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1. Letter of endorsement from the head of department: maximum 500 words

An accompanying letter of endorsement from the head of department should explain how the SWAN action plan and activities in the department contribute to the overall department strategy and academic mission.

The letter is an opportunity for the head of department to confirm their support for the application and to endorse and commend any women and STEMM activities that have made a significant contribution to the achievement of the departmental mission.

(Letter – 538 words)
28th April 2014

Dear Ms. Dickinson,

I am pleased to endorse this application from the Environment Department at the University of York for an Athena SWAN award. The Department’s mission is to provide research and education to support a more sustainable and equitable world. We have always striven to provide a supportive and family-friendly work environment and to offer equal opportunities to all staff and students. I am delighted therefore to support the Athena SWAN committee in their efforts to develop our policies further in this area. I confirm on behalf of the Departmental Management Team that we are committed to continue working with our Athena SWAN Departmental Committee and the wider Department to ensure that our Action Plan is implemented and that we move towards gender equality in all areas.

The self-assessment process has highlighted some important challenges for the Department. A clear weakness is the lack of female readers and professors within the Department. We are aware that improving the gender balance amongst senior academics within the Department is a long-term challenge. We are seeking to address this in a number of ways: We are engaging in proactive career development for all academics within the Department and actively targeting external female applicants for new senior positions. I am encouraged by the pattern of ongoing applications for promotion amongst female colleagues and by the recent attraction of applicants (four female, eight male) and shortlisted candidates (three female, one male) to a new Chair in Human Geography.

I take this opportunity to commend specific colleagues for their contribution to our Department and the wider study of the Environment. Dr Lisa Emberson is Director of the Stockholm Environment Institute York, a research centre embedded within the Department; Lisa’s drive and vision has been critical in maximising the benefits of integration following the move of SEI York to the Department in 2010; her research on effects of air pollution on global crop productivity and human health has influenced the United Nations Environment Programme and the Climate and Clean Air Coalition. Dr Nicola Carslaw has oversight and responsibility for all academic activities within the Department as Chair of Board of Studies; Nic’s attention to detail and ability to engage the support of her colleagues has been pivotal during a period of rapid expansion of our teaching programmes; Nic was also recently appointed to the UK Government’s Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollution. Our undergraduate programmes, in which about 50% of students are female, are convened currently by Dr Katherine Selby, Dr Charlotte Burns, Dr Claire Hughes and Dr Sylvia Toet, whilst our highest recruiting MSc Programme (Marine Environmental Management) was conceived and convened since introduction by Dr Julie Hawkins. The Department is indebted to Dr Kathryn Arnold for coordinating this Athena SWAN submission and the management changes it has engendered; Kate recently featured in a headline article on women in the forefront of science.
I conclude by confirming by unequivocal support for this application and the work of our Athena SWAN Departmental Committee. Our Action Plan identifies a range of important actions to enhance gender equality; I consider addressing gender balance amongst senior academics to be a personal priority alongside strengthening our procedures relating to mentoring, career development and support for return from maternity leave.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Professor Colin Brown
2. The self-assessment process: maximum 1000 words

Describe the self-assessment process. This should include:

a) A description of the self assessment team: members’ roles (both within the department and as part of the team) and their experiences of work-life balance.

The Environment Department’s Athena Swan Departmental Committee (ASDC) was set up to develop the application for the Athena SWAN Departmental Bronze Award. The members were chosen to ensure that the full range of staff grades in the department were represented and include full and part-time, academic and research staff as well as a PhD student. Both male and female staff members were included as well as recently appointed staff and staff returning from maternity leave.

**Kathryn Arnold** (ASDC Chair) was in 2013 appointed as a Lecturer in ecology following a Royal Society University Research Fellowship. She has been a member of the University’s AS working group since 2012, sits on the Environment Department's Research Committee and is Chair of our Ethics Committee. Her husband is a lecturer in the Chemistry Department. Recently returned from a second bout of maternity leave, she has worked part time (currently 0.7FTE) since 2010 in order to enjoy both her career and family.

**Zoë Austin**, is a Senior Research Fellow (2012 - present). She is a member of the Environment Department’s Research Committee. As well as her research projects on a NERC-funded programme: Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Sustainability (BESS), she also manages a small communications role. Her key areas of interest regarding the AS group include; job security and career planning for researchers and maintaining a healthy work-life balance.

**Charlotte Burns** is a Lecturer in Environmental Politics and Policy. She is the convenor of the Environment Economics and Ecology Degree and sits on the Department’s Teaching Committee. She was a part-time worker at the University of Leeds, (0.6 FTE for 5 years and 0.8 FTE for 18 months), and has taken two periods of maternity leave since completing her PhD. Her husband is also a fulltime academic. She joined the Environment Department in January 2012 as a full-time lecturer.

**Mark Hodson**, Professor in the Environment Department since 2012, previously at Reading University for 13 years. Married with two young children, his wife went back to full time work 3 months after the birth of each of their sons and he had the main carer responsibilities outside of nursery hours; dropping children off and collecting them from nursery, feeding the children, getting them to bed etc. Children are now at school and since his wife gave up her partnership in a city law firm they have a more equal sharing of child care responsibilities. Incoming Chair of the Research Committee and member of the Departmental Management Team.

**Rob Marchant**, Reader in the Environment Department (2005-present). Deputy chair of the Environment Department's Research Committee. Married with two teenage children. Now working full time although was the primary carer when children were infants.

**Rachel Pateman**, Researcher at SEI-Y-York (Jan 2013 - present) after completing PhD in Biology Department in 2012. With recent experience of the recruitment process for researchers, she is conscious of challenges experienced by women starting out in their academic careers.
**Nvenakeng Suzanne Awung** is a PhD student and mother in the Environment Department. From Cameroon, she also the Founder and CEO of 'The Forgotten Green Heroes' is a non-governmental, non-political and non-profit making organisation which seeks to build capacity amongst the local forest communities and indigenous people at home and abroad.

b) an account of the self assessment process: details of the self assessment team meetings, including any consultation with staff or individuals outside of the university, and how these have fed into the submission.

The self-assessment process was started informally last summer and involved meetings between the chair of the ASDC Kathryn Arnold (KA), Human Resources (HR) and the Head of the Environment Department. This was to determine whether we were ready to make the AS application. Once the decision had been made to apply then we asked for volunteers from the Environment Department (ED) to join the Committee. Since January 2014, the ASDC has met approximately every three weeks and communicated extensively by email in order to analyse and interpret the staff and student data, write sections of the application and to develop the action plan. At one of the final meetings before submission, we discussed the subsection on increasing the number of, and participation in, networking and social events, as this had been recently raised at the Research Away Day. We also made recommendations to our ‘New Building Committee’ to ensure there will be a communal coffee room and adequate child changing facilities. KA met several times with Professor Jane Hill who coordinated the Biology department’s recent Gold application and has served on AS panels, to gain insight into the process of bringing about coordinated change within our department. Jane Hill, Corrine Howie HR and Linda Whiting from the UoY Equality and Diversity office reviewed a draft of our application and Action Plan as ‘critical friends’. We reviewed the application experiences of other institutions via the contacts of ASDC members.

In March 2014 we carried out an Equality Survey in the Environment Department to help us to understand how our staff experience their working environment and what improvements we can make to ensure equality of opportunity for all. The survey was promoted by the Head of Department (HOD) and Chair of the ASDC, drawing a response rate of 37% across all staff grades and roles. The survey focused on seven key areas such as Recruitment and Selection; Appraisal and Performance Management; Family Friendly Policies and Flexible Working; and Workplace Culture. We have included some of the quantitative data and qualitative responses in this application and used it as evidential support in the development of our Action Plan (AP).

c) Plans for the future of the self assessment team, such as how often the team will continue to meet, any reporting mechanisms and in particular how the self assessment team intends to monitor implementation of the action plan.

The group will continue to meet at least once per term to ensure that the Action Plan is implemented and any issues surrounding implementation can be discussed. The Chair will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the action plan but tasks from the action plan will be shared out as appropriate among members of staff in the department. We will continue to provide updates to the Department Management Team (DMT) and report to staff meetings as outlined in the Action Plan.
We will conduct a further Equality Survey in 18-24 months’ time to monitor the implementation of the Action Plan in terms of staff experiences and views on the promotion and management of gender equality.

(1002 words)

3. A picture of the department: maximum 2000 words

a) Provide a pen-picture of the department to set the context for the application, outlining in particular any significant and relevant features.

The Environment Department (ED) was established in 1992 to develop and disseminate the approaches required to address the complex environmental challenges facing society. Our guiding principle is that issues of sustainable development demand interdisciplinary research across the interface between natural, physical and social sciences. The interdisciplinary mission of the Department is founded on a mix of ecology, environmental science, human and physical geography, and environmental economics. Our research is organised within three themes. Conceptually, we see Earth Systems and Environmental Change researching into how earth systems operate; Environmental Health and Pollution understanding the impacts of human activities on the system; and Ecosystems and Society investigating links between environment and human wellbeing and mechanisms to influence behaviours. All research themes have major impacts on national and international environmental policy. Staff advise global policymakers including UNEP, FAO and WHO, support international NGOs such as WWF, and sit on national and international expert committees.

Research within the Department was strengthened in 2010 by the incorporation of the Stockholm Environment Institute York. SEI-Y is one of six constituent centres of the Stockholm Environment Institute, an independent, internationally renowned research organisation with the goal of encouraging sustainable development by linking basic scientific research and policy making.

The Department currently offers four undergraduate BSc degrees. This will be supplemented in 2015/16 by the introduction of a BA in Human Geography and Environment. At the postgraduate level, we offer five taught MSc programmes. Our PhD programmes parallel the research interests of the academic staff. The ED comprises just over 300 undergraduate students, 60 taught postgraduates, 50 PhD students and 80 staff.

The Department has grown rapidly over the last decade and plans a further period of expansion through to 2020. We are in the late stages of design for a new Environment Building with construction starting in summer 2014 so that the Department can take ownership for autumn 2015. The design of the building has been created in close collaboration with staff and includes a communal social area for staff, baby change facilities as well as all the state-of-the-art teaching and research facilities suitable for a modern Environment Department.

b) Provide data for the past three years (where possible with clearly labelled graphical illustrations) on the following with commentary on their significance and how they have affected action planning.

NOTE: AP 1.1 etc. refers to the relevant section in the Action Plan. The data analysed are from 1st January 2011 to 31st December 2013.
Student data

(i) **Numbers of males and females on access or foundation courses** – comment on the data and describe any initiatives taken to attract women to the courses.

The ED runs three extended degrees which include a foundation year at York College. The courses have been designed for students without formal qualifications, or for those who are returning to education. The foundation courses attract small but significant numbers: 2011 – 5F:7M, 2012 – 2F:5M, 2013 – 4F:5M. There is a male bias in students but the numbers are too small from which to draw conclusions. There are currently no specific initiatives designed to attract women onto these courses.

**Undergraduate male and female numbers** – full and part-time – comment on the female: male ratio compared with the national picture for the discipline. Describe any initiatives taken to address any imbalance and the impact to date. Comment upon any plans for the future.

![Figure 1: The absolute number of students enrolled at 31st December 2011, 2012 and 2013 across our four degrees (EE = “Environmental Economics and Environmental Management” combined with the data for “Environmental Economics and Ecology”, EG = Environmental Geography, ES = Environmental Science).](image)

Females made up roughly 50% of fulltime UGs in our department but this varied with degree (Figure 1). Our two degrees which include economics (combined into EE on Figure 1 above) consistently attracted fewer females than males and this appeared to be a consistent trend (34% Females in 2013). These are unique courses with a relatively small intake per year and no obvious comparator courses at the national level. Environmental Science varied between 45 – 52% females which is similar to the current national average of 50% (2013/14 data for Russell and 1994 Group Universities). Environmental Geography consisted of 52 – 56% females over three years which was somewhat lower than the national average of 65% in 2013. The data do not suggest a strong gender bias against females but we will continue to monitor the data (AP...
To maintain and improve our recruitment of women onto UG courses, over summer 2014, the Teaching Committee in collaboration with the ASDC will re-design our promotional material for all of our taught degrees. In addition, we feature case studies on our website and in our newsletter highlighting individual students and we will confirm that there is proportionate representation by gender (AP 2.1).

Currently we do not offer part-time UG degrees although students occasionally need to go part-time for personal reasons. We recognise that some of our students have family commitments that make full-time study difficult. Informal talks with course conveners suggest that at present additional part-time degrees are not realistic options given that our staff are working at full capacity and there are timetabling constraints. Also, we have had very few requests from applicants to study part-time. However, we are committed to carrying out a study to determine the feasibility of and demand among staff and students for part-time degrees (AP 2.5).

(ii) **Postgraduate male and female numbers completing taught courses** – full and part-time – comment on the female: male ratio compared with the national picture for the discipline. Describe any initiatives taken to address any imbalance and the effect to date. Comment upon any plans for the future.

![Figure 2: Absolute number of fulltime taught PG students in the Environment Department across all our four degree courses as of 31st December 2011, 2012 and 2013.](image)

Over our four PG taught courses, females generally equate to about 66% of our intake. This is higher than the national average of 57% across similar masters degrees. Thus, we do not perceive there to be a problem in recruiting female masters students but we will continue to monitor the data (AP1.1). Also along with the UG promotional material, we will be revising the PG prospectuses and ensuring that females are represented both among images and case
studies (AP 2.1). Currently we do not offer part-time taught PG courses, although students can request to go part-time if personal circumstances change (see also AP 2.2 and 2.5).

(iii) **Postgraduate male and female numbers on research degrees** – full and part-time – comment on the female:male ratio compared with the national picture for the discipline. Describe any initiatives taken to address any imbalance and the effect to date. Comment upon any plans for the future.

50 – 63% of fulltime research students were female which compares well to the national average of 47% across Universities offering PhDs in similar research areas. Overall our numbers of PhD students have been declining and with it the ratio of females which requires monitoring (AP 1.1). Given increased competition for PhD funding, we need to ensure that the application process for PhD positions is transparent and comparable across funding sources and project types. (AP 2.4)

The other future initiative is for the ASDC to raise at the Board of Studies how the department can better embed consideration of work-life balance into PG students supervision. Chairs of Thesis Advisory Committees will be made aware that Equality issues should be raised during review meetings. (AP 2.2) We have very few part-time PhD students with both males and females choosing to do research degrees part-time for a variety of reasons including work and family commitments.

Currently the UoY is in the process of developing a maternity policy for students; previously we have taken the lead from funding councils, but the process was inflexible and bureaucratic. In 2012 one female student withdrew from her PhD following a period of maternity leave and part-time research. We hope to learn from this by instigating a better exit survey for PhD
students. Of those that graduate, this exit survey will also allow us to track our ex-PhD students better and maintain relationships with our alumni for networking, recruitment and advising current students. (AP 2.3)

(iv) **Ratio of course applications to offers and acceptances by gender for undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research degrees** – comment on the differences between male and female application and success rates and describe any initiatives taken to address any imbalance and their effect to date. Comment upon any plans for the future.

*Undergraduates:*

Undergraduate applications were 260F:269M in 2011/12, 280F:290M in 2012/13 and 313F:243M in 2013/14. In terms of the offers made, 51 - 57% were made to females (Figure 4). This roughly corresponds to the intake into the department. Within gender, a slightly higher percentage of females who applied were made offers but a slightly lower percentage of these females accepted these offers compared with males (Figure 4). We will continue to monitor these data to determine whether there is a consistent pattern among females in choosing not to study at York and gather feedback at Open Days which might explain any observed patterns (AP 1.1).

Overall, we feel that there is no bias in our admissions process, based on these data and also because students are judged on their personal statement and projected grades, all three admissions tutors are currently women and the admission tutors represent degree programmes at open days, thus providing positive and inspiring role models.

![Figure 4](image.png)

**Figure 4:** Within gender, the percentage of males and females who applied to study an undergraduate degree in the Environment Department at York who were offered a place and the percentage of those who accepted these offers in 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14.
Postgraduate taught:

Table 1: Number, percentage and ratio of course applications to offers and acceptances by gender for postgraduate taught courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th></th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of apps</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total apps</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% apps receiving offers</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% offers accepted</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of apps:offers</td>
<td>1:0.73</td>
<td>1:0.55</td>
<td>1:0.75</td>
<td>1:0.60</td>
<td>1:0.69</td>
<td>1:0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of apps:accepts</td>
<td>1:0.24</td>
<td>1:0.19</td>
<td>1:0.27</td>
<td>1:0.21</td>
<td>1:0.22</td>
<td>1:0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More females than males applied to do PG courses. Approximately 10% more female applicants than males were made offers which suggests that either there is a bias against males or males who apply have lower entry grades than female applicants. Female applicants were slightly more likely to end up studying in York than males.

Postgraduate research:

![Figure 5: Within gender, the percentage of males and females who applied to do a postgraduate research degree in the Environment Department at York who were offered a place and the percentage of those who accepted these offers.]

Year

Percentage within gender given or accepting offers

Male Offers
Female Offers
Male Accept
Female Accept

12
In 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14, the numbers of females versus males applying to do a PhD in the ED were 79:62.5, 26:48 and 46.5:58.5 respectively. ‘Half’ students are split between departments or part-time. In terms of the application procedure, there was a lot of inter-year variation as seen in Figure 5, with no consistent pattern or bias. These data include home and overseas students so the reasons why students are made offers and subsequently reject them are probably many and varied. In the future, the ASDC would like to analyse in more detail the application process for PhD students in relation to funding sources and also the type of projects on offer. (AP 2.4)

(v) **Degree classification by gender** – comment on any differences in degree attainment between males and females and describe what actions are being taken to address any imbalance.

**Undergraduate:**

A higher number and percentage of females (mean = 81%, range 72 – 86%) than males (mean = 64%, range = 54 – 72%) achieved firsts and 2:1s (see Figure 6 below). Few students fail or graduate with ordinary or pass degrees each year so the numbers are too small to analyse. For most assessments, marking is anonymous so essentially ‘gender blind’. Students can choose modules based on the form of assessment they prefer – coursework, exam or a mix.
Figure 6: Degree classification by gender for undergraduates: A) numbers of females; B) numbers of males; C) percentage within gender of females and D) percentage within gender of males from the ED achieving third, lower second (2.2), upper second (2.1) first and first distinction classes of honours degrees in 2011, 2012 and 2013.
For taught PGs, more females than males have achieved distinctions every year (Figure 7). Within gender, females gained a higher percentage of distinctions than males: 2011 - 40%F:38%M, 2012 - 45%F:27%M and 2013 – 37%F: 15%M. Although exams and most coursework reports are marked anonymously, projects, which contribute the bulk of the overall marks, are named pieces of work. Males do not seem to be performing as well as females which might require further monitoring and investigation. (AP 1.1)
Every year more females than males have been awarded PhD degrees from the ED department (Figure 8). It is very rare for students to fail so there are few data to allow comparisons. There does not appear to be any bias in the awarding of PhDs but we will monitor these data annually. (AP 1.1)

**Staff data**

(vi) **Female: male ratio of academic staff and research staff** – researcher, lecturer, senior lecturer, reader, professor (or equivalent). Comment on any differences in numbers between males and females and say what action is being taken to address any underrepresentation at particular grades/levels

Below are the headcount data with individuals classified according to their main post-holding (academic or researcher).
Most of the staff at SEI-Y are researchers, thus boosting the numbers of researchers at all grades in the ED. Some SEI-Y staff also have part-time academic positions in the ED but we have only counted individuals once based on their main post-holding. There is a slight female bias among grade 6 researchers and a strong male bias among grade 7 (Figure 9). The ratio of staff at grade 8 has been made more equitable with two recent appointments who are female. We hope to increase the percentage of females moving up the grading structure (AP 3.2) by enhancing the uptake of UoY careers advice for RAs (AP 4.2) and improving and expanding the mentoring scheme (AP 4.1). Another plan is to actively search for high quality female academics via lists of NERC and Royal Society research fellows. This would also help us to meet our target of increasing the number of independent research fellows within the ED (AP 3.1).
We have evidence of the classic ‘leaky pipe’ with over 50% of PhD students being female, similar levels at grade 6, roughly 40% females at grade 7/lecturer, but no female Readers or Professors (AP 1.3). Although we do have equal gender representation at grade 8/senior lecturer (Figure 10), the overall gender bias could take many years to solve. This imbalance has been exacerbated because essential areas of expertise for recent appointments were not in areas where significant numbers of highly qualified female applicants were to be found. We have attempted to attract female applicants (see section 4bi below) and this remains a policy for the future (AP 3.2). Indeed, this year we have worked particularly hard to encourage female applicants to apply for senior posts, and this has resulted in a higher number of females applying for senior lecturer and professorship positions advertised in 2014 (results TBA). In addition, a number of women are currently preparing for internal promotion to more senior positions (AP 3.2).

(vii) **Turnover by grade and gender** – comment on any differences between men and women in turnover and say what is being done to address this. Where the number of staff leaving is small, comment on the reasons why particular individuals left.

Few staff have left over the past three years:

**2011:** One male lecturer resigned in order to take up a lectureship in his home country; three female (21% of female researchers) and three male (18%) researchers came to the end of fixed term contracts and three male (18%) and three female (21%) researchers resigned.
2012: One male professor retired (7% of male academics) and one male professor resigned to take up a position with industry. One male researcher resigned to take up a lectureship with the ED. One female teaching fellow resigned to take up a research position in her home country.

2013: No academics left the ED. Four female researchers (29% of female researchers) and three males (18% of male researchers) came to the end of their contracts. One male teaching fellow decided not to renew his fixed-term contract and took up a research position at a research organisation.

Aside from staff finishing fixed-term contracts, staff turnover was very low and there are no obvious gender differences. Slightly more females than males have left due to the termination of a fixed term contract which is an issue that we are aware needs monitoring. Among academics, no females have left over the past three years which might reflect that many of them have school age children so choose not to move locations for a higher grade position. We intend to revise our current leaving form to include additional questions which will ensure that we can monitor the reasons staff leave and their future plans (AP 1.4).

(Total 2185)

4. Supporting and advancing women’s careers: maximum 5000 words

Key career transition points

a) Provide data for the past three years (where possible with clearly labelled graphical illustrations) on the following with commentary on their significance and how they have affected action planning.

   (i) Job application and success rates by gender and grade – comment on any differences in recruitment between men and women at any level and say what action is being taken to address this.

From 2011-2013, 39 positions have been advertised in the ED: 15 academic (only 8 resulted in appointments), 17 research (11 resulting in appointments), 8 support (admin and technical – resulting in 12 appointments) and 2 teaching fellows (both appointed).
Research Staff:

For research positions in which an appointment was made, on average 39% of applicants and 47% of interviewees were female (see Figure 10 for total numbers of individuals). Six males and five females were appointed. Across all applicants, female applicants had a 1.8% (4.7% of female applicants) chance of being appointed and males a 2.2% (3.7% of male applicants) chance of being appointed. There does not seem to be a problem with our recruitment process for researchers, once individuals have applied, although we are striving to attract more female applicants.

Both teaching fellows appointed were female although 52% of the applicants were male.

Figure 10: Total number of males and females applying and being interviewed for grade 6, grade 7 and Marie Curie researcher positions which were appointed in the ED 2011-13.
Of the 8 academic jobs awarded, 28% of applicants and 38% of the interviewees were female (see Figure 11 for total numbers). However, the application rate from women for the chair positions (3/23) emphasises our need to work on our recruitment processes to encourage female applicants at this level (AP 3.2). Five women and three men have been appointed. Thus, a woman had a 7.7% chance of being appointed across all female applicants and a 2.1% chance across all applicants. A man had a 1.8% chance of being appointed across the male pool of candidates and a 1.3% chance of being appointed across all applicants, but both professorial appointments were male.

(ii) Applications for promotion and success rates by gender and grade – comment on whether these differ for men and women and if they do explain what action may be taken. Where the number of women is small applicants may comment on specific examples of where women have been through the promotion process. Explain how potential candidates are identified.

Three males have applied for promotion to Professor and one to Reader, and all were successful. No female academics in the ED have ever applied for a Professorship or Readership. Two out of two females were successful in their application to grade 8 on the researcher scale. For promotion to Senior Lectureship, 2/2 males and 3/4 females were successful. One out of two male applicants and 1/1 female applicant were promoted to grade 7. There does not seem to be any bias in success rates, although numbers are very small, that females are just not applying for promotion to Readership and Professorial positions. One reason is of course that they are unlikely to meet the promotion criteria as they are still a Lecturer or a grade 6 Researcher.
Annually, all academic and research staff receive an email providing the criteria for promotion and inviting them to discuss the potential for a promotion application with the HoD (or Director of SEI-Y). Also, potential applicants are identified during the annual performance reviews with follow up meetings with the HoD or SEI-Y Director to discuss progress in the run up to the deadline. There is a formal section on the Performance Review form to sign-off to say that this has happened. However, our Equality Survey highlighted that 17% of respondents were unfamiliar with promotion requirements and 53% stated that they did not feel actively supported to apply for promotion. Hence we plan to run some internal workshops on how to apply for promotion (AP 3.2). In addition, to enhance the CVs of people preparing for promotion, we wish to encourage more female staff and students to put themselves forward for prizes and awards, as well as produce press releases based on their research (AP 5.4). Such success stories will be featured on our website and promotional material which will provide positive role models.

b) For each of the areas below, explain what the key issues are in the department, what steps have been taken to address any imbalances, what success/impact has been achieved so far and what additional steps may be needed.

(i) Recruitment of staff – comment on how the department’s recruitment processes ensure that female candidates are attracted to apply, and how the department ensures its short listing, selection processes and criteria comply with the university’s equal opportunities policies

At the UoY, recruitment is largely devolved to the departments although Human Resources (HR) set out the strict procedures which we follow. Professorial appointments are managed by central HR but with extensive input from the Department. All ED academic staff are consulted when academic posts are to be advertised. Links to the websites of short listed candidates are circulated to all academics. Short listed candidates enter an inclusive and transparent selection process: First, candidates give a presentation to academic and research staff. Second, academic staff soundings are elicited after the presentations and communicated to the appointment panel. Third, a formal interview is chaired by a senior member of University staff, along with the HoD (or nominee), and the independent member. All interview panel chairs have received University interview training, which incorporates Equality and Diversity and work-life balance considerations. The above data show that the number of females being interviewed and appointed is proportionate to their application rate which is encouraging.

Our main challenge is to increase the number of female applicants particularly at Senior Lecturer position and above. Currently, all staff are encouraged to suggest potential candidates who can be targeted but this could be done more systematically with a view to increasing the number of female applicants. In addition, we are in the process of revising the material that we send to potential applicants to highlight the family-friendly nature of our working environment (AP 3.2). We also intend to revise our website to include such information (AP 6.1) and to highlight the successful scientists working in our department (AP 5.5), particularly women with families (AP 6.2).

For the two academic appointments advertised in 2014 (not included in above analyses as negotiations are ongoing), the HoD and Chair of the ASDC changed the wording of job adverts to emphasize our positive and inclusive departmental culture plus the UoY’s
flexible working and family friendly policies. This seemed to have a positive effect with more women applying than for previous positions at that grade and women were shortlisted for both the Senior Lecturer (1/5 interviewees) and Professorship positions (3/4 interviewees). In future, we will investigate the wording of all job adverts and candidate briefs to ensure that we do not unintentionally bias against or deter female applicants (AP 3.2).

(ii) **Support for staff at key career transition points** – having identified key areas of attrition of female staff in the department, comment on any interventions, programmes and activities that support women at the crucial stages, such as personal development training, opportunities for networking, mentoring programmes and leadership training. Identify which have been found to work best at the different career stages.

Currently, most support or guidance for staff at key career transition points is done via the performance review process and/or on an informal basis. This AS application process has highlighted a clear need for revisiting the current arrangements. Thus, our AP includes measures to improve the support our colleagues receive at key career transitions. For example, it has been suggested that identifying staff for Leadership training is done rather on an *ad hoc* basis and needs to be made fairer and more transparent. This would be effective for staff at higher grades looking to promotion. For staff at grade 7 and below, the University offers a plethora of personal development training as part of the ‘Effective Researcher’ and ‘Preparing Future Academics’ programmes. Our Equality Survey identified that many staff were unaware of the training and support available to them. Research staff on fixed term contracts in particular felt that training opportunities were limited, although they are all eligible to attend University training and career coaching. Consequently, we will be promoting careers and training events more widely than currently (AP 4.2)

There is a departmental policy that all new and/or grade 7 academic staff should be allocated a mentor. From our staff equality survey it was clear that while there was a general desire for the mentoring scheme from those who responded, there was a lack of clarity about the system. Therefore, we need processes to ensure people know the mentoring scheme exists, how it works and to whom it is open. More importantly we need to ensure that the scheme is effective which requires investment of time and resource from senior members of staff. Research staff within SEI-Y are currently not eligible to join the ED mentoring scheme, but this will be reviewed. All staff can join the UoY’s mentoring and career coaching schemes. (AP 4.1)

**Career development**

a) For each of the areas below, explain what the key issues are in the department, what steps have been taken to address any imbalances, what success/impact has been achieved so far and what additional steps may be needed.

a) **Promotion and career development** – comment on the appraisal and career development process, and promotion criteria and whether these take into consideration responsibilities for teaching, research, administration, pastoral work and outreach work; is quality of work emphasised over quantity of work?
The AS process has identified a number of issues associated with promotion that the department needs to address. In our recent Equality Survey, 54% of people stated that staff who work part-time do not have the same opportunities for promotion as fulltime staff. Reasons suggested include that it is harder for those who work part-time (which is common among female academics in the ED) to get promoted because they do not have the capacity to work extra hours to write the papers, proposals etc. required for promotion. When we interviewed one female academic about her experiences of promotion to Senior Lecturer she stated ‘For me, I probably waited longer than I should as I felt (though not because of anything that was explicitly said to me) that as a part-time worker with young children, I probably had to do more to prove I was worthy. However, promotion should be about the level of your achievements, with the part-time element affecting quantity but not quality. This was reflected by the fact that when my promotion was announced, there was more than one comment that it was long overdue.’

The annual performance review provides a focus for discussing promotion, ambition and opportunities, but it is clear that we need to dispel the myth that part-time working curtails career development (indicated by comments from 29% of respondents). The UoY has promotion criteria for academic, teaching and scholarship and research staff, common across departments. Guidelines have been amended over the last two years and now explicitly note that due regard will be paid ‘to career breaks and relevant personal circumstances such as maternity leave. While career breaks might explain delayed career development, they are not viewed as a weakness in a career profile’. The UoY promotion guidelines repeatedly mention quality, not necessarily quantity, of work as the overriding feature of successful applicants.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer, for example, is made on the basis of a) research and scholarship; (b) teaching and the promotion of learning; and (c) other forms of service, including departmental and other leadership or administrative responsibilities. Candidates must demonstrate an effective and continuing contribution in all three areas, with evidence of a more significant contribution in any two. Thus, staff who have heavy teaching and administration loads but who are less research active are still eligible for promotion.

The new promotion guidelines are also more flexible in the types of outputs accepted as evidence of scholarship and research. A source of concern for SEI-Y researchers in particular has been that consultancy projects often ask for policy briefs, for example, rather than traditional academic publications. The value of such policy documents and reports, particularly in relation to the research impact of departments, is increasingly being recognised at the university level and within the Research Excellence Framework. Finally, conflicting advice from senior staff about readiness to apply for promotion was also mentioned as a barrier to promotion. Consequently, we aim to start a pro-active approach to internal promotion by the HoD running promotion seminars and personal approaches by senior staff. We will also assess whether Line Managers require training in supporting their staff through the promotions procedure so that more consistent and accurate advice is given in the future (AP 3.2).

b) **Induction and training** – describe the support provided to new staff at all levels, as well as details of any gender equality training. To what extent are good employment practices in the institution, such as opportunities for networking, the
flexible working policy, and professional and personal development opportunities promoted to staff from the outset?

ED staff receive the induction materials provided to all new staff by the University and are able to participate in University induction days. In addition, each member of staff is given a departmental induction where they are introduced to colleagues and are apprised of relevant policies. However, we approached seven new staff (appointed within the last 18 months) and found that in all cases none were aware of flexible working arrangements, they were not made aware of networking opportunities and were not apprised of gender equality training opportunities. There is clearly scope therefore for the department to improve communication of University and Departmental policies to new staff as part of the induction process. We will therefore develop an induction pack which addresses the issues of flexible working, networking and gender equality training, accompanied by supporting materials on our departmental website. (AP 3.3)

c) **Support for female students** – describe the support (formal and informal) provided for female students to enable them to make the transition to a sustainable academic career, particularly from postgraduate to researcher, such as mentoring, seminars and pastoral support and the right to request a female personal tutor. Comment on whether these activities are run by female staff and how this work is formally recognised by the department.

The Environment Department currently hosts PhD students from a wide range of nations and religions, with eight of the students currently registered as having child-care responsibilities. The Department provides a supportive environment to cater for this diversity of personal circumstances, particularly based around flexible working practice and design of PhD projects, for example designing fieldwork around child-care commitments. However, there is room for improvement in terms of work-life balance and the UoY’s maternity policy for students (AP 2.2 and 2.3).

There are a series of mechanisms in place within the Department and the wider University to enable PhD researchers to make the transition to a sustainable career within academic (particularly from postgraduate to researcher) and non-academic sectors; these include, for example, internships with key employers and social events with our Alumni working in the Environment sector. Within the Department these include mentoring, exposure to a vibrant departmental seminar program, pastoral support and the right to request a female personal tutor. Such arrangements are formally recognised by the Department within the Thesis Advisory Committee. Support for students is provided by all staff irrespective of gender and PhD supervision is recognised in the staff workload model. We are committed to discovering how we can improve our professional and pastoral support structures for our PhD students (AP 2.3).

d) **Organisation and culture**

a) Provide data for the past three years (where possible with clearly labelled graphical illustrations) on the following with commentary on their significance and how they have affected action planning.
(i) **Male and female representation on committees** – provide a breakdown by committee and explain any differences between male and female representation. Explain how potential members are identified.

Over the past three years, the ED has grown from a ‘small’ to a ‘medium’ (according to the UoY definitions) department and in the past administration has been done on a rather ‘ad hoc’ basis. We are still in the process of developing official procedures and systems for recording information about the department (AP 5.1). We do not have any specific policies or procedures in place to ensure female representation on committees. Members of staff are usually chosen (or volunteer) to sit on committees because of the roles they play in the organisation. We do not have official records of the make-up of past committees, but the current situation is shown in Table 2. The sex ratio of Chairs of Committees is proportionate with the sex ratio of the department. Equal numbers of males and females serve on committees but there are twice as many male than female academics in the ED.

*Table 2: The current ratio of female:male representation on ED committees.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Female members</th>
<th>Male members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Management Team</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI-Y Management Team</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Studies</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>All academic and teaching staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI-Y Advisory Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Committee</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Committee</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigating Circumstances (UG)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigating Circumstances (PG)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Committee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Advisory Board</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4F:6M</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) **Female: male ratio of academic and research staff on fixed-term contracts and open-ended (permanent) contracts** – comment on any differences between male and female staff representation on fixed-term contracts and say what is being done to address them.
Table 3: Numbers and ratios (female: male) based on headcounts of academic and research staff on fixed term and open ended contracts as of 31st December 2011, 2012 and 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role type</th>
<th>Number or sex ratio on contract types</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>No. on fixed term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>No. on fixed term</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>No. on open</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>No. on open</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Ratio on fixed term</td>
<td>0:1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Ratio on fixed term</td>
<td>1:1.33</td>
<td>1:1.33</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Ratio on open</td>
<td>1:2.2</td>
<td>1:2.2</td>
<td>1:1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Ratio on open</td>
<td>1:1.2</td>
<td>1:1.1</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen on Figure 12 and in Table 3, females are not more likely to be employed on fixed term contracts than males either among academics or researchers. We do not feel that there is a gender specific issue to address here.

b) For each of the areas below, explain what the key issues are in the department, what steps have been taken to address any imbalances, what success/impact has been achieved so far and what additional steps may be needed.

(i) **Representation on decision-making committees** – comment on evidence of gender equality in the mechanism for selecting representatives. What evidence is there that women are encouraged to sit on a range of influential committees inside and outside the department? How is the issue of ‘committee overload’ addressed where there are small numbers of female staff?
In the last three years, the department has been expanding and changing rapidly which has involved developing and embedding a number of new management and research strategies. The major management change was to create a Departmental Management Team (DMT) to run the department (previously done by the HoD alone) in which staff responsible for key departmental functions (e.g. Teaching, Research, Administration, Director of SEI-Y and Technical Support) are represented. One major benefit of this is that women are now more explicitly involved in the management of the department. The DMT tries to ensure transparency of process and this has resulted in changes in management that are relevant to the AS process.

Across the ten committees, six chairs are male and four are female (but one female chairs two of these committees). Excluding the Board of Studies which includes all academic and teaching staff, there are 32 females and 31 males on committees which suggests that female academics are over-represented on committees as the ratio of F:M academics in the ED is 1:2. Some committee members are researchers but again there are more males than females employed in the ED on research grades (15F:18M). This is something that needs to be examined via the workload model to make sure that the research time of female academics is protected from ‘committee overload’ (AP 5.1). Committee membership is only one aspect of our administrative entry in the workload model and this is checked annually at individual performance review interviews.

For the REF exercise, the department collected some information relating to which external bodies and committees our staff serve on, e.g. Advisory Committee on Pesticides, Veterinary Products Committee, British Indian Ocean Territory Science Advisory Panel, Defra TB Expert Panel. However, this was not done by gender which should be done in the future. Our Equality Survey highlighted that one third of staff did not feel that they had been encouraged to represent the ED externally either at a conference or external committee. Hopefully, if we can establish a more effective mentoring system then more staff will gain the contacts and encouragement needed to apply to join external committees (AP 4.2).

(ii) **Workload model** – describe the systems in place to ensure that workload allocations, including pastoral and administrative responsibilities (including the responsibility for work on women and science) are taken into account at appraisal and in promotion criteria. Comment on the rotation of responsibilities e.g. responsibilities with a heavy workload and those that are seen as good for an individual’s career.

In 2012, a transparent and equitable workload model for the academic staff in ED was introduced. Workloads are now estimated for all academic staff on an annual basis and the results are available for the purposes of annual appraisal and promotion. The full results and calculation criteria will soon be made available to all ED staff. The majority of academic staff are committed to 30% of their time on teaching, and 30% on administration and 40% upon their research. Exceptions to this are made for Teaching Fellows, who spend 80% of their time on teaching and administration, and for new lecturers who have reduced teaching loads. Additionally, this does not apply to most SEI-Y staff who are primarily research focussed unless they have a split contract which means that they are also academic members of staff with commensurate responsibilities and workload patterns. Instead of the Workload Model, SEI-Y research staff complete a Time
Plan in which future research and grant writing activities are planned and a Time Sheet so that completed research can be charged to appropriate budgets.

Administrative responsibilities are shared between staff in the department, with the more senior staff usually conducting the more time-consuming tasks – such as chair of Board of Studies for example. Other responsibilities may be based on staff FTE – this is the case with the number of student projects allocated to individual staff members for example. Since responsibilities rotate on a three-year basis, loads are spread. Ability and a willingness to undertake particular responsibilities are clearly important issues, but every effort is made to match roles with the career needs of colleagues, taking into account the requirements of promotion. At the end of a particularly heavy administrative role, staff are offered a research sabbatical to allow them to re-establish their research programme.

In the core ED, appraisal of the workload is usually conducted during staff Performance Reviews. The Performance Review form completed during this process allows a space to mention and discuss administrative responsibilities, e.g. membership of the ED and UoY Athena SWAN committees, and other pastoral matters. SEI-Y use the same appraisal form and promotion criteria as the Environment Department. Section B of Performance Review form covers administrative responsibilities.

Most SEI-Y staff are funded through research or consultancy contracts. Thus, SEI-Y staff complete a Time Plan which outlines the time they have allocated to projects, teaching and project supervision, meetings, paper and proposal writing and administrative responsibilities. Administrative responsibilities for research staff are allocated based on a) ability to do the job and b) space in time plan. Responsibilities with heavy workload e.g. staff rep (York and SEI-Y wide) are fixed for 2 years but re-election is possible.

(iii) **Timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings** – provide evidence of consideration for those with family responsibilities, for example what the department considers to be core hours and whether there is a more flexible system in place.

Staff meetings are held 11-12.30 once per month. Dates are in the diary a year in advance and these are very rarely changed. All staff are encouraged to attend. Some social events take place during the day (e.g. the Summer Party) but others such as the departmental Christmas seminar are evening events (5pm-8pm) which can be more difficult for people with family responsibilities to attend. Where possible we try to ensure that such events are family friendly, so people can bring their children along too.

Nominally, core hours are 10-4pm, but days and times of work are agreed with line managers. Academics have considerable freedom to work at home when not teaching and this is often done informally. Formal requests for constraints on timetabling to allow individuals to collect children from school etc have always been approved by the HoD. Research staff can work from home with prior approval of their line manager. Staff in SEI-Y can request a regular arrangement of up to one day per week working from home. This needs to be approved by the SEI-Y York Management Team.
(iv) **Culture**—demonstrate how the department is female-friendly and inclusive.

‘Culture’ refers to the language, behaviours and other informal interactions that characterise the atmosphere of the department, and includes all staff and students.

Environment and the SEI-Y are friendly and approachable departments with good relations amongst staff and between staff and students. 93% of respondents in the UoY’s 2011 Staff Survey found that their immediate manager was approachable and 86% said that their manager treated them with respect. Our accessibility is exemplified by our open door policy which encourages a welcoming atmosphere. All our meetings are timetabled in the morning or the middle of day to ensure participation by those with caring responsibilities. We have weekly departmental research seminars on Tuesday lunchtimes to which all staff and students are invited and encouraged to ask questions and engage in dialogue with invited speakers. The Environment Department has regular departmental meetings on Thursday mornings. Staff in SEI-Y have weekly departmental meetings on Wednesday mornings at which coffee and cake are provided. We also hold regular away days for teaching and research to allow staff to reflect on best practice in a more informal setting.

In terms of encouraging social interaction between staff and students we hold an annual Christmas seminar with drinks afterwards. We are aiming to hold termly social events to allow students and staff to mix in a more informal setting (AP 5.6). In our Equality Survey, 97% of respondents agreed with the statement ‘your workplace is one where everyone is treated with dignity and respect, irrespective of gender’. Interactions between staff are friendly with regular informal gatherings. There is a refreshing lack of hierarchy and internal politics, with a Departmental Management Team that is always happy to meet up with individual staff members.

(v) **Outreach activities**—comment on the level of participation by female and male staff in outreach activities with schools and colleges and other centres. Describe who the programmes are aimed at, and how this activity is formally recognised as part of the workload model and in appraisal and promotion processes.

Within our workload model “Outreach” is one of several activities that all staff are allocated 10% of their time to engage in – i.e. separate to the specific roles that fall under the teaching, admin and research categories. Outreach is discussed in appraisals if the staff member is engaged in outreach or wishes to be. However, it is not a standing appraisal agenda item in recognition of the fact that not all members of staff are comfortable participating in outreach. Outreach activities are considered within the promotion process and are specifically mentioned in the promotion papers. Our Equality Survey identified that about 50% of respondents have participated in some form of Outreach activities in the past 12 months but 20% of people would like to do even more. One male (Professor) and one female (Grade 6) carry out a high level of outreach work and in both cases this is specifically identified as part of their current role. There was no gender bias in the numbers of staff that reported that they engage in outreach.

**Flexibility and managing career breaks**

a) Provide data for the past three years (where possible with clearly labelled graphical illustrations) on the following with commentary on their significance and how they have affected action planning.
(i) **Maternity return rate** – comment on whether maternity return rate in the department has improved or deteriorated and any plans for further improvement. If the department is unable to provide a maternity return rate, please explain why.

Only three members of staff have been on maternity in the past three years and all of them have returned to work afterwards. This return is similar to that in previous years. The University provides a generous maternity package and the department positively supports part-time and flexible working particularly for parents with children (see below).

(ii) **Paternity, adoption and parental leave uptake** – comment on the uptake of paternity leave by grade and parental and adoption leave by gender and grade. Has this improved or deteriorated and what plans are there to improve further.

Nobody has taken adoption leave in the past three years. Two men in the ED have taken paternity leave but the University does not collect data on whether staff have children unless they request maternity or paternity leave so we cannot comment on the uptake of paternity leave among eligible staff.

(iii) **Numbers of applications and success rates for flexible working by gender and grade** – comment on any disparities. Where the number of women in the department is small applicants may wish to comment on specific examples.

These data have only started to be collected in the last year and most agreements over flexible working are done informally, so we are unable to provide detailed data for this section of the application. In terms of constraints on timetabling for academics (i.e. when staff formally request not to be assigned teaching), in 2013/14 four women and two men requested and were granted timetabling constraints to allow them to work flexibly due to caring responsibilities. For example, one fulltime female lecturer leaves at 2.30pm every day to collect her children but then works from home. A male professor works from home every Friday so he can collect his children from school. The ED is very supportive of flexible working for all staff; the HOD confirmed that all requests for flexible working have been approved without any changes to the request during his period in office (2010-present).

b) For each of the areas below, explain what the key issues are in the department, what steps have been taken to address any imbalances, what success/impact has been achieved so far and what additional steps may be needed.

(i) **Flexible working** – comment on the numbers of staff working flexibly and their grades and gender, whether there is a formal or informal system, the support and training provided for managers in promoting and managing flexible working arrangements, and how the department raises awareness of the options available.

Most flexible working in the Department is done informally, although staff working for SEI-Y are generally only permitted to work from home one day per week and this needs to be approved by their Line Manager. Data on formal requests for flexible working are only just starting to be collected so we cannot comment on them here. In our Equality Survey, over 80% of staff said that they felt that it is easy to use the flexible working arrangements available to them e.g. ‘Flexible working possible and appreciated’ and more than 90% were comfortable talking to their line manager about flexible working.
arrangements. Several respondents felt that the ED needed to provide more information about flexible working options particularly in the induction pack and this will addressed in our Action Plan (AP 3.3).

(ii) **Cover for maternity and adoption leave and support on return** – explain what the department does, beyond the university maternity policy package, to support female staff before they go on maternity leave, arrangements for covering work during absence, and to help them achieve a suitable work-life balance on their return.

As only three women, one administrator, one academic and one technician, have been on maternity leave in the past three years, the ED has not developed any formal support package for returners. For a relatively small department, funding for staff cover has been a key issue. The AS process has highlighted support for returners as an area which needs addressing:

*For the administrator*, a temporary replacement was employed for four of the six months that she was away. Some duties were carried out during her ‘Keeping in Touch’ days towards the end of her maternity leave. On her return to full time work, she requested and was granted flexible working arrangements to fit in with childcare.

*For the academic*, some of her administration and student supervision duties were taken on by existing staff and she did most of her normal lecturing via the ‘Keeping in Touch’ days (on an hourly basis depending on timetabling). There was no cover provided to keep her research projects active. On her return she opted to work 0.6 FTE rising to 0.7FTE after four months. Flexible working allows her to work more hours during University term time to accrue extra time off during the school holidays.

*For the technician*, who is employed on a research grant, funding was found to employ a replacement for about half of the eight months that she was on maternity leave. She now works 0.5FTE rather than full time at her request.

We are aiming to improve the support provided to people on and returning from maternity or adoption leave; this is a long term goal in our Action Plan and a personal priority of our HoD (see letter of endorsement) (AP 6.3). A key issue seems to be cover for staff during maternity leave, as in the past this has not always been available leaving colleagues to cover for absent staff and research simply not being continued. This can cause negative feelings among other staff and have negative impacts on the functioning of the department and the career of the individual on maternity or adoption leave. The UoY has recently changed the way that it funds maternity cover which might alleviate some of the financial strains on smaller departments. For returning academics this support package would include offering a returner one term without teaching to allow he/she the opportunity to re-start his/her research programme and apply for grants and studentships. In addition, returners would be given priority for internal research funds to gather pilot data for grant applications. This would be in addition to the existing policies of supporting requests for part-time and flexible working (AP 6.1).

(4435 words)
5. **Any other comments: maximum 500 words**

Please comment here on any other elements which are relevant to the application, e.g. other SET-specific initiatives of special interest that have not been covered in the previous sections. Include any other relevant data (e.g. results from staff surveys), provide a commentary on it and indicate how it is planned to address any gender disparities identified.

From our recent Equality Survey it emerged that only 20% of staff have participated in Equality and Diversity training. This training is currently being re-designed by the UoY Equality and Diversity Office. So in the meantime, we have invited Professor Paul Walton to give a Departmental Talk on ‘Unconscious Bias’ and how the Chemistry Department gained its Gold Athena SWAN award. We also aim to increase the number of staff who have completed the HR course on Recruitment which touches upon gender issues in the workplace (AP 5.2). This is currently compulsory for staff on recruitment panels but not for those hiring PhD students, for example.

(106 words)

6. **Action plan**

Provide an action plan as an appendix. An action plan template is available on the Athena SWAN website.

The Action Plan should be a table or a spreadsheet comprising actions to address the priorities identified by the analysis of relevant data presented in this application, success/outcome measures, the post holder responsible for each action and a timeline for completion. The plan should cover current initiatives and your aspirations **for the next three years**.

The action plan does not need to cover all areas at Bronze; however the expectation is that the department will have the organisational structure to move forward, including collecting the necessary data.
ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF YORK:
ACTION PLAN

Priority actions within each section are in bold and indicated *. Within the main application we refer to individual actions (*AP 1.1 etc*) and provide the evidence base, more details of the issues to be tackled and our proposed plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
<th>Action taken already and outcome at March 2014</th>
<th>Further action planned at March 2014</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Success Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baseline Data and Supporting Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Monitor UG and PG student data by gender Annual report to - BoS - DMT - Staff meeting</td>
<td>Data collected for entry and for cohorts; local systems fit for purpose; created record of national data; created standard ongoing process and record; checked whether data in line with national figures. Assessed data - no evidence of discrimination.</td>
<td>Repeat analysis</td>
<td>UoY Centre to provide data. ASDC to analyse</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Maintain the equitable level of offers and intake based on gender. For PhD students, determine whether there is a decline in applications from women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Collect data on requests for flexible and part-time working arrangements</td>
<td>University worksheet given to Dept Administrator. Data collection started but too early to analyse.</td>
<td>To collect data on all future applications for flexible or part-time working</td>
<td>HR and Dept Administrator</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>An accurate record of flexible and part-time working arrangements in the ED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor staff appointments, including fellowships and promotion success rates.</td>
<td>University HR provided 2011-13 data. ASDC identified a male bias among grade 7 researchers, Readers and Professors.</td>
<td>Repeat analysis and report to Staff meeting and DMT.</td>
<td>HR, HoD and ASDC</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Report on gender profile of grade progression (at level of aggregation to ensure anonymity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3*</td>
<td>Monitor staff destinations and reasons for leaving ED</td>
<td>Information not currently collected formally except for whether someone resigns, dies, retires or comes to the end of a fixed term contract. Slight bias in female researchers leaving at the end of fixed term contracts but unknown what happens to them after that.</td>
<td>Develop exit questionnaire to include questions on reasons for leaving and future plans.</td>
<td>ASDC</td>
<td>6 months to develop questionnaires</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>Increase proportion of leavers’ destination information. Monitor for gender differences in reasons for leaving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UG and PG Students</td>
<td>To redesign our student recruitment material to ensure that it is gender neutral with images and case studies of both males and females.</td>
<td>Agreed at Teaching Committee. Initial analyses of existing brochure showed no obvious gender bias among images.</td>
<td>Collect or create suitable images, case studies and text. Produce new brochure and web-pages.</td>
<td>Publicity Officer and Admissions Tutors</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To determine how the department can better embed work-life balance into PG students’ supervision.</td>
<td>Not currently addressed.</td>
<td>Add this to the agenda of the next Staff-Student Liaison Meeting for discussion.</td>
<td>ASDC, Chair of BoS and PG coordinator</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Increased student satisfaction e.g. expressed through the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>To develop a PG exit questionnaire to discover the destinations of our graduates and how the PhD experience (including the application process) can be improved.</td>
<td>Currently these data are not collected</td>
<td>Recruit a masters’ student to collect and analyse these data as part of a research project on careers in the Environmental sector.</td>
<td>PG coordinator and masters’ project supervisor</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Achieve at least 50% return rate of questionnaires. Utilise information to improve student experience particularly for women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>To make the application process for PhD positions more transparent.</td>
<td>Identified trends during self-assessment process – apparent decline in proportion of females applying for PhDs which corresponds to a change in funding model and application process.</td>
<td>Analyse in more detail the application process for PhD students in relation to funding sources and also the type of projects on offer. Use information from exit questionnaire (AP 2.3).</td>
<td>ASDC and PG coordinator</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Sept 2016</td>
<td>Report on effects of funder and application process on gender bias in PhD recruitment. Updated guidance for staff and applicants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To investigate the feasibility of offering part-time degrees.

Informal discussions with degree conveners suggest that part-time taught degrees are not considered possible currently because of timetabling constraints, limited staff time and lack of demand.

ASDC discovered that rules on part-time PhDs are dependent on the restrictions of the funder not the UoY.

To carry out a feasibility study to determine the market for part-time study, what our competitors offer and internal constraints on offering part-time degrees.

To investigate whether the main PhD funders would support students undertaking PhDs part-time.

Degree conveners

3 months

January 2017

A business and educational case for or against part-time learning options.

3 Key Career Transition Points, Appointments and Promotions

3.1 Encourage more post-doctoral fellowship applications to the dept.

Discussed at Research Committee and first draft of text for website written.

Finish writing guidance document for prospective fellowship applicants and post on website.

Identify potential UoY funded Daphne Jackson Fellowship applicants.

Research committee

3 months

July 2014

Increase the number of research fellows in ED from 3 to 5 in line with REF aspirations.

Research Committee, all staff and ASDC

Prior to next deadline.

Deadline TBA

Appointment of a Daphne Jackson Fellow to ED.
| 3.2 * Increase the number of female staff at senior levels. | Invited Prof Paul Walton to a staff meeting to talk to us about Unconscious Bias and how the Chemistry Dept increased numbers of women at Senior lecturer or grade 8 and above. | Started a pro-active approach to internal promotion by HoD running promotion seminars and personal approaches by senior staff. | Promote our positive and inclusive dept culture plus the UoY’s flexible working and family friendly policies. | HoD, DMT and Chair of ASDC | 30 months | July 2014 | In next Equality survey, an increase staff who feel that they are supported to apply for promotion from 45% to 60%. Increase in numbers of staff applying for promotion. The promotion or recruitment of two female professors and three female senior lecturers. An increase in the number of female researchers at grade 7. |
| Changed the wording of recent job adverts to emphasize our positive and inclusive departmental culture plus the UoY’s flexible working and family friendly policies. | Identify Line Managers who require training in supporting staff through promotion so more consistent and accurate advice is given. | Further investigate the wording of job adverts and candidate briefs to ensure that we do not unintentionally bias against or deter female applicants. |
### 3.3 To improve the induction process for new staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Via our Equality Survey and interviews, the ASDC identified that Department policies and practices are not communicated consistently to new staff. The resulting reliance on informal networks might differ in effectiveness for men and women especially those with caring responsibilities or who are part-time.</td>
<td>Establish an online staff repository of information for staff. Update the current ED staff handbook which will form the basis of a Dept specific induction. Introduce a ‘buddy’ system for new staff to facilitate better flows of information between staff.</td>
<td>VLE coordinator &amp; SEI-Y web manager HoD Chair of BoS and ASDC. HoD</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
<td>In next Equality Survey, show an improvement in the induction experiences of new staff. A staff handbook and online repository of relevant information. New staff meeting regularly with buddies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 Career Advice and Support

#### 4.1 Review and monitor uptake of Mentoring Scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equality Survey identified a lack of clarity over the existing mentoring scheme, with poor uptake and confidence in the scheme.</td>
<td>Re-organise the mentoring scheme so that it is offered to all academics and researchers. Ensure that mentors and mentees are offered training to maximise the effectiveness of the scheme.</td>
<td>HoD and Chair of Research Committee</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Sept 2014</td>
<td>Improved perception of mentoring in next Equality Survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Improve uptake of training and careers advice for researchers.</td>
<td>Training courses and careers advice are currently offered via the University but information is not always circulated to all staff.</td>
<td>Advertise Careers surgeries and training courses more widely. Identify requirements for specific research skills in the environmental sciences.</td>
<td>Careers Service, Line Managers and Dept administrators</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Culture, Communications and Departmental Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>* Monitor committee membership and seminar speakers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.2 | Improve awareness of Equality and Diversity at Department level:  
- Welcome and induction sessions for all new staff  
- Staff meetings | Equality Survey revealed that approximately 20% of staff have completed E&D training.  
Invited Prof Paul Walton to a staff meeting to talk to us about Unconscious Bias and how the Chemistry Dept increased numbers of female readers and professors. | The UoY’s Equality and Diversity Unit are revising the current training.  
Encourage uptake of new E&D e-learning modules; Monitor uptake.  
Send info and links to all staff | ASDC and Dept Administrator | 30 months | Sept 2014 | 50% of PIs to take e-learning course. |
| 5.3 | Review and document Department Workload Model | This has been started. | Discuss with individual staff how much time new posts require so more accurate time allocations can be added to the Model. | HoD and SEI-Y director | Ongoing | Jan 2015 (next PDR meetings) | A better work-life balance reported in future Staff and Equality surveys. |
| 5.4 | Publicise the procedure for nominations for awards and prizes to all staff. | Informal scheme in place | Include information about awards and prizes in circulars to all staff. Discuss options for targeting individuals, particularly women, who might not nominate themselves. | All staff to pass on information to Dept. Administrator for circulation | Ongoing | Summer 2014 (when new research administrator in post) | Increased awareness of staff about awards and prizes. |
| 5.5 | **Publicize awards and prizes on web, staff meetings etc.** | New website has rolling news function. Newsletter produced each term. New website homepage launched with updated news function | Ensure that success stories featuring women are presented commensurate with the sex ratio of the ED. | HoD, newsletter editor and website manager | Ongoing | Summer 2014 (when new research administrator in post) | Continue with good practice. |
| 5.6 | **Improve social aspect of Department** | Group functions and retirement parties held; Xmas lecture & party – all seen as positive to working culture | Look to establish more department-wide events that include students as well as staff. | HoD, seminar organiser | ongoing | June 2014 | Establishment of summer staff party and staff/student quiz night. |
| **6** | **Career breaks/flexible working** | | | | | | |
| 6.1 | **Advertise parental leave, return to work and flexible working policies widely** | HR policies highlighted on website and job adverts | Add information about flexible and part-time working to the Staff handbook, new Induction Pack and online staff resource site (see AP 3.3). | Dept administrator, HoD and Website Manager | ongoing | August 2014 | In Staff and Equality surveys, increase the percentage of staff who feel that they are able to take up flexible or part-time working opportunities from 82% to 90%. |
| 6.2 | **Advertise career success stories of women with families in the Department widely and on the web** | Not explicitly done. | Success stories from staff and students to be written and posted on web page | Publicity officer, ASDC and Website Manager | 12 months | August 2015 | New web pages are created. |
**KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS**

1. UoY = University of York
2. ASDC = Athena Swan Departmental Committee (in the Environment Department of the University of York)
3. HR = Human Resources
4. BoS = Board of Studies
5. HoD = Head of Department
6. DMT = Departmental Management Team
7. ED = Environment Department
8. SEI-Y = Stockholm Environment Institute - York
9. RA = Research Associate
10. PDR = Performance Development Review (done annually in January)
11. VLE = Virtual Learning Environment (online repository for teaching and admin material at UoY)

| 6.3 | Develop a policy for supporting staff after returning from maternity or adoption leave. | All returners meet with HoD to discuss workload after maternity leave. All staff can request flexible and part-time working | Discuss with staff how admin and teaching workloads for academic returners can be minimised for a term to allow research activities to be rejuvenated. Provision of funding to acquire pilot data for applications. | HoD, Chair of research committee and DMT | ongoing | When next staff member goes on maternity or adoption leave. | Maintain high return rate after maternity and adoption leave. |