% | 7 | 37\% | 15 | 42\% | 5 | 71\% | 1 | 50\% | 6 | 67\% | 21 | 47\% |
| Q5.7 | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 2\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 21\% | 2 | 11\% | 5 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 11\% |
| 3 | 2 | 67\% | 2 | 14\% | 6 | 32\% | 10 | 28\% | 2 | 29\% | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 33\% | 13 | 29\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 36\% | 7 | 37\% | 12 | 33\% | 2 | 29\% | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 33\% | 15 | 33\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 29\% | 4 | 21\% | 8 | 22\% | 3 | 43\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 33\% | 11 | 24\% |
| Q5.8 | 3 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 3 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 7\% | 1 | 5\% | 2 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 4\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 43\% | 8 | 42\% | 14 | 39\% | 2 | 29\% | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 33\% | 17 | 38\% |
| 5 | 3 | 100\% | 7 | 50\% | 10 | 53\% | 20 | 56\% | 5 | 71\% | 1 | 50\% | 6 | 67\% | 26 | 58\% |

Table CS.7. Count of responses per question and rating, by academic contract type and gender

|  | Research and Teaching (ART) Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) Total |  |  |  |  | Academic Staff |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section 1 | N/a $n=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | N/a $n=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Total $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Q1.1 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 20\% | 5 | 29\% | 8 | 28\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 29\% | 10 | 28\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 5 | 29\% | 7 | 24\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 43\% | 10 | 28\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 60\% | 6 | 35\% | 12 | 41\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 14 | 39\% |
| Q1.2 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 3 | 2 | 100\% | 1 | 10\% | 2 | 12\% | 5 | 17\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 14\% | 6 | 17\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 50\% | 6 | 35\% | 11 | 38\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 43\% | 14 | 39\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 40\% | 9 | 53\% | 13 | 45\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 75\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 43\% | 16 | 44\% |
| Q1.3 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 20\% | 2 | 12\% | 5 | 17\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 20\% | 3 | 18\% | 6 | 21\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 25\% | 2 | 100\% | 4 | 57\% | 10 | 28\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 10\% | 8 | 47\% | 9 | 31\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 11 | 31\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 50\% | 4 | 24\% | 9 | 31\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 10 | 28\% |
| Q1.4 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 2 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 1 | 6\% | 3 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 8\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 18\% | 4 | 14\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 25\% | 2 | 100\% | 4 | 57\% | 8 | 22\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 60\% | 7 | 41\% | 13 | 45\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 14 | 39\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 5 | 29\% | 8 | 28\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 10 | 28\% |
| Q1.5 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 10\% | 1 | 6\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 3 | 18\% | 5 | 17\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 29\% | 7 | 19\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 60\% | 6 | 35\% | 12 | 41\% | 1 | 100\% | 2 | 50\% | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 57\% | 16 | 44\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 7 | 41\% | 9 | 31\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 10 | 28\% |
| Q1.6 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 3 | 2 | 100\% | 3 | 30\% | 4 | 24\% | 9 | 31\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 10 | 28\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 40\% | 7 | 41\% | 11 | 38\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 75\% | 2 | 100\% | 5 | 71\% | 16 | 44\% |

0

Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) Total
Research and Teaching (ART) Total

|  | Research and Teaching (ART) Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) Total |  |  |  |  | Academic Staff |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section 2 | N/a $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | N/a $n=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Total $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Q2.1 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 20\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 14\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 10\% | 6 | 35\% | 7 | 24\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 2 | 100\% | 3 | 43\% | 10 | 28\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 60\% | 10 | 59\% | 16 | 55\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 75\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 43\% | 19 | 53\% |
| Q2.2 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 9 | 53\% | 12 | 41\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 25\% | 2 | 100\% | 4 | 57\% | 16 | 44\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 60\% | 8 | 47\% | 14 | 48\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 75\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 43\% | 17 | 47\% |
| Q2.3 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 1 | 6\% | 3 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 8\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 50\% | 11 | 65\% | 16 | 55\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 23 | 64\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 5 | 29\% | 8 | 28\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 22\% |
| Q2.4 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 30\% | 1 | 6\% | 5 | 17\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 3 | 18\% | 5 | 17\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 43\% | 8 | 22\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 5 | 29\% | 7 | 24\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 29\% | 9 | 25\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 40\% | 7 | 41\% | 11 | 38\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 13 | 36\% |
| Q2.5 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 14\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 3 | 2 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 29\% | 7 | 24\% | 1 | 100\% | 2 | 50\% | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 57\% | 11 | 31\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 40\% | 9 | 53\% | 13 | 45\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 15 | 42\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 3 | 18\% | 6 | 21\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 17\% |
| Q2.6 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 2 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 1 | 6\% | 3 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 29\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 6 | 35\% | 8 | 28\% | 1 | 100\% | 2 | 50\% | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 57\% | 12 | 33\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 40\% | 7 | 41\% | 11 | 38\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 12 | 33\% | \% Male $n=$ $\begin{array}{rr}\% & n= \\ 100 \% & 7\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{rr}\mathrm{n}= & \text { \% } \\ 7 & \mathbf{1 0 0 \%} \\ 0 & 0 \%\end{array}$
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Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) Total Academic Staff

| Section 3 | Research and Teaching (ART) Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N/a $n=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | N/a $n=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ |
| Q3.1 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 |
| 3 | 2 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 18\% | 5 | 17\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 7 | 41\% | 9 | 31\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 50\% | 6 | 35\% | 11 | 38\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 |
| Q3.2 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 6 | 60\% | 3 | 18\% | 10 | 34\% | 1 | 100\% | 3 |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 6 | 35\% | 8 | 28\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 29\% | 5 | 17\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| Q3.4 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 |
| 3 | 2 | 100\% | 2 | 20\% | 3 | 18\% | 7 | 24\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 6 | 35\% | 9 | 31\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 40\% | 7 | 41\% | 11 | 38\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 |
| Q3.5 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 10\% | 1 | 6\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 30\% | 7 | 41\% | 11 | 38\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 5 | 29\% | 8 | 28\% | 1 | 100\% | 3 |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 4 | 24\% | 7 | 24\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| Q3.6 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 20\% | 4 | 24\% | 7 | 24\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 10 | 59\% | 13 | 45\% | 1 | 100\% | 2 |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 50\% | 2 | 12\% | 7 | 24\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| Q3.7 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 |
| 1 | 2 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 3 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 10\% | 2 | 12\% | 3 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 |
| 3 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 40\% | 3 | 18\% | 7 | 24\% | 1 | 100\% | 2 |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 9 | 53\% | 12 | 41\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 |


| \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Total $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 0\% | 2 | 100\% | 2 | 29\% | 7 | 19\% |
| 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 10 | 28\% |
| 75\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 43\% | 14 | 39\% |
| 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 14\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 75\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 57\% | 14 | 39\% |
| 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 29\% | 10 | 28\% |
| 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 8 | 22\% |
| 0\% | 2 | 100\% | 3 | 43\% | 12 | 33\% |
| 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 13 | 36\% |
| 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 12 | 33\% |
| 75\% | 2 | 100\% | 6 | 86\% | 14 | 39\% |
| 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 19\% |
| 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 14\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 9 | 25\% |
| 50\% | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 57\% | 17 | 47\% |
| 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 19\% |
| 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 8\% |
| 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 29\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 43\% | 10 | 28\% |
| 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 29\% | 14 | 39\% |

Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) Total Academic Staff

|  | Research and Teaching (ART) Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) Total |  |  |  |  | Academic Staff |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section 4 | N/a $n=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | N/a $n=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Total $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Q4.2 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 3 | 8\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 14\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 50\% | 10 | 59\% | 15 | 52\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 29\% | 17 | 47\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 5 | 29\% | 7 | 24\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 43\% | 10 | 28\% |
| Q4.3 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 20\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 11\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 3 | 18\% | 5 | 17\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 6 | 17\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 40\% | 9 | 53\% | 13 | 45\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 25\% | 2 | 100\% | 4 | 57\% | 17 | 47\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 4 | 24\% | 7 | 24\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 9 | 25\% |
| Section 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q5.1 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 2 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 3 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 14\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 6 | 17\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 10 | 59\% | 12 | 41\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 2 | 100\% | 3 | 43\% | 15 | 42\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 50\% | 5 | 29\% | 10 | 34\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 12 | 33\% |
| Q5.2 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 2 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 10\% | 1 | 6\% | 2 | 7\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 4 | 11\% |
| 3 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 5 | 29\% | 8 | 28\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 29\% | 10 | 28\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 8 | 47\% | 10 | 34\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 29\% | 12 | 33\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 40\% | 3 | 18\% | 7 | 24\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 8 | 22\% |
| Q5.3 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 2 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 3 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 8\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 3 | 18\% | 5 | 17\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 3 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 10\% | 1 | 6\% | 2 | 7\% | 1 | 100\% | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 43\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 50\% | 8 | 47\% | 13 | 45\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 2 | 100\% | 3 | 43\% | 16 | 44\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 4 | 24\% | 6 | 21\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 7 | 19\% |
| Q5.4 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 2 | 100\% | 1 | 10\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 14\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 10\% | 3 | 18\% | 4 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 5 | 14\% |


| Section 5 (cont.) | Research and Teaching (ART) Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) Total |  |  |  |  | Academic Staff |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N/a $n=$ | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | N/a n= | \% | Female $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Male $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Total $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Q5.5 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 4 | 24\% | 6 | 21\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 7 | 19\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 30\% | 8 | 47\% | 11 | 38\% | 1 | 100\% | 2 | 50\% | 2 | 100\% | 5 | 71\% | 16 | 44\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 40\% | 5 | 29\% | 9 | 31\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 10 | 28\% |
| Q5.6 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 2 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 10\% | 1 | 6\% | 3 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 29\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 40\% | 8 | 47\% | 12 | 41\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 29\% | 14 | 39\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 50\% | 7 | 41\% | 12 | 41\% | 1 | 100\% | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 43\% | 15 | 42\% |
| Q5.7 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 5 | 14\% |
| 3 | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 20\% | 4 | 24\% | 7 | 24\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 100\% | 3 | 43\% | 10 | 28\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 40\% | 7 | 41\% | 11 | 38\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 12 | 33\% |
| 5 | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 20\% | 4 | 24\% | 6 | 21\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 8 | 22\% |
| Q5.8 | 2 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 36 | 100\% |
| 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| 3 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 2 | 6\% |
| 4 | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 50\% | 8 | 47\% | 13 | 45\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 14 | 39\% |
| 5 | 2 | 100\% | 5 | 50\% | 8 | 47\% | 15 | 52\% | 1 | 100\% | 2 | 50\% | 2 | 100\% | 5 | 71\% | 20 | 56\% |


|  | Gender (Total $\mathrm{n}=14$ ) |  |  |  | Total <br> \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q1.7 Do you have any suggestions for ways the Department could increase the sense of belonging and inclusion? | $\underset{(n=7)}{F}$ | $\underset{(n=5)}{M}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N / a \\ & (n=2) \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{n}=$ |  |
| 1. No comment. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 29\% |
| 2. There should be more emphasis on staff networks and/or social events. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 29\% |
| 3. When concerns are raised, they should be taken more seriously. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14\% |
| 4. There should be more recognition and celebration of the work that staff do. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 14\% |
| 5. There should be more racial and/or gender diversity in the department. The department's hiring strategy needs to be amended. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14\% |
| 6. There should be greater equality between $T \& S$ and research staff, $O R$, There should be greater equality in terms of workload and job security. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14\% |
| 7. The department is too large to foster a sense of cohesion, inclusion, and belonging. Well-led, smaller clusters could better achieve this. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7\% |
| 8. There should be more effective training around unconscious bias and inclusive practices. The culture of the department should enforce this training in practice, and hold people accountable. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7\% |
| 9. More should be done to create an inclusive environment for students. This begins with staff behaviour. All staff should be expected to contribute to widening participation. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7\% |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 58 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 32 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 10 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19 \\ 100 \% \end{array}$ | 100\% |
|  | Gend | (Tota | $n=13)$ |  | Total |
| Q2.7 Do you have any suggestions for ways the department can improve gender equality? | $\underset{(n=6)}{F}$ | $\underset{(n=5)}{M}$ | $\begin{gathered} N / a \\ (n=2) \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| 1. No comment. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 31\% |
| 2. Take practical steps to address workload inequality, which disproportionately impacts women. This is especially true under the effects of Covid-19 (due to caring responsibilities), and it continues to have a knock-on impact on workloads and output. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 23\% |
| 3. There is clearly an effort being made to address gender equality issues. However, the voices of those affected need to be amplified and foregrounded. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8\% |
| 4. There should be fewer male professors. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8\% |
| 5. There should be coaching for attaining committee positions aimed towards non-men. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8\% |


| 6. All work activities should be workloaded in order to have a better understanding of how work is distributed along gendered lines. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7. More formal encouragement of men to take caring leave and be supported upon their return. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8\% |
| 8. Gender equality should not be measured by the demographics of leadership roles. It is a matter of acknowledging equal capabilities. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8\% |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 46 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 38 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 16 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ 100 \% \end{array}$ | 100\% |
|  | Gender (Total $\mathrm{n}=9$ ) |  |  |  | Total <br> \% |
| Q3.8 Please share any suggestions for the Department to improve support for a good work-life balance and the general wellbeing of staff | $\begin{gathered} F \\ (n=4) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(n=3)}{M}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N / a \\ & (n=2) \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{n}=$ |  |
| 1. Workloads are too high in general. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 44\% |
| 2. There is not enough time for research. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 33\% |
| 3. Teaching loads should be reduced. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 33\% |
| 4. Supervision of students should attract more recognition as a time-intensive work activity. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22\% |
| 5. No comment. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22\% |
| 6. There should be greater equality in (caring) leave opportunities between ART, T\&S, and support staff. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11\% |
| 7. There should be better, and more long-term, mental health support available. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11\% |
| 8. Preparation time should be workloaded and should take in account (lack of) experience and/or familiarity with teaching content. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7\% |
| 9. Individual staff should be consulted on their timetabling. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11\% |
| 10. There should be a wider range of options for flexible working (reducing hours is not always a suitable option). | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11\% |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ 63 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 26 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 11 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19 \\ 100 \% \end{array}$ | 100\% |
|  | Gender (Total $\mathrm{n}=6$ ) |  |  |  | Total |
| Q4.4 Is there anything the department can do to improve how we tackle bullying and harassment? | $\underset{(n=2)}{F}$ | $\underset{(n=2)}{M}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N / a \\ & (n=2) \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| 1. No comment. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 33\% |
| 2. There should be more supervision and surveillance of GTAs and how they relate to their students. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 17\% |
| 3. There needs to be better understanding amongst colleagues of what is/is not acceptable, and greater sensitivity to complicated social dynamics. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17\% |


| 4. I am not aware of any bullying. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5. I am aware of some instances of behaviour that I do not feel are appropriate. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 17\% |
|  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 100\% |
|  | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% | 100\% |  |
|  | Gen | (To | $\mathrm{n}=9$ ) |  | Total |
| Q5.9 Please share any suggestions for ways the department can improve support for equitable and inclusive recruitment, career development and/or promotion process | $\underset{(n=5)}{F}$ | $\underset{(n=2)}{M}$ | $\begin{gathered} N / a \\ (n=2) \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| 1. Targeted recruitment or an amended recruitment strategy to increase diversity along gender, race, and class lines. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 33\% |
| 2. Address workload inequality. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 22\% |
| 3. Less focus on REF when it comes to recruitment priorities. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22\% |
| 4. Better coaching and guidance on how to achieve promotion for mid-career staff, along with support that is tailored to this career level specifically. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11\% |
| 5. Offer specific Covid-related support to help mitigate the effects of the pandemic on mental health, workloads, and output. This directly impacts promotion eligibility. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11\% |
| 6. Make meetings with mentors optional. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11\% |
| 7. Clearer guidance for ALs about how to progress into permanent positions. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11\% |
| 8. Offer career development opportunities for professional support staff. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11\% |
| 9. Give T\&S staff more flexibility, recognition, and greater ownership of their work. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11\% |
| 10. Better career support and promotion opportunities for T\&S staff. Make opportunities for innovation, research, and networking available to T\&S staff on par with ART staff. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11\% |
| 11. Recruit more women at junior levels. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11\% |
| 12. Greater commitment to supporting a healthy work-life balance. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11\% |
| 13. Increase fairness and equality of opportunity within the department. Increase transparency of decision-making. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11\% |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 65 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 12 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 23 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 100 \% \end{array}$ | 100\% |

Figure CS.1. Pie charts illustrating respondent demographics


Figure CS.2. Bar graphs for total count of responses per question and rating

| - Total ( $\mathrm{n}=45$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{r} 45 \\ 40 \\ 35 \\ 30 \\ 25 \\ 20 \\ 15 \\ 10 \\ 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 2 <br> $(4 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (22 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|c}  & \begin{array}{c} 20 \\ (44 \%) \\ 13 \\ (29 \%) \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(13 \%)}{6}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (36 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (51 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 <br> (0\%) |  <br> 5 <br> $(11 \%)$ <br> $\square$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (22 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  | chen 17 $(38 \%)$ $\square$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 3 $(7 \%)$ | 9 <br> $(20 \%)$ <br> $\square$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (36 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (36 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 1 $(2 \%)$ | 2 $(4 \%)$ | 8 <br> $(18 \%)$ |  | 0 (0\%) | 1 (2\%) | 10 $(22 \%)$ | 21 <br> (47\%) <br> 13 <br> (29\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { Q1.1 } \end{gathered}$ | 2 <br> I feel dep | 3 <br> ike I be partme | $4 \quad 5$ <br> long in my nt | 1 <br> Q1. pleas | $2$ <br> 2 The nt wo | $3$ <br> depar rking | 4 <br> tment environ | 5 <br> is a ment |  | $2$ <br> My co ued in | $3$ <br> ontrib my dep | $4$ <br> utions partme | 5 <br> are ent | 1 <br> Q1.4 abou | $2$ <br> I feel me | $3$ <br> that p my d | 4 <br> people departm | 5 <br> care <br> ment | $1$ | 2 <br> 5 Ife <br> king my | 3 <br> el com <br> p and <br> opinio | $4 \quad 5$ <br> fortable expressing ns |  | $2$ 1.6 Th partm | $3$ <br> cultu ent is | re of my ndusive |






Figure CS.3. Bar graphs for count of responses per question and rating, by gender






Figure CS.4. Bar graphs for count of responses per question and rating, by gender, staff role, and contract type, where women's average response was lower than men's




Figure CS.5. Bar graphs for average responses to Q2.6 and Q3.6, by caring responsibilities (yes/no), gender, staff role, and academic contract type


Q3.6. My department provides staff with support around all types of caring leave


## Appendix 2: Data tables

Please present the mandatory data tables, and if desired, any additional datasets.

|  | Department data requirements | Location | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Students at foundation, UG, PGT, and PGR level | Table DT. 15 <br> Table DT. 16 | Table DT. 15 includes UG students on PPE degrees that are jointly run by the Politics Department. Table DT. 16 only includes UG students on Politics degrees (Politics, IR, Politics with IR, and Global Development) |
| 2 | Degree attainment and/or completion rates for students at foundation, UG, PGT, and PGR level | Table DT. 17 <br> Table <br> DT.17a | Data for UG attainment is currently available only up to the academic year 2020/21. |
| 3 | Academic staff by grade and contract function | Table DT. 4 <br> Table DT. 6 <br> Table DT. 7 <br> Table DT. 8 | Table DT. 4 and Table DT. 6 represent the current year. Table DT. 6 excludes postdoctoral researchers. Table DT. 7 and Table DT. 8 cover the period 2018-23. Table DT. 8 includes postdocs, who are all on fixed term contracts. |
| 4 | Academic staff by grade and contract type | Table DT. 2 <br> Table DT. 5 <br> Table DT. 9 | Data for the current year represents the demographics of the Department as of July 2023, to include newly recruited staff. Table DT. 2 and Table DT. 5 detail the current year. |
| 5 | Professional, technical and operational (PTO) staff by job family | Table DT. 1 | There are no technical and operational staff in the department. Thus, this data relates to professional support staff (PSS) only. Since PSS are not categorised by job family, we include Grade as an alternative. Departmental officers are included alongside PSS in the category of 'non-academic staff' in Table DT.3, Table DT.3a, and Figure DT.1. |
| 6 | PTO staff by contract type | Table DT. 3 <br> Table DT.3a | PSS are hired on open-ended contracts by default, except when there is an acute need for additional support. There are no PSS on fixed term contracts currently. We include part-time/full-time status. |
| 7 | Applications, shortlists and appointments made in recruitment to academic posts | Table DT. 11 <br> Table <br> DT.11a <br> Table DT. 12 <br> Table <br> DT.12a | Our Departmental Manager changed in 2021 and shortlists data was not transferred to the new DHFO. We did not manage to obtain it from HR either. However, we have consistently sought to have gender-balanced shortlists, though this has proved impossible in traditionally male dominated specialisms, like Public Policy. Table DT. 11 and Table DT.11a provide applications data aggregated over the period 2017-22. The proportion of female applicants remained consistent year on year, at a ratio of approximately $1: 2$, with the exception of professorial level (1:5). Table DT. 12 and Table DT.12a provide appointments data. There is no recruitment at Grade 8 (Senior Lecturer). |
| 8 | Applications, shortlists and appointments made in recruitment to PTO posts | Table DT. 11 <br> Table <br> DT.12a | Table DT. 11 and Table DT.12a include both academic and professional support staff for comparison. The proportion of female:male applicants for PSS roles is the inverse of academic posts (2:1). |
| 9 | Applications and success rates for academic promotion | Table DT. 10 | With the exception of one application for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer by a male staff member, all applications have been successful between 2017-22. |
| 10 | Applications and success rates for PTO progression | N/a | There is a lack of career progression for PSS. Besides changing jobs altogether, career progression only occurs through role reviews and secondment opportunities. |

Table DT.1. Current professional support staff by grade and gender

|  | Grade 4 | Grade 5 |  | Grade 6 |  | Grand Total |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Gender | $\mathbf{n}=$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{n}=$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{n}=$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{n}=$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Female | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 \%}$ |
| Full-time | $\mathbf{7}$ | $64 \%$ | 1 | $20 \%$ | 3 | $60 \%$ | 11 | $52 \%$ |
| Part-time | 4 | $36 \%$ | 4 | $80 \%$ | 2 | $40 \%$ | 10 | $48 \%$ |
| Male | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 \%}$ |
| Full-time | 1 | $100 \%$ | 2 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 3 | $100 \%$ |
| Part-time | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Table DT.3. Current non-academic staff by job role and full-time/part-time status

|  | Part-time |  | Full-time | Grand Total |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job role | $\mathbf{n}=$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{n}=$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{n}=$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Departmental officer | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Female | 0 | $0 \%$ | 7 | $41 \%$ | 7 | $41 \%$ |
| Male | 0 | $0 \%$ | 10 | $59 \%$ | 10 | $59 \%$ |
| Professional support staff | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Female | 10 | $100 \%$ | 11 | $79 \%$ | 21 | $87 \%$ |
| Male | 0 | $0 \%$ | 3 | $21 \%$ | 3 | $13 \%$ |
| Total Female | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Total Male | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Table DT.3a. Current non-academic staff by gender and full-time/part-time status

| Gender | Part-time |  | Full-time |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Female | 10 | 100\% | 18 | 55\% | 28 | 68\% |
| Departmental officer | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 41\% | 7 | 25\% |
| Professional support staff | 10 | 100\% | 11 | 59\% | 21 | 75\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 13 | 42\% | 13 | 32\% |
| Departmental officer | 0 | 0\% | 10 | 77\% | 10 | 77\% |
| Professional support staff | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 23\% | 3 | 23\% |
| Grand Total | 10 | 100\% | 31 | 100\% | 41 | 100\% |

Table DT.2. Current academic staff by grade and academic contract type, excluding postdocs

| Level of Seniority | ART |  |  | T\&S | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $n=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Associate Lecturer (Grade 6) | 0 | 0\% | 9 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 44\% | 4 | 44\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 56\% | 5 | 56\% |
| Lecturer (Grade 7) | 17 | 68\% | 8 | 32\% | 25 | 100\% |
| Female | 5 | 29\% | 2 | 25\% | 7 | 28\% |
| Male | 12 | 71\% | 6 | 75\% | 18 | 72\% |
| Senior Lecturer (Grade 8) | 17 | 89\% | 2 | 11\% | 19 | 100\% |
| Female | 8 | 44\% | 1 | 50\% | 9 | 47\% |
| Male | 9 | 56\% | 1 | 50\% | 10 | 53\% |
| Professor (Grade 9) | 15 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 15 | 100\% |
| Female | 7 | 47\% | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 47\% |
| Male | 8 | 53\% | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 53\% |
| Total Female | 20 | 74\% | 7 | 26\% | 27 | 100\% |
| Total Male | 29 | 71\% | 12 | 29\% | 41 | 100\% |
| Grand Total | 49 | 72\% | 19 | 28\% | 68 | 100\% |

Table DT.4. Current academic staff by grade and contract function

| Level of Seniority | Fixed Term |  | Open Contract |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Postdoc Research Fellow | 8 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 100\% |
| Female | 6 | 75\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 75\% |
| Male | 2 | 25\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 25\% |
| Associate Lecturer (Grade 6) | 7 | 42\% | 2 | 58\% | 9 | 100\% |
| Female | 3 | 43\% | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 44\% |
| Male | 4 | 57\% | 1 | 50\% | 5 | 556 |
| Lecturer (Grade 7) | 0 | 0\% | 25 | 100\% | 25 | 100\% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 28\% | 7 | 28\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 18 | 72\% | 18 | 72\% |
| Senior Lecturer (Grade 8) | 0 | 0\% | 19 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 9 | 47\% | 9 | 47\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 10 | 53\% | 10 | 53\% |
| Professor (Grade 9) | 0 | 0\% | 15 | 100\% | 15 | 100\% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 47\% | 7 | 47\% |


| Male | 0 | $0 \%$ | 8 | $53 \%$ | 8 | $53 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Female | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Total Male | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Table DT.5. Current academic staff by academic contract type and contract function, excluding postdocs

| Level of Seniority | Research and Scholarship (ART) |  |  |  |  |  | Teaching and Scholarship (T\&S) |  |  |  |  |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fixed Term |  | Open |  | Total |  | Fixed Term |  | Open |  | Total |  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |  |  |
| Associate Lecturer (Grade 6) | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 78\% | 2 | 77\% | 9 | 68\% | 9 | 100\% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 43\% | 1 | 50\% | 4 | 44\% | 4 | 44\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 57\% | 1 | 50\% | 5 | 56\% | 5 | 56\% |
| Lecturer (Grade 7) | 0 | 0\% | 17 | 100\% | 17 | 68\% | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 100\% | 8 | 32\% | 25 | 100\% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 29\% | 5 | 29\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 25\% | 2 | 25\% | 7 | 28\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 12 | 71\% | 12 | 71\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 75\% | 6 | 75\% | 18 | 72\% |
| Senior Lecturer (Grade 8) | 0 | 0\% | 17 | 100\% | 17 | 89\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 100\% | 2 | 11\% | 19 | 100\% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 47\% | 8 | 47\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 50\% | 9 | 47\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 9 | 53\% | 9 | 53\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 50\% | 10 | 53\% |
| Professor (Grade 9) | 0 | 0\% | 15 | 100\% | 15 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 15 | 100\% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 47\% | 7 | 47\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 47\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 53\% | 8 | 53\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 53\% |
| Grand Total | 0 | 0\% | 49 | 100\% | 49 | 72\% | 7 | 37\% | 12 | 63\% | 19 | 28\% | 68 | 100\% |

Table DT.6. Current academic staff by gender and contract function, excluding postdocs

| Gender | Fixed Term Contract |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Open Ended Contract |  |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ART |  | T\&S |  | Total | ART |  |  | T\&S |  | Total \% |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ |  | $\mathrm{n}=$ |  | n= | \% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 100\% | 3 | 11\% | 19 | 79\% | 5 | 21\% | 24 | 89\% | 27 | 100\% |
| Associate Lecturer (Grade 6) | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 100\% | 3 | 75\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 25\% | 4 | 100\% |
| Lecturer (Grade 7) | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 71\% | 2 | 29\% | 7 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% |
| Senior Lecturer (Grade 8) | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 89\% | 1 | 11\% | 9 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% |
| Professor (Grade 9) | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 86\% | 1 | 14\% | 7 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 100\% | 4 | 10\% | 29 | 78\% | 8 | 22\% | 37 | 90\% | 41 | 100\% |
| Associate Lecturer (Grade 6) | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 100\% | 4 | 67\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 100\% | 2 | 33\% | 6 | 100\% |
| Lecturer (Grade 7) | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 11 | 65\% | 6 | 35\% | 17 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% |
| Senior Lecturer (Grade 8) | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 10 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 10 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% |
| Professor (Grade 9) | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 100\% | 8 | 100\% |
| Grand Total | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 100\% | 7 | 10\% | 48 | 79\% | 13 | 21\% | 61 | 90\% | 68 | 100\% |

Figure DT.1. Pie charts of current staff demographics

| Staff Role | Non-Academic Staff | Departmental Officers | Professional Support Staff (PSS) | Academic Staff |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic Contract Type | ART Staff | T\&S Staff | Associate Lecturer Grade 6 | Lecturer Grade 7 |
| Senior Lecturer Grade 8 | Professor Grade 9 | Academic Staff: Contract Function | Fixed Term Contract | Open Ended Contract |



Figure DT.1a. Proportion of BME identity by staff role 2022


Table DT.7. Academic staff by gender, grade, and contract function between 2018-2023, excluding postdocs

| Gender | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | 2023 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Female | 33 | 48\% | 32 | 43\% | 30 | 45\% | 28 | 41\% | 33 | 42\% | 27 | 40\% |
| Grade 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Associate Lecturer | 14 | 42\% | 9 | 29\% | 8 | 27\% | 7 | 26\% | 12 | 35\% | 4 | 15\% |
| Fixed Term Contract | 12 | 85\% | 8 | 89\% | 4 | 45\% | 3 | 40\% | 6 | 54\% | 3 | 75\% |
| Open Contract | 2 | 15\% | 1 | 11\% | 4 | 55\% | 4 | 60\% | 5 | 46\% | 1 | 25\% |
| Grade 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lecturer | 10 | 30\% | 15 | 46\% | 13 | 43\% | 8 | 28\% | 9 | 26\% | 7 | 26\% |
| Fixed Term Contract | 1 | 10\% | 1 | 7\% | 1 | 8\% | 1 | 13\% | 1 | 8\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Open Contract | 9 | 90\% | 14 | 93\% | 12 | 92\% | 7 | 87\% | 8 | 92\% | 7 | 100\% |
| Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Senior Lecturer | 5 | 15\% | 4 | 13\% | 4 | 13\% | 8 | 28\% | 9 | 26\% | 9 | 33\% |
| Open Contract | 5 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 8 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% |
| Grade 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reader | 1 | 3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open contract | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professor | 3 | 9\% | 4 | 13\% | 5 | 17\% | 5 | 18\% | 4 | 12\% | 7 | 26\% |
| Open Contract | 3 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 5 | 100\% | 5 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% |
| Total Fixed Term Contract | 13 | 39\% | 9 | 29\% | 5 | 15\% | 4 | 14\% | 7 | 21\% | 3 | 11\% |
| Total Open Contract | 20 | 61\% | 23 | 71\% | 25 | 85\% | 24 | 86\% | 26 | 79\% | 24 | 89\% |
| Total Female | 33 | 100\% | 32 | 100\% | 30 | 100\% | 28 | 100\% | 33 | 42\% | 27 | 100\% |
| Male | 36 | 52\% | 42 | 57\% | 37 | 55\% | 41 | 59\% | 45 | 58\% | 41 | 60\% |
| Grade 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Associate Lecturer | 17 | 47\% | 20 | 47\% | 12 | 33\% | 11 | 27\% | 9 | 20\% | 5 | 12\% |
| Fixed Term Contract | 15 | 88\% | 16 | 79\% | 9 | 75\% | 7 | 64\% | 7 | 78\% | 4 | 80\% |
| Open Contract | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 21\% | 3 | 25\% | 4 | 36\% | 2 | 22\% | 1 | 20\% |
| Grade 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lecturer | 7 | 20\% | 7 | 17\% | 7 | 19\% | 11 | 27\% | 17 | 38\% | 18 | 44\% |
| Open Contract | 7 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 11 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 18 | 100\% |
| Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Senior Lecturer | 6 | 17\% | 9 | 21\% | 9 | 24\% | 10 | 24\% | 10 | 22\% | 10 | 24\% |
| Open Contract | 6 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% |
| Grade 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professor | 6 | 15\% | 6 | 15\% | 9 | 24\% | 9 | 22\% | 9 | 20\% | 8 | 20\% |
| Open Contract | 6 | 100\% | 6 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% | 8 | 100\% |
| Total Fixed Term Contract | 15 | 42\% | 16 | 37\% | 9 | 25\% | 7 | 17\% | 7 | 16\% | 4 | 10\% |
| Total Open Contract | 21 | 58\% | 26 | 63\% | 28 | 75\% | 34 | 83\% | 38 | 84\% | 37 | 88\% |
| Total Male | 36 | 100\% | 42 | 100\% | 37 | 100\% | 41 | 100\% | 45 | 100\% | 41 | 100\% |
| Grand Total | 69 | 100\% | 74 | 100\% | 67 | 100\% | 69 | 100\% | 78 | 100\% | 68 | 100\% |

Table DT.8. Academic staff by grade and contract function between 2018-2023

| Grade 6 - Associate Lecturer/Postdoc | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | 2023 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Fixed Term Contract | 26 | 87\% | 24 | 83\% | 13 | 65\% | 10 | 56\% | 13 | 64\% | 15 | 88\% |
| Female | 12 | 44\% | 8 | 34\% | 4 | 28\% | 3 | 29\% | 6 | 47\% | 9 | 60\% |
| Male | 15 | 56\% | 16 | 66\% | 9 | 72\% | 7 | 71\% | 7 | 53\% | 6 | 40\% |
| Open Contract | 4 | 13\% | 5 | 17\% | 7 | 35\% | 8 | 44\% | 7 | 36\% | 2 | 12\% |
| Female | 2 | 50\% | 1 | 20\% | 4 | 59\% | 4 | 52\% | 5 | 73\% | 1 | 50\% |
| Male | 2 | 50\% | 4 | 80\% | 3 | 41\% | 4 | 48\% | 2 | 27\% | 1 | 50\% |
| Grade 6 Total | 30 | 100\% | 29 | 100\% | 20 | 100\% | 18 | 100\% | 20 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% |


|  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | 2023 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 7 - Lecturer | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Fixed Term Contract | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 5\% | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5\% | 1 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Female | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Open Contract | 16 | 94\% | 21 | 95\% | 19 | 95\% | 18 | 95\% | 25 | 97\% | 25 | 100\% |
| Female | 9 | 56\% | 14 | 66\% | 12 | 63\% | 7 | 38\% | 8 | 32\% | 7 | 28\% |
| Male | 7 | 44\% | 7 | 34\% | 7 | 37\% | 11 | 62\% | 17 | 68\% | 18 | 72\% |
| Grade 7 Total | 17 | 100\% | 22 | 100\% | 20 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 26 | 100\% | 25 | 100\% |
| Grade 8 - Senior Lecturer | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | 2023 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $n=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Fixed Term Contract | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Open Contract | 11 | 100\% | 13 | 100\% | 13 | 100\% | 18 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% |
| Female | 5 | 45\% | 4 | 31\% | 4 | 31\% | 8 | 45\% | 9 | 46\% | 9 | 47\% |
| Male | 6 | 55\% | 9 | 69\% | 9 | 69\% | 10 | 55\% | 10 | 54\% | 10 | 53\% |
| Grade 8 Total | 11 | 100\% | 13 | 100\% | 13 | 100\% | 18 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% |
| Grade 9 - Professor | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | 2023 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Fixed Term Contract | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Open Contract | 9 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 13 | 100\% | 15 | 100\% |
| Female | 3 | 35\% | 4 | 39\% | 5 | 36\% | 5 | 36\% | 4 | 31\% | 7 | 47\% |
| Male | 6 | 65\% | 6 | 61\% | 9 | 64\% | 9 | 64\% | 9 | 69\% | 8 | 53\% |
| Grade 9 Total | 9 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 13 | 100\% | 15 | 100\% |
| Grand Total | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | 2023 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Total Fixed Term Contract | 28 | 41\% | 25 | 33\% | 14 | 21\% | 11 | 16\% | 14 | 18\% | 15 | 20\% |
| Female | 13 | 46\% | 9 | 37\% | 5 | 33\% | 4 | 36\% | 7 | 50\% | 9 | 60\% |
| Male | 15 | 54\% | 16 | 63\% | 9 | 67\% | 7 | 64\% | 7 | 50\% | 6 | 40\% |
| Total Open Contract | 40 | 59\% | 49 | 67\% | 53 | 79\% | 58 | 84\% | 64 | 82\% | 61 | 80\% |
| Female | 19 | 48\% | 23 | 47\% | 25 | 48\% | 24 | 42\% | 26 | 41\% | 24 | 39\% |
| Male | 21 | 52\% | 26 | 53\% | 28 | 52\% | 34 | 58\% | 38 | 59\% | 37 | 61\% |
| Grand Total | 68 | 100\% | 74 | 100\% | 67 | 100\% | 69 | 100\% | 78 | 100\% | 76 | 100\% |

Table DT.9. Academic staff by grade and gender between 2018-2023

| Grade | 2018 |  |  | 2019 | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | 2023 |  | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |  |
| Grade 6 | 31 | 46\% | 29 | 39\% | 20 | 30\% | 18 | 26\% | 21 | 27\% | 19 | 13\% | 32\% |
| Female | 14 | 45\% | 9 | 31\% | 8 | 40\% | 7 | 39\% | 12 | 57\% | 4 | 44\% | 42\% |
| Male | 17 | 55\% | 20 | 69\% | 12 | 60\% | 11 | 61\% | 9 | 43\% | 5 | 56\% | 58\% |
| Grade 7 | 17 | 25\% | 22 | 30\% | 20 | 30\% | 19 | 28\% | 26 | 33\% | 25 | 37\% | 28\% |
| Female | 10 | 59\% | 15 | 68\% | 13 | 65\% | 8 | 42\% | 9 | 35\% | 7 | 28\% | 49\% |
| Male | 7 | 41\% | 7 | 32\% | 7 | 35\% | 11 | 58\% | 17 | 65\% | 18 | 72\% | 51\% |
| Grade 8 | 11 | 16\% | 13 | 18\% | 13 | 19\% | 18 | 26\% | 19 | 24\% | 19 | 28\% | 22\% |
| Female | 5 | 45\% | 4 | 31\% | 4 | 31\% | 8 | 44\% | 9 | 47\% | 9 | 47\% | 42\% |
| Male | 6 | 55\% | 9 | 69\% | 9 | 69\% | 10 | 56\% | 10 | 53\% | 10 | 53\% | 58\% |
| Grade 9 | 9 | 13\% | 10 | 14\% | 14 | 21\% | 14 | 20\% | 13 | 16\% | 15 | 22\% | 18\% |
| Female | 3 | 33\% | 4 | 40\% | 5 | 36\% | 5 | 36\% | 4 | 31\% | 7 | 47\% | 37\% |
| Male | 6 | 67\% | 6 | 60\% | 9 | 64\% | 9 | 64\% | 9 | 69\% | 8 | 53\% | 63\% |



Table DT.10. Academic promotions by grade and gender between 2017-2022, with average number of years between promotions

|  | 2017 |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  | 2019 |  |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  |  | 2022 |  |  | Grand Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Promotion from/to | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Av. yrs | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Av. yrs | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Av. yrs | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Av. yrs | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Av. yrs | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Av. yrs | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | Av. yrs |
| Lecturer to Senior Lecturer | 2 | 67\% | 5.5 | 3 | 75\% | 4.7 | 2 | 67\% | 4.0 | 4 | 67\% | 2.5 | 5 | 100\% | 5.4 | 3 | 100\% | 6.3 | 19 | 79\% | 4.7 |
| Female | 1 | 50\% | 4.0 | 1 | 33\% | 6.0 | 0 | 0\% | 0.0 | 2 | 50\% | 2.0 | 4 | 80\% | 5.8 | 2 | 67\% | 8.0 | 10 | 53\% | 5.3 |
| Male | 1 | 50\% | 7.0 | 2 | 67\% | 4.0 | 2 | 100\% | 4.0 | 2 | 50\% | 3.0 | 1 | 20\% | 4.0 | 1 | 33\% | 3.0 | 9 | 47\% | 4.0 |
| Senior Lecturer to Professor | 1 | 33\% | 5.0 | 1 | 25\% | 2.0 | 1 | 33\% | 10.0 | 2 | 33\% | 9.5 | 0 | 0\% | 0.0 | 0 | 0\% | 0.0 | 5 | 21\% | 7.2 |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 0.0 | 1 | 100\% | 2.0 | 1 | 100\% | 10.0 | 1 | 50\% | 4.0 | 0 | 0\% | 0.0 | 0 | 0\% | 0.0 | 3 | 60\% | 5.3 |
| Male | 1 | 100\% | 5.0 | 0 | 0\% | 0.0 | 0 | 0\% | 0.0 | 1 | 50\% | 15.0 | 0 | 0\% | 0.0 | 0 | 0\% | 0.0 | 2 | 40\% | 10.0 |
| Grand Total | 3 | 100\% | 5.3 | 4 | 100\% | 4.0 | 3 | 100\% | 6.0 | 6 | 100\% | 4.8 | 5 | 100\% | 5.4 | 3 | 100\% | 6.3 | 24 | 100\% | 5.2 |

Table DT.11. Applications for recruitment to academic and professional support posts by gender between 2017-2022

| Gender | ART |  | T\&S |  | Academic Posts |  | PSS Posts |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total |  | Total |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |  |  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Female | 559 | 33\% | 111 | 29\% | 670 | 32\% | 491 | 69\% | 1,161 | 42\% |
| Male | 1,124 | 67\% | 275 | 71\% | 1,399 | 68\% | 221 | 31\% | 1,620 | 58\% |
| Grand Total | 1,683 | 100\% | 386 | 100\% | 2,069 | 100\% | 712 | 100\% | 2,781 | 100\% |

Table DT.11a. Applications for recruitment to Research and Teaching (ART) posts by grade and gender between 2017-2022

| Gender | Associate Lecturer Grade 6 |  | Lecturer Grade 7 |  | Professor Grade 9 |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Female | 53 | 26\% | 497 | 35\% | 9 | 17\% | 559 | 33\% |
| Male | 150 | 74\% | 930 | 65\% | 44 | 83\% | 1,124 | 67\% |
| Grand Total | 203 | 100\% | 1,427 | 100\% | 53 | 100\% | 1,683 | 100\% |

Table DT.12. Appointments made in recruitment to academic posts by gender and grade between 2018-2022

|  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Female | 4 | 44\% | 3 | 30\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 25\% | 5 | 42\% | 15 | 33\% |
| Grade 6 | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 67\% | 2 | 40\% | 6 | 40\% |
| Grade 7 | 2 | 50\% | 3 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 33\% | 3 | 60\% | 9 | 60\% |
| Male | 5 | 56\% | 7 | 70\% | 3 | 100\% | 9 | 75\% | 7 | 58\% | 31 | 67\% |
| Grade 6 | 4 | 80\% | 4 | 57\% | 2 | 67\% | 5 | 56\% | 3 | 43\% | 18 | 58\% |
| Grade 7 | 1 | 20\% | 2 | 29\% | 1 | 33\% | 4 | 44\% | 4 | 57\% | 12 | 39\% |
| Grade 9 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 3\% |
| Grand Total | 9 | 100\% | 10 | 100\% | 3 | 100\% | 12 | 100\% | 12 | 100\% | 46 | 100\% |

Table DT.12a. Appointments made in recruitment for academic and professional support staff between 2018-2022

| Staff role | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Academic Staff | 9 | 50\% | 10 | 83\% | 3 | 43\% | 12 | 52\% | 12 | 71\% | 46 | 60\% |
| ART | 3 | 33\% | 6 | 60\% | 1 | 33\% | 5 | 42\% | 7 | 58\% | 22 | 48\% |
| Female | 2 | 67\% | 3 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 20\% | 3 | 43\% | 9 | 41\% |
| Male | 1 | 33\% | 3 | 50\% | 1 | 100\% | 4 | 80\% | 4 | 57\% | 13 | 59\% |
| T\&S | 6 | 67\% | 4 | 40\% | 2 | 67\% | 7 | 58\% | 5 | 42\% | 24 | 52\% |
| Female | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 29\% | 2 | 40\% | 6 | 25\% |
| Male | 4 | 67\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 5 | 71\% | 3 | 60\% | 18 | 75\% |
| Professional Support | 9 | 50\% | 2 | 17\% | 4 | 57\% | 11 | 48\% | 5 | 29\% | 31 | 40\% |
| Female | 9 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 8 | 73\% | 5 | 100\% | 28 | 90\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 27\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 10\% |
| Grand Total | 18 | 100\% | 12 | 100\% | 7 | 100\% | 23 | 100\% | 17 | 100\% | 77 | 100\% |

Figure DT.2. 100\% stacked bar chart for academic staff gender by grade between 2018-2023


Figure DT.3. Bar chart for percentage of fixed term vs open contracts in Grade 6 academic staff by gender (2018-2023)


Figure DT.4. 100\% stacked bar chart for academic appointments to grades 6 and 7 (2018-2022)


Figure DT.4a. 100\% stacked bar charts for academic promotions to Grades 8 and 9 between 2017-2022 by gender


Table DT.13. Academic leavers by grade and gender between 2018-2022

|  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  |  | 2022 | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | \% |
| Grade 7 | 3 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 60\% | 3 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 56\% |
| Female | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 100\% | 2 | 67\% | 0 | 0\% | 67\% |
| Male | 2 | 67\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 33\% |
| Grade 8 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 40\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 25\% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 50\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 50\% |
| Grade 9 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 19\% |
| Female | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 33\% |
| Male | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 50\% | 67\% |
| Grand Total | 3 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 5 | 100\% | 3 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 100\% |

Table DT.14. Academic leavers by gender, academic contract type, and full-time/part-time status between 2018-2022

|  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | Average \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |  |
| Female | 1 | 33\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 80\% | 2 | 67\% | 2 | 50\% | 56\% |
| Full-time | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 100\% |
| ART | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 2 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 78\% |
| T\&S | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 22\% |
| Male | 2 | 67\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 20\% | 1 | 33\% | 2 | 50\% | 44\% |
| Full-time | 2 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 86\% |
| ART | 2 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 2 | 100\% | 100\% |
| Part-time | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 14\% |
| ART | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 100\% |
| Grand Total | 3 | 100\% | 1 | 100\% | 5 | 100\% | 3 | 100\% | 4 | 100\% | 100\% |

Table DT.15. Current undergraduate students by course and gender, including Politics degrees and PPE degrees

| Course | Female |  | Male |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| Economics and Philosophy | 3 | 43\% | 4 | 57\% | 7 | 100\% |
| Economics and Politics | 10 | 36\% | 18 | 64\% | 28 | 100\% |
| Global Development | 43 | 74\% | 15 | 26\% | 58 | 100\% |
| History and Politics | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 50\% | 2 | 100\% |
| International Relations | 56 | 47\% | 64 | 53\% | 120 | 100\% |
| Philosophy and Politics | 12 | 27\% | 33 | 73\% | 45 | 100\% |
| Philosophy, Politics and Economics | 99 | 40\% | 151 | 60\% | 250 | 100\% |
| Politics | 42 | 37\% | 71 | 63\% | 113 | 100\% |
| Politics with International Relations | 131 | 52\% | 121 | 48\% | 252 | 100\% |
| Grand Total | 397 | 45\% | 478 | 55\% | 875 | 100\% |

Table DT.16. Students by level and gender between 2017/18-2022/23 (Politics degrees only)

| Level | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 / 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1 / 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2 / 2 3}$ | Average |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| UG | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |  |
| Female | $44 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| Male | $56 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $52 \%$ |
| PGT | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |  |
| Female | $39 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Male | $61 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $55 \%$ |


| PGR | $100 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Female | $15 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| Male | $85 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $64 \%$ |

Table DT.16a. Conversion rates for undergraduate home students by gender between 2016/17-2022/23

| Conversion Type | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Applications to Offers | 96\% | 95\% | 97\% | 96\% | 97\% | 98\% | 98\% |
| Female | 98\% | 95\% | 99\% | 97\% | 98\% | 99\% | 99\% |
| Male | 95\% | 95\% | 96\% | 95\% | 96\% | 97\% | 97\% |
| Applications to Unconditional Firm | 24\% | 19\% | 24\% | 20\% | 22\% | 22\% | 17\% |
| Female | 23\% | 17\% | 22\% | 19\% | 21\% | 19\% | 15\% |
| Male | 25\% | 22\% | 25\% | 21\% | 22\% | 25\% | 20\% |
| Offers to Positive Responses | 40\% | 36\% | 40\% | 43\% | 41\% | 44\% | 48\% |
| Female | 40\% | 36\% | 38\% | 38\% | 40\% | 39\% | 47\% |
| Male | 40\% | 35\% | 42\% | 47\% | 41\% | 50\% | 50\% |
| Positive Responses to UF | 62\% | 57\% | 62\% | 49\% | 55\% | 51\% | 36\% |
| Female | 59\% | 48\% | 59\% | 51\% | 55\% | 50\% | 31\% |
| Male | 66\% | 65\% | 63\% | 47\% | 55\% | 52\% | 41\% |

Table DT.17. Undergraduate attainment by gender between 2017/18-2020/21

| Gender | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7} / \mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0} / \mathbf{2 1}$ | Average |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Female | $\mathbf{4 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 \%}$ |
| First (D) | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| First | $14 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| US | $71 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $66 \%$ |
| LS | $15 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Third | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Lower Exit | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Male | $\mathbf{5 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 \%}$ |
| First (D) | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| First | $9 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| US | $63 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| LS | $21 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Third | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Lower Exit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Grand Total | $100 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Table DT.17a. Postgraduate attainment by gender

| Level | 2017/18 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PGT | 86\% | 92\% | 93\% | 92\% | 91\% | 96\% | 92\% |
| Female | 43\% | 49\% | 51\% | 47\% | 55\% | 52\% | 50\% |
| Distinction | 10\% | 25\% | 21\% | 35\% | 34\% | 19\% | 25\% |
| Merit | 46\% | 52\% | 49\% | 54\% | 52\% | 42\% | 49\% |
| Pass | 44\% | 20\% | 25\% | 10\% | 11\% | 36\% | 23\% |
| Lower exit | 0\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% |
| Fail | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Male | 57\% | 51\% | 49\% | 53\% | 45\% | 48\% | 50\% |
| Distinction | 16\% | 14\% | 9\% | 39\% | 27\% | 14\% | 21\% |
| Merit | 62\% | 54\% | 63\% | 43\% | 48\% | 56\% | 53\% |
| Pass | 22\% | 26\% | 20\% | 17\% | 14\% | 27\% | 21\% |
| Lower exit | 0\% | 6\% | 6\% | 1\% | 10\% | 3\% | 5\% |
| Fail | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| PGR | 14\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 10\% | 4\% | 8\% |


| Female | $56 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Pass | $100 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| Fail | $0 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Male | $44 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 7 \%}$ | $56 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 5 \%}$ |
| Pass | $100 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $93 \%$ |
| Fail | $0 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Grand Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Figure DT.5. Pie charts for current student demographics by level, course and gender


Figure DT.6. 100\% stacked bar chart for student intake by level and gender between 2017/18-2022/23

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $0 \%$ |  |

Figure DT.7. Horizontal bar chart for undergraduate attainment by gender between 2017/18-2020/21


## Figure DT.8. Bar chart for trends in UG attainment by gender




Figure DT.10. 100\% stacked bar chart for PGT attainment between 2017/18-2022/23 by gender


Figure DT.10a.Bar chart for PGR completion rate (Pass) between 2017/18-2022/23 by gender


|  |  | Proportion of respondents ( $\mathrm{n}=4$ ) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | On a scale of 1 to 5, how would you assess our current maternity, paternity, parent and adoption leave policy? | $\mathrm{n}=$ | \% |
| 1 | Extremely poor | 0 | 0\% |
| 2 | Poor | 0 | 0\% |
| 3 | Average | 0 | 0\% |
| 4 | Good | 2 | 50\% |
|  | Extremely good | 2 | 50\% |



## Proportion of respondents ( $n=4$ )

D. How would you assess its impact on your research productivity, return to teaching, connection to the department, work/life balance and overall wellbeing?

1. The policy has had a positive impact overall.
2. The reduced teaching/research obligations mean realistic expectations are set, and a level of productivity that supports overall well-being is made achievable.
3. The supportive culture in the department made the transition back to work easier to manage.
4. Flexibility is the main factor that facilitates pursuit of a healthy work/life balance, which in turn allows for increased productivity, confidence, and quality of work.
5. The policy does not take into account that second- or third-time parents have more to manage at home than first-time parents.

## E. Suggestions for improvement

Proportion of respondents ( $n=2$ )

1. Clearer and more accessible resources explaining what the benefits are and how to make use of them. The policy document on the university website is unclear. Those going on leave would benefit from having this information delivered as a one-page document, written informally.
2. A robust peer support network. A mentoring scheme that involves coupling someone who is going on leave with someone who has recently returned to work and is able to offer support and advice. There is a need for practical advice regarding what structural issues to expect, and how best to navigate them.
3. I am concerned that staff on differing contracts may not benefit equally from the additional research leave/reduced teaching load, such that those on T\&S contracts may not see their obligations reduced equitably.
F. If you were a user of both our current maternity policy and its precursor, could you offer a brief comparative assessment?
4. N/A

## Appendix 3: Snapshot of the Department (2022/2023)

A snapshot of the department in 2023
Note: Data records legal sex not gender identity. Charts represent gender in terms of sex and use the word 'gender' in that way.

Figure 1. Percentage of students by gender in the Politics Department (2022/23)
Female
Male


Figure 2. Percentage of staff by gender in the Politics Department (2022/2023)Female
Male


Figure 3. Percentage of academic staff by contract type in the Politics Department $(2022 / 2023)$


Figure 4. Percentage of ART, T\&S and postdocs by gender in the Politics Department (2022/23)
Female

## Male

100\%
$75 \%, 6$


Figure 5. Percentage of academic staff on fixed-term and open-ended contracts, excluding postdocs (2022/23)


Figure 6. Percentage of academic staff on open-ended contracts by gender (2022/23)Female
Male


Figure 7. Percentage of staff on fixed- term contracts by gender, excluding postdocs (2022/2023)Female
Male
$100 \%$


## Appendix 4: Glossary

Please provide a glossary of abbreviations and acronyms used in the application.

| The following abbreviations are used in this application |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| ART | Academic, Research \& Teaching |
| AS | Athena SWAN |
| BME | Black and Minority Ethnic |
| BoS | Board of Studies |
| CS | Culture Survey <br> Poputy Head of Faculty Operations for the Department of |
| DHFO | Deputy Head of Department |
| DHoD | Department Meeting |
| DM | Department Management Team |
| DMT | Department Research Committee |
| DRC | Equality, Diversity \& Inclusion Committee |
| EDIC | Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (the <br> committee within the Department of Politics that looks <br> after Equality, Diversity and Inclusion issues, which acted <br> as the SAT for this submission) |
| EDIC | ECR Inclusion |


| F | Female |
| :---: | :---: |
| FTC | Fixed Term Contract |
| FT | Full Time |
| FTE | Full Time Equivalent |
| HESA | Higher Education Funding Council for England |
| HoD | Head of Department |
| HR | Human Resources |
| LGBTQ+ | Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Gender Queer |
| M | Male |
| OC | Open Contract |
| PDR | Performance and Development Review |
| PDRA | Postdoctoral Research Associate |
| PGCAP | Postgraduate Certificate of Academic Practice |
| PG | Postgraduate |
| PGR | Research Postgraduate |
| PGT | Taught Postgraduate |
| PSS | Professional and Support Services |
| PT | Part Time |
| REF | Research Excellence Framework |


| RG | Russell Group Universities |
| :--- | :--- |
| SAT | Self-Assessment Team |
| T\&S | Teaching \& Scholarship Staff |
| UG | Undergraduate |
| WRDTP | White Rose Doctoral Training Partnership |

