Department Application
Bronze and Silver Award
ATHENA SWAN BRONZE DEPARTMENT AWARDS

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

ATHENA SWAN SILVER DEPARTMENT AWARDS

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

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

COMPLETING THE FORM

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

This form should be used for applications for Bronze and Silver department awards.

You should complete each section of the application applicable to the award level you are applying for.

Additional areas for Silver applications are highlighted throughout the form: 5.2, 5.4, 5.5(iv)

If you need to insert a landscape page in your application, please copy and paste the template page at the end of the document, as per the instructions on that page. Please do not insert any section breaks as to do so will disrupt the page numbers.

WORD COUNT

The overall word limit for applications are shown in the following table.

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

We have provided the following recommendations as a guide.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department application</th>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Silver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word limit</strong></td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Recommended word count</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Letter of endorsement</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of the department</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-assessment process</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Picture of the department</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supporting and advancing women’s careers</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Case studies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Further information</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2L</td>
<td>Access to Leeds</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>Annual Academic Meeting</td>
<td>MaPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAD</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>MRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Advisory Education Centre</td>
<td>MSc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>NHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Academic Related</td>
<td>P&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Athena Swan</td>
<td>PAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASWG</td>
<td>Athena Swan Working Group</td>
<td>PDRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUA</td>
<td>Association of University Administrators</td>
<td>PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBSRC</td>
<td>Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council</td>
<td>PGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoR</td>
<td>Director of Research</td>
<td>PGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSE</td>
<td>Director of Student Education</td>
<td>PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;I</td>
<td>Equality and Inclusion</td>
<td>RCUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIC</td>
<td>Equality and Inclusion Committee</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWG</td>
<td>Employability Working Group</td>
<td>RES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDSE</td>
<td>Faculty Director of Student Education</td>
<td>SAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
<td>SBMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSK</td>
<td>GlaxoSmithKline</td>
<td>SDDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEaTED</td>
<td>Higher Education and Technicians Educational Development</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>Higher Education Statistics Agency</td>
<td>SMCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoS</td>
<td>Head of School</td>
<td>SRDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>STEMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPY</td>
<td>Industrial Placement</td>
<td>STU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSF</td>
<td>Institutional Strategic Support Fund</td>
<td>SYA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IST</td>
<td>Institute of Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>TECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>Keep in Touch</td>
<td>UAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT+</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender</td>
<td>UG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICAMM</td>
<td>Leeds Institute of Cardiovascular and Metabolic Medicine Lifelong Learning Centre</td>
<td>UoL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLC</td>
<td>Lifelong Learning Centre</td>
<td>WaLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of institution</td>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Faculty of Biological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of department</td>
<td>STEMM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of application</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Level</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Athena SWAN award</td>
<td>Date: June 2009, Nov 2012 &amp; April 2016</td>
<td>Level: Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact for application</td>
<td>Julie Aspden and Sue Whittle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.aspden@leeds.ac.uk">j.aspden@leeds.ac.uk</a> and <a href="mailto:s.r.whittle@leeds.ac.uk">s.r.whittle@leeds.ac.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>0113 343 9607 and 0113 343 3114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fbs.leeds.ac.uk/">http://www.fbs.leeds.ac.uk/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT FROM THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT**

Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words
Faculty of Biological Sciences
The University of Leeds
LC Miall Building
Leeds, LS2 9JT

To whom it may concern
Athena SWAN Charter
Equality Challenge Unit
7th floor, Queens House
55/56 Lincoln’s Inn Fields
London, WC2A 3LJ

26th April 2017

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to enthusiastically endorse the application and associated Action Plan for the Faculty of Biological Sciences (FBS) Athena-SWAN (AS) Silver Award. I took over as Dean of the Faculty in December 2014 and it was clear that, although we had received our Bronze award, we had just embarked on a journey toward greater awareness, understanding and engagement in the values of the AS Charter. With a staff of 453 and 2226 students, promoting the AS agenda can be a challenge, however through the activity of a driven and highly enthusiastic committee there is no doubt that great strides have been made.

Although the success of the AS activity in the Faculty requires involvement from all of our staff and students, the actions by senior management are fundamental in sending out a strong message about its importance. In this regard we have made some major changes/advances. The AS working group has been revitalised through appointing Julie Aspden and Sue Whittle as co-chairs and by changing the structure to reflect the AS mandate for Professional and Managerial staff, and support staff, as well as the inclusion of undergraduate and PhD student representation. We have recently appointed Karen Birch as the new Head of School of Biomedical Sciences. A major realignment of the Faculty has initiated a broader Faculty-based management system, that has facilitated the communication of AS activity as a Faculty-wide activity and helped wider engagement for all our staff. This is perfectly exemplified by the high level of staff attendance (121 attendees) at unconscious bias training across the Faculty.

Tangible signs of impact have already emerged including improved numbers of female undergraduate (UG) applications for Sports and Exercise through better gender balance in promotional materials; improvement in promotions of female academics; improvement in
monitoring of Annual Academic Meetings to support promotion applications; proportional increase in the grant applications made, and funding received is notably larger for female staff than male staff; improved recruitment of UG females through access routes; reduced proportion of females in fixed-term contracts.

Faculty AS events/activity have contributed to an awareness of gender equality as exemplified by the following:

- World Women and Girls in Science Day Celebration (February 2017) including a panel discussion on role models.
- Monthly ‘Coffee and Careers’ sessions – inviting FBS alumni back to talk about their science related careers, attended by PhD students, postdocs and technicians.
- Quarterly AS hosted Faculty Coffee mornings with HR clinic.
- ‘Footsteps’ booklet of case studies for careers.
- Annual Irene Manton Lectures.
- Vibrant up-to-date website.
- Twitter account to publicise events and connect with other AS/gender equality movements.
- Guidelines to seminar organisers to ensure gender equality of invitees.

We appreciate that promoting the AS agenda is a journey, and that we have to continually improve and refresh our ability to keep on the right track, however the direction of travel is right and we are achieving our objectives with a strong, comprehensively representative and enthusiastic team. It is a rewarding part of my role as Dean to be part of this journey and seeing the AS values increasingly complementing Faculty activity.

Yours,

Professor John Ladbury
Dean of Faculty of Biological Sciences

Word count 514
2. DESCRIPTION OF THE DEPARTMENT
Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words

The Faculty of Biological Sciences (FBS) is one of the leading groups of life-science researchers in the UK, contributing to world-class research, offering superb facilities, providing a high-quality research training environment and delivering an exceptional student education. The University of Leeds (UoL) was named University of the Year 2017 by The Sunday Times’ Good University Guide as a result of “heavy investment in campus facilities” “strong pastoral system of student support”, “final year research-based project as the centre-piece of students’ academic activities”, and “Leeds for Life scheme that helps prepare students for life after university”. These are all core activities within FBS as well as University level and we have developed tailored programmes in these areas for our students.

Our position amongst the UK elite for bioscience research was confirmed in the results of the recent Research Excellence Framework (REF) where we were ranked as 6th in the country for research impact. Integral to the success of the Faculty, and in line with the University’s Equality and Inclusion framework, is the desire to harness the full capability of all our staff and students and to provide a diverse, inclusive Faculty environment that allows all staff and students to realise their full potential.

In addition to 143 academic staff, the Faculty has 133 postdoctoral fellows and 271 postgraduate students supported by a current active research grant portfolio of some £53m derived from a range of sources including research councils, charities, the European Union and industry. The Faculty has 3 Schools (Fig 2.1):

- School of Biology (SB)
- School of Molecular and Cellular Biology (SMCB)
- School of Biomedical Sciences (SBMS)

Teaching in life sciences is delivered and supported by the Biological Sciences Student Education Service and the three Schools. Teaching provision is via the Undergraduate & Graduate Schools with B.Sc. and M. Biol programmes aligned across SB, SMCB and SBMS. Provision of all teaching is overseen by the Pro-Dean for Student Education supported by the Faculty Director of Student Education working with School Directors of Student Education (DSE) (Fig 2.2). The Director of the Graduate School oversees postgraduate research student training and progression across FBS.
With around 1900 undergraduate students and 100 taught postgraduate students, we are one of the largest life sciences faculties in the UK. Our programmes cover the breadth of the biological sciences with undergraduate programmes in the areas of biology, biochemistry, microbiology, sport and exercise sciences and medical sciences including physiology and neuroscience. Significant investments in our infrastructure contribute to our dynamic and vibrant research environment, offering excellent opportunities for cutting edge research focused around key areas, including neuroscience, sports and exercise science, membrane biology, and structural molecular biology.
Of the 14 members of Senior Management Academic staff we have 4 women in leadership roles, (29% females). Although most of these females are currently all in one school (SBMS), SMCB had a female DSE until 2017.
Table 2.A: Composition of FBS staff and students by gender 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Students</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Staff (postdocs)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Managerial Staff</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 2.3: Overview of FBS staff and student numbers by gender
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3. THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Recommended word count: Bronze: 1000 words | Silver: 1000 words

(i) A description of the self-assessment team

The self-assessment team (SAT), or Athena Swan Working Group (ASWG), which are the same thing, consists of 20 members (Table 3.A), 75% of whom are female. It brings together academic, professional and managerial, research and support staff, both at early-career and senior levels, as well as postdocs and PhD students across the three schools of the faculty. We have recently recruited UG student representatives, one of whom attended our March 2017 Meeting. This ensures views of diverse stakeholders are represented plus buy-in of senior management (incl Dean), which are vital to ongoing success of the gender equality agenda. The SAT members have different experiences, with some having caring responsibilities, working part-time or on a flexible basis and having diverse career trajectories. There are six continuing members from the 2014 Bronze Submission SAT who bring continuity and experience to the self-assessment process. The Chair, Professor Anne King, stepped down from the committee in 2016, to focus on other commitments. Dr Sue Whittle (SW), an Associate Professor and a long-standing member of FBS ASWG, and Dr Julie Aspden (JA), a new University Academic Fellow, were appointed as Co-Chairs. This has allowed us to draw on two different perspectives in terms of teaching and research focused academics, at different stages of their careers. SW has a teaching and scholarship focus, whilst JA joined FBS in 2015. JA’s recent experience of making the transition from postdoc to academic puts her in an excellent position to tackle this key part of the leaky pipeline. Together SW and JA represent the importance of both research and teaching, which is at the heart of FBS.

Table 3.A: Description of self-assessment team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role on Team</th>
<th>Role in Faculty</th>
<th>Experience and work-life balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michaela Agapiou</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>PhD student (School of Molecular and Cellular Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(female)</td>
<td>representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Andrew Aldridge</td>
<td>PDRA representative</td>
<td>PDRA in BMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(male)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Julie Aspden</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>UAF in Pervasive Transcription (School of Molecular and Cellular Biology)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Craven</td>
<td>Advisor on HR</td>
<td>FBS HR Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(female)</td>
<td>policy development &amp; implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Hannah Dugdalle</td>
<td>School of Biology academic representative</td>
<td>Lecturer in Conservation Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashleigh Elliott (female)</td>
<td>Postgraduate representative</td>
<td>PhD student in School of Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Philippa Garner (female)</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Scholarship representative</td>
<td>Teaching Fellow in School of Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Goodall (female)</td>
<td>Support staff representative</td>
<td>Faculty Senior Technical Services Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Keith Hamer (male)</td>
<td>School of Biology academic representative</td>
<td>Professor of Animal Ecology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Mark Harris (male)</td>
<td>School of Molecular and Cellular Biology academic representative</td>
<td>Professor of Virology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Emma Hesketh (female)</td>
<td>PDRA representative</td>
<td>PDRA in School of Molecular and Cellular Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Isuru Jayasinghe (male)</td>
<td>School of Biomedical Sciences academic representative</td>
<td>Lecturer in Cardiovascular Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Anne King (female)</td>
<td>Ex-Chair and BMS representative</td>
<td>Chair of Translational Neuroscience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Hannah Kirton (female)</td>
<td>PDRA representative</td>
<td>PDRA in School of Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jessica Kwok (female)</td>
<td>School of Biomedical Sciences academic representative</td>
<td>UAF in Medical Engineering in the Spinal Cord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor John Ladbury (male)</td>
<td>Dean of FBS</td>
<td>Dean of Faculty of Biological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Charlotte Scarff (female)</td>
<td>PDRA representative</td>
<td>PDRA in School of Molecular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ii) An account of the self-assessment process

The SAT meets monthly: business from other FBS committees, including Equality and Inclusion (EIC) and Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) is discussed along with new and ongoing initiatives. Standing items on our agenda include updates from postdoc and student representatives. There are sub-committees for postdocs, PhD students and UG students. Each sub-group meets to develop strategies and activities specifically to support gender equality within these populations. This is essential to encourage progression of gender equality through the career steps for young female scientists.

Athena SWAN is a regular item on agendas for school staff meetings (2/year), FEC and EIC meetings, so that the committees feed into each other (2013 Action 1.1). The FBS Athena SWAN website (www.fbs.leeds.ac.uk/equality-and-diversity/athena-swan/) is also used to communicate information (2013 Action 5.3). Achievements around Athena SWAN objectives are highlighted on this website and in Dean’s weekly email communication to all Faculty members. PhD student and postdoc representatives on the committee invite their peers to discuss their needs regarding the Athena SWAN agenda at coffee mornings. With the recent incorporation of support and professional & managerial staff we are currently developing mechanisms for this to occur for these groups too, e.g. at the next Technical Staff away day there will be an Athena Swan presentation.

Since our Bronze Award in 2014, the SAT has worked to implement the action plan but also developed and delivered new initiatives. These additional activities have benefited from new members of the SAT bringing fresh ideas and incorporating good practices from other groups at UoL and beyond. The SAT has reviewed current policies and practices in FBS and our progress over the last three years by reviewing relevant data. To assess impacts of our actions we performed two surveys, the first in 2013 and the second in 2016, to identify changes during this period. These were Faculty-wide ‘Staff Culture Surveys’ assessing staff opinions on issues relating to work/life balance, career progression and barriers to progression. Following each survey, we organised four focus groups to discuss key areas highlighted in the survey: part-time working, mentoring, career progression and return to work after career breaks (Table 3.B). Outcomes have been incorporated into actions, alongside quantitative data and used within this application to illustrate impact. We also surveyed our PhD students in 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claire Smith (female)</td>
<td>Support staff representative</td>
<td>Faculty Education Service Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichola Sykes (female)</td>
<td>HR: SAT coordination &amp; administrative support</td>
<td>HR Officer in FBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sue Whittle (female)</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Associate Professor in School of Molecular and Cellular Biology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and Cellular Biology
Table 3.B: Numbers of people attending focus groups in 2016/17, and percentage who are female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Group size</th>
<th>% female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time working</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career progression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University AS Steering Group has provided input, support and discussions regarding self-assessment. We received particular input from the Faculty of Medicine and Health (FMH) who were recently awarded silver and from Mathematics and Physical Sciences Faculty (MAPs) as Christina Craven is also a member of their SAT.

External to UoL, we have interacted with a number of other Athena Swan Groups. In 2016 Dr Frankie MacMillan (University of Bristol) shared their experiences of ‘Advancing to Silver and Beyond’. Dr MacMillan described initiatives that they had introduced, and brought fresh ideas on new activities for career development across the faculty. We meet with representatives from York and Sheffield and the White Rose Partnership to discuss best practice and exchange ideas. Dr Julie Aspden also regularly discusses actions and initiatives with colleagues at University of Sussex who have been critical friends during the self-assessment process.

(iii) Plans for the future of the self-assessment team

The ASWG will continue to meet monthly to review data, implement initiatives, and monitor implementation and effectiveness of the Action Plan. After our submission, we will split into sub-teams to focus on specific types of activity within our action plan e.g. mentoring, to allow us to focus and contribute to areas we are passionate about. To ensure ASWG tackles school specific challenges e.g. PGR applications, we will also meet as teams from each School, led by AS School representatives. One area we aim to address along with members of the EIC is Trans issues, working with University levels Athena Swan groups. Our newly formed undergraduate sub-group will meet regularly and liaise with the PhD student reps to organise events, and promote AS awareness and culture. We will focus on developing improved survey mechanisms in June 2017, a “Survey Sub-group” will be established to develop a new and improved survey structure that will profile all groups of staff and students, with tailored questions on an annual basis.
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4. A PICTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT
Recommended word count: Bronze: 2000 words | Silver: 2000 words

4.1 Student data

(i) Numbers of men and women on access or foundation courses

FBS accepts students via three access routes: foundation courses, Access to HE, and the Access to Leeds scheme (A2L). The majority enter via A2L, the university’s widening access programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Entry</th>
<th>A2L</th>
<th>Access to HE schemes</th>
<th>Foundation Year</th>
<th>Total (sum of A2L, Access and Foundation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Registrations</td>
<td>% F</td>
<td>Total Registrations</td>
<td>% F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 4.1.1: Percentage of students from access routes who are female

The percentage of female entrants from all routes increased from 54% in 2012 to 70% in 2016. Historically, females were underrepresented on the Access to HE route, but now constitute 50% of the cohort. The proportion of male students entering through access courses is decreasing; action is required to improve gender balance.
(ii) Numbers of undergraduate students by gender

FBS offers 17 UG degree programmes within three Schools. Data for SES are reported separately from SBMS, of which it is part, since SES delivers distinct degree programmes. Gender distribution in SES is different, and consequently specific actions are required. Only SB recruits part-time (PT) undergraduates and numbers are low (~1-2/year) so are excluded. National benchmark data are HESA derived and Russell Group benchmarks shown for a more direct comparison.

Table 4.1. B: Numbers and gender of UG students in FBS and within schools, with percentages of those who are female (green), along with National sector benchmarks (Nat ben)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011/12 F</th>
<th>2011/12 M</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>% M</th>
<th>2012/13 F</th>
<th>2012/13 M</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>% M</th>
<th>2013/14 F</th>
<th>2013/14 M</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>% M</th>
<th>2014/15 F</th>
<th>2014/15 M</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>% M</th>
<th>2015/16 F</th>
<th>2015/16 M</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>% M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>53225</td>
<td>53655</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55530</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56910</td>
<td>57205</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100090</td>
<td>101240</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>101240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>16655</td>
<td>11680</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12050</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17945</td>
<td>12475</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18870</td>
<td>12580</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCB</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>6945</td>
<td>5675</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5925</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7380</td>
<td>6105</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7690</td>
<td>6090</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBMS</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>17820</td>
<td>10915</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11310</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19430</td>
<td>11445</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19670</td>
<td>11205</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>11805</td>
<td>25385</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12025</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12155</td>
<td>27180</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11925</td>
<td>27655</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 4.1.2: Percentage of UG students across FBS who are female, along with Russell Group and National benchmarks

Fig 4.1.3: Percentage of UG students in SB, SMCB, SBMS and SES, who are female, along with Russell Group and National benchmarks
The proportion of UG female students has risen at faculty level to >60%, in line with other RG universities (Fig 4.1.2). School data suggest that percentages of female students have risen particularly in SMCB and SBMS (approaching 70% F), though changes in SB have stabilised (Fig 4.1.3). SMCB has a more even gender balance than SB or SBMS. These levels exceed National and RG benchmarks, particularly in SBMS. In contrast, the percentage of female UG students in SES has decreased slightly, is above the National benchmark but not RG levels. It is encouraging that decreasing female registrations in SES have stabilised in 2014-16, resulting from our actions to attract females to this course (2013 Action 2.3).

**ACTION**

1.3 Review number of male and females hosting open days, and promotional materials to attract male students particularly to BMSC programmes
### ii.b UG Applications, offers and acceptances

Table 4.1.C: Percentage of students who are female applying, getting offers and accepting, with actual numbers of female students in brackets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apps</td>
<td>Offers</td>
<td>Accs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>51 (2704)</td>
<td>55 (2214)</td>
<td>56 (330)</td>
<td>55 (2217)</td>
<td>59 (1939)</td>
<td>62 (395)</td>
<td>57 (2696)</td>
<td>62 (2254)</td>
<td>63 (404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Benchmark</td>
<td>48 (86620)</td>
<td>48 (87425)</td>
<td>49 (14050)</td>
<td>48 (90635)</td>
<td>48 (15285)</td>
<td>50 (100090)</td>
<td>49 (16210)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>59 (805)</td>
<td>59 (656)</td>
<td>62 (108)</td>
<td>62 (634)</td>
<td>64 (555)</td>
<td>67 (122)</td>
<td>65 (751)</td>
<td>68 (598)</td>
<td>68 (129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Benchmark</td>
<td>57 (24120)</td>
<td>58 (4190)</td>
<td>58 (24090)</td>
<td>58 (4275)</td>
<td>59 (25745)</td>
<td>61 (30160)</td>
<td>62 (5140)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCB</td>
<td>51 (634)</td>
<td>53 (554)</td>
<td>58 (102)</td>
<td>58 (556)</td>
<td>59 (502)</td>
<td>62 (112)</td>
<td>56 (706)</td>
<td>58 (603)</td>
<td>56 (102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Benchmark</td>
<td>51 (10041)</td>
<td>103 (1685)</td>
<td>52 (11175)</td>
<td>53 (1900)</td>
<td>55 (12040)</td>
<td>58 (2050)</td>
<td>60 (14625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBMS</td>
<td>60 (913)</td>
<td>63 (777)</td>
<td>58 (100)</td>
<td>64 (808)</td>
<td>64 (725)</td>
<td>67 (140)</td>
<td>69 (998)</td>
<td>71 (884)</td>
<td>72 (144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Benchmark</td>
<td>59 (36890)</td>
<td>63 (4810)</td>
<td>58 (37625)</td>
<td>63 (5000)</td>
<td>59 (38190)</td>
<td>63 (5420)</td>
<td>62 (37065)</td>
<td>67 (5185)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>30 (352)</td>
<td>36 (227)</td>
<td>37 (32)</td>
<td>30 (219)</td>
<td>35 (157)</td>
<td>32 (21)</td>
<td>27 (241)</td>
<td>37 (169)</td>
<td>40 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Benchmark</td>
<td>27 (15570)</td>
<td>29 (2985)</td>
<td>28 (14535)</td>
<td>29 (2875)</td>
<td>28 (14660)</td>
<td>27 (3065)</td>
<td>27 (18240)</td>
<td>27 (3540)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 4.1.4: Percentage of applicants to UG programmes, who are female in FBS, with National and Russell Group benchmarks

Fig 4.1.5: Percentage of those making applications to UG programmes, who are female SB, SMCB, SBMS and SES.
Fig 4.1.6: Percentage of those receiving offers to UG programmes, who are female in FBS
Fig 4.1.7: Percentage of those receiving offers to UG programmes, who are female in SB, SMCB, SBMS and SES.
Fig 4.1.8: Percentage of students accepting offers who are female, across FBS. Russell group and national benchmarks are also indicated.

Acceptances: FBS

Fig 4.1.9: Percentage of students accepting offers who are female, in individual Schools; SB, SBMS, SMCB and SES. Russell group and national benchmarks are also indicated.

Acceptances: SB

Acceptances: SMCB
Fig 4.1.10: Percentage of students applying, getting offers and accepting them who are female, in FBS.

**Female successful application process: FBS**
Fig 4.1.11: Percentage of students applying, getting offers and accepting them who are female, in SB, SMCB, SBMS, SES.

The percentage of female applicants has risen, as have offers and acceptances. Female students are slightly more likely to obtain and accept offers than males, (Fig 4.1.9 and 10) possibly because females perform better at interview and achieve better A levels. At Faculty level, % female applicants and acceptances mirror other RG universities (Fig 4.1.4 and Fig 4.1.8).

At School level, SMCB and SES recruit a higher percentage of females than the national/RG average. We changed SES course recruitment material to include more female representation in marketing videos and brochures (2013 Action 2.3), which has resulted in increased applications, from ~30% in 2012/2013 to ~50% in 2016/2017 (Fig 4.1.9) despite a national/RG decrease. This impact should result in higher numbers of female registrations.

SB and SBMS recruit in line with national trends; however, we are concerned that SBMS acceptances from males are approaching 25% and will address this (Action 1.3).
### ACTION

1.4 Monitor ongoing effects of changes to strategies and materials on SES registrations

### UG Degree attainment by gender

Table 4.1.D: Number of students achieving degree classifications by gender and year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II(i)</th>
<th>II(ii)</th>
<th>III/Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>7505</td>
<td>3210</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>5850</td>
<td>4245</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>3185</td>
<td>8100</td>
<td>3150</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>6895</td>
<td>4560</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>3865</td>
<td>8425</td>
<td>3075</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>2515</td>
<td>7665</td>
<td>4640</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>2645</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>3990</td>
<td>7560</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>2570</td>
<td>6405</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 4.1.12: Percentage of female and male students across FBS achieving 2.1, along with Russell Group and National benchmarks

Females outperform males at Faculty level, and most years in every School. Male graduates perform slightly less well compared to other RG universities, though differences are small. The levels of female success in FBS mirror RG benchmarks. The gap between genders varies year-on-year, but no trend, and no reason for the greater gender gap observed in 2013 and 2016 can be identified. Similar gender gaps are evident in national data.

Table 4.1.E: Difference in the percentage of females and males obtaining a 2.1 or better

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 4.1.13: Percentage of UG students achieving at 2.1 or higher, by gender in SB, SMCB, SBMS and SES
At School level, poorer performance by male students in SES identified in 2013 appears to have slightly improved (Fig 4.1.13-SES); continued tracking is required, as male performance remains more variable than in other Schools. We seek to mitigate this pattern of male under-achievement, which is seen across HE.

**ACTION**

1.5 Joint project will be undertaken with Faculty of Arts, Humanities & Cultures to investigate causes of male underperformance: actions may be taken depending on outcomes.
(iii) Numbers of men and women on postgraduate taught degrees (PGT)

iii a Full and part-time registrations

In FBS only SB and SMCB offer full-time taught Masters courses (PGT). SB offers a part-time variant.

Full-time PGT

Table: 4.1.F: Number and percentages of postgraduate taught students who are female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>%F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>3290</td>
<td>2980</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2930</td>
<td>2630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCB</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.1.15: Percentage of postgraduate taught students who are female across whole FBS Both Russell Group and National sector benchmarks are shown.
Fig. 4.1.16: Percentage of postgraduate taught students who are female across SB and SMCB. Both Russell Group and National sector benchmarks are shown.

Percentage female registrations have fluctuated, unsurprisingly with such low numbers. There is approximate gender balance at Faculty and School levels, similar to national/RG data. The number of part-time PGT students is very low (<10/year) and the percentage of females varies (29%-75%) year-on-year. No trends can be identified.

### iii b PGT applications, offers and acceptances

Table 4.1.G: Numbers and percentage of all Postgraduate taught students applying, offered and accepting place in FBS who are female. Total numbers in brackets and percentage outside brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>App</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(348)</td>
<td>(221)</td>
<td>(398)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(185)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(292)</td>
<td>(177)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(319)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 4.1.17: Percentage of students applying, getting offers and accepting places on full-time postgraduate taught programmes in FBS, who are female.

Full-time PGT applications show reasonable gender balance. Slightly more females than males receive offers, and recently female acceptances have reached 67%, in line with undergraduate recruitment.

iii c. Degree completion rates by gender

Table 4.1.H: Completion rates (%) for PGT students comparing females and males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Completion rate (%)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a high completion rate for PGT students, and no difference between male and female students: no action is required.

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

iv a. Postgraduate Research student registrations

In FBS there are several doctoral training programmes (DTPs): we also recruit through UoL schemes and direct entry.
### Table 4.1.1: Full-time Postgraduate Research student registrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>% F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>4495</td>
<td>3865</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4670</td>
<td>4095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCB</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBMS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>1165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig 4.1.18**: Percentage of full-time PGR students in FBS, who are female, along with Russell Group and National benchmarks.

![FBS: FT PGR](image-url)
In FBS, full-time female registrations remained fairly constant, around 50%, slightly lower than national/RG averages. At School level SMCB is steady around 50% and in-line with benchmarks. However, SBMS and SB show a decreasing percentage of female students, falling below RG/National benchmarks. In the 2017 PhD student survey only 2% reported that the recruitment process was gender biased, however we will ensure that all members of interview panels have participated in unconscious bias and gender equality training. The gender composition of PhD interview panels will be monitored, aiming to improve gender balance if required.

We are working with Marketing to ensure that all promotional materials reflect equal gender balance, and to create a ‘Women in Science’ video to attract female PGR students.

**Part-time**

Table 4.1 J: Number and percentage of Part-time Postgraduate Research student registrations who are female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>% F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National benchmark</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 4.1.20: Percentage of part-time PGR students in FBS, who are female, along with Russell Group and National benchmarks.

The number of part-time PGR students is increasing slightly, however the number of females has more than doubled between 2012 and 2016. Compared to national/RG data, FBS has a higher percentage of female part-time PGR students. 3 of these work part-time as technicians, supported by FBS to transition from support staff to PhD students.

**ACTION**

1.6 Review research postgraduate website and advertising materials for good gender balance

1.7 Develop female PhD case studies for PG recruitment material

1.8 Ensure even gender balance of staff and students hosting postgraduate open day/evening events

**iv b. Applications, offers and acceptances**

Table 4.1.K Percentage and numbers of students who applied, were offered places and accepted them, who are female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT %</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT %</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applications, offers and acceptances for FT PGR students are almost gender balanced (data for individual Schools not recorded). No particular trend is apparent. Numbers of part-time PGR applicants are low, predominantly female, and generally successful in receiving offers.

**ACTION**

1.9 Survey UG/PhD students to identify barriers/issues affecting experience of males and females to identify gender-related issues relating to application and completion

**iv.c. Degree completion rate by gender**

Full and part-time data are combined. The dates refer to the start date and therefore show a lag, i.e. students who started in 2011/12 completed in 2016.

**Table 4.1.L: Numbers and percentages of those completing degrees by gender.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start year</th>
<th>Starters</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
<th>Completion rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completion rates are high, slightly higher for males. A recent change in reporting completion rates at university level, taking suspensions into account, may lead to improved completion data. Currently, according to RC DTP guidelines, students who take maternity/shared-parental leave during their PhDs and therefore do not finish within 4 years, count as “non-completions”. FBS academics requested that funding bodies change this policy, as it is inaccurate and unsupportive of gender equality. Head of Graduate School has since raised this issue at UoL level and will lobby funding bodies for policy change.

**Action**

1.10 Monitor completion rates: investigate causes of slightly poorer completion rates for females if necessary.

### v. Progression pipeline between undergraduate and postgraduate degrees

**Table 4.1.M: Proportions of students who are female from the UG to PGT to PGR pipeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th></th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th></th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th></th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>% F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>% F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>% F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGR</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 4.1.22: Percentages of those completing degrees by gender
While the increasing percentage of female students at undergraduate level is mirrored at Masters level, the proportion of females has remained broadly constant at PGR level. SBMS has the largest drop-off between UG and PGR, due to high female UG levels and lower levels of PGR students. We will work particularly to ensure gender balance in SBMS PGR recruitment evenings.

This FBS-wide drop-off between UG and PGR suggests that female UG students are not moving through the academic pipeline, but it may be premature to judge, as increased UG and PGT female percentages started in 2013/14. As female UG students outperform males this is surprising because PG degrees select high achieving undergraduates. However, female students may be seeking opportunities for entry to graduate employment across varied careers. An FBS study shows that female students engage more than males with careers events, and opportunities such as mentoring (Table 4.1.N), suggesting that they are considering a range of careers.

**Table 4.1.N: Percentage of the UG students taking advantage of career mentorship programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonetheless, FBS attracts proportionately fewer female PGR students than other institutions, which suggests that action should be taken, as described. The number of part-time female PhD students has more than doubled over the past 5 years (Table 4.1.J), a positive sign that FBS is facilitating female students to study via a flexible route. In future we will survey this group specifically to ensure that the support offered has an impact.
Summary of 2013 Action points and outcomes, with future actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Action point</th>
<th>Progress 2013-2016</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Future actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To address gender imbalance in applications through foundation courses,</td>
<td>Action 2.1</td>
<td>Monitoring has taken place annually.</td>
<td>% of female student registrations from all access/foundation routes has increased; levels (67-70%) are now in line with successful applications via traditional routes. Concerns that male recruitment via these routes is decreasing have been identified.</td>
<td>1.1 Recruit male Ambassador Plus students from September 2017, which allows trained undergraduate ambassadors to visit Schools in areas underrepresented in HE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particularly Access to HE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action 2.2</td>
<td>-Monitoring has taken place annually.</td>
<td>Overall proportion of female applications and acceptances continue to rise slowly, in line with national/ RG trends (Fig 4.1.8-10). Concerns around low levels of male recruitment, particularly in one School, have been identified.</td>
<td>1.2 2017-18 brochures will be modified to include equal emphasis on male and females in illustrations and Case Studies. 1.3 Review number of male and females hosting open days, and promotional materials displayed to attract a wide range of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SB previous rise in % female applicants and acceptances has levelled off in last 2 years close to national/ RG levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SBMS – female students now comprise more than 70% of all applicants and acceptances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SMCB – both applications and acceptances show higher % female than national/ RG, and rising slowly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To specifically tackle gender imbalance across all UG programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To specifically tackle lower levels of applications by female students to SES degree programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Action 2.3**
Review UG recruitment processes, identify gender bias & develop strategy to offset imbalances in applicants to SES programmes. Use successful female role models in course marketing material. | Marketing strategy and materials were reviewed to increase visibility of female role models/images of female students. Interviews were introduced 3 years ago as part of the application process; in the last round of recruitment 30% of interviews were conducted by female staff. | Applications to SES by female students have risen over the last two years, with female acceptances approaching 50% in 2016, from a minimum of 32% in 2013. | 1.4 Monitor ongoing effects of changes to strategies and materials: check that over the next 2-3 years, registration of SES female students increases in line with changes to acceptances. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To increase awareness/availability of part-time routes to PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Action 2.4**
Consult with PGR students/supervisors to determine level of demand & feasibility of part-time postgraduate study; highlight part-time opportunities in the postgraduate recruitment processes. | Students interested in part-time study are actively encouraged to discuss options with admissions staff. | The total number of part time postgraduate research students (PGR) is increasing slightly, however the number of females has more than doubled. Both students with children and those undertaking a PhD alongside related employment are recruited to the part-time option. | Action complete
Continued monitoring |
| To address the possibility that males are falling behind in level of degree classification | **Action 2.5** | -Female students continue to out-perform their male peers across all Schools.  
-Male performance in Sport & Exercise Science is now more in line with males from other Schools. | 1.5 Started joint project Faculty of Arts Humanities and Cultures to develop strategy to tackle male underperformance (Claire Smith, Faculty Education Service Manager). Will be first time that male underperformance will be directly addressed. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To address the drop-off female students taking postgraduate courses after undergraduate courses | **Action 4.8** | -Programme of careers events including annual careers fair, and monthly newsletter aimed mainly at UG is organised by the Faculty Employability Officer. -Employability Facebook page. CV writing and interview skills are core components of all UG programmes. Continuing professional development optional modules here available at Level 1 and 2  
-FBS Nurturing talent Mentoring Scheme started in 2014 offers industry mentors for UG students. | 1.9 Survey UG/PhD students to identify barriers/issues affecting experience of males and females to identify gender-related issues relating to application and completion |
To improve the gender-equality culture in FBS and make those not yet aware of AS aware of importance

| Action 5.2 | - Athena Swan Posters have been placed in student areas, and are visible at UG & PG Open Days.
- Postgraduate representatives on AS Committee who disseminate information to their peers.
- Announcements of AS matters & Women@Leeds events appear in the weekly Dean’s communication & on plasma screens in public areas.
- All PGR students were provided with Footsteps booklet, which will also be available at Outreach events & Open Days from 2017.

To tackle lack of awareness of Athens Swan in UG and PG students

| Action 5.5 | - Survey indicates 54% of female PhD students have participated in AS activities and 45% of male PhD students (who completed survey).

5.3 Continued roll-out of unconscious bias training for staff and students (page 91)  
5.4 New mandatory E&I online training modules currently being developed by UoL address inappropriate behaviours  
5.5 Plans to enhance UG & PGT awareness include introduction of a lecture on AS/unconscious bias/, and Equality & Inclusion training as part of induction programmes  
5.6 Assessment of awareness/support for AS amongst UG/PGT students will be introduced, and monitored annually.
4.2 Academic and research staff data

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

Overall the number of female research and academic staff in FB has changed little over the period (36%–37%, p>0.05; Table 4.2.A). In 2014, UoL launched an exciting new tenure-track position, a University Academic Fellow (UAF) as part of a strategic investment to recruit “250 great minds”. FBS has recruited 22 UAFs in 2015 and 2016. The first cycle resulted in 56% females and the second in 42% females being recruited.

Over the 2010-16 period there has been a small overall reduction in the number of lecturer posts because most academic appointments at grade 8 have been to UAF positions, and several lecturers have been promoted (see later). UAFs have a comprehensive set of objectives over a 5-year period, which on successful completion will lead to promotion to Associate Professor (Grade 9). This will therefore increase the number of female Grade 9 academics in FBS in 4 years.

The percentage of Grade 9 staff (Senior Lecturer/Reader/Associate Professor) who are female has declined slightly, the result of 3 promotions to Grade 10. The overall number of female professors within the Faculty has increased. The slight decline between 2014/15 and 2015/16 is due to two female Professors retiring. However, since the census date (2016), two further female Professors have been appointed, (not included).

The leaky pipeline predicts a decline in women advancing up the academic career ladder. Our analyses at Faculty level revealed that at transitions between Lecturer/UAF (grade 8) and grade 9 there is no significant drop in the proportion of females (p>0.05). But there is a significant reduction in the proportion of female Professors (p<0.05) compared to Grade 9. Therefore, for female academics in FBS the most challenging step is from grade 9 to grade 10. There is a higher proportion of female Teaching Fellows (p<0.05), but numbers in teaching track positions are too low to profile in detail.

Table 4.2.A – FBS total numbers and % female staff in post by category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher (postdoc: grades 6,7)</td>
<td>149 44</td>
<td>154 45</td>
<td>144 46</td>
<td>127 46</td>
<td>116 47</td>
<td>121 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Fellow (grade 6,7)</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 50</td>
<td>7 71</td>
<td>11 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer (grade 8)</td>
<td>34 24</td>
<td>32 25</td>
<td>33 36</td>
<td>30 40</td>
<td>33 27</td>
<td>35 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF (grade 8)</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>9 56</td>
<td>19 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL/Reader/AP (grade 9)</td>
<td>38 32</td>
<td>42 29</td>
<td>41 29</td>
<td>40 25</td>
<td>38 29</td>
<td>38 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor (grade 10)</td>
<td>37 19</td>
<td>34 21</td>
<td>36 19</td>
<td>41 24</td>
<td>40 25</td>
<td>40 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>258 36</td>
<td>262 37</td>
<td>254 38</td>
<td>242 38</td>
<td>243 39</td>
<td>264 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To look at the transition from postdoc to junior academic we have combined all grade 8 roles (lecturers and UAFs).

Table 4.2.B – FBS and National benchmarks of % female staff in post by category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBS Postdoc (researcher)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Postdoc (Researcher)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS Grade 8 (Lecturer and UAF)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Lecturer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS SL/Reader/AP</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National SL/Reader/AP</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS Professor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Professor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data show a substantial drop from levels of female researchers (postdocs) to lecturer (blue to grey), but a significant improvement since 2013. The proportion of female postdocs is steady but the proportion of grade 8 female academics has increased from 24% in 2011 to 36% in 2016, due to recruitment of UAFs. The combination of cultural change and unconscious bias training may be improving the ability of FBS to recruit female academics.

Since 2014 the percentage of female Professors has risen to above the national average. The percentage of female postdocs is close to the national average, whilst grade 8 and 9 levels are both below. (Fig. 4.2.2).
Fig 4.2.3 – Percentage of women in research and academic roles in FBS compared to National benchmarks. The national averages, by career stage, are shown as squares, and the variation that could occur by random chance is shown with error bars. FBS values are plotted as crosses, and all lie within this random chance region.

Table 4.2.C: Percentage of women in research and academic roles in School of Biology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% F</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% F</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Fellow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL/Reader/AP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Grade 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.2.D: Percentage of women in research and academic roles in School of Molecular and Cell Biology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>73 49</td>
<td>78 45</td>
<td>65 45</td>
<td>59 37</td>
<td>63 41</td>
<td>70 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>13 31</td>
<td>8 25</td>
<td>8 38</td>
<td>8 38</td>
<td>8 25</td>
<td>8 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Fellow</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>6 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL/Reader/AP (Grade 9)</td>
<td>11 36</td>
<td>13 31</td>
<td>13 23</td>
<td>15 20</td>
<td>15 27</td>
<td>14 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>15 27</td>
<td>13 31</td>
<td>12 25</td>
<td>15 33</td>
<td>14 36</td>
<td>16 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.2.E: Percentage of women in research and academic roles in School of Biomedical Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
<td>Total % F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>32 22</td>
<td>36 39</td>
<td>42 38</td>
<td>35 43</td>
<td>27 48</td>
<td>26 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>16 25</td>
<td>16 31</td>
<td>16 38</td>
<td>13 38</td>
<td>17 24</td>
<td>18 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Fellow</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>6 83</td>
<td>9 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>6 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL/Reader/AP (Grade 9)</td>
<td>15 40</td>
<td>17 35</td>
<td>18 39</td>
<td>16 31</td>
<td>14 36</td>
<td>15 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8 0</td>
<td>8 0</td>
<td>10 10</td>
<td>12 25</td>
<td>12 25</td>
<td>11 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 4.2.4: Percentage of women in research and academic roles in School of Biology along with National benchmarks.

Fig. 4.2.5: Percentage of women in research and academic roles in School of Molecular and Cellular Biology along with National benchmarks.
In all Schools, unsurprisingly, the greatest loss of female staff comes between postdoc and lecturer roles. Partially, this will be due to lack of recruitment at lecturer level. However, postdoc mentoring circles, together with increased support for activities such as paper/proposal writing will maximise opportunities for postdocs to obtain continued employment in academic roles, at UoL or elsewhere.

SBMS makes most use of the teaching career track, with a number of recent Teaching Fellow appointments. The other change in SBMS since 2013 is the increase in the number of female Professors, supported by Athena Swan action to improve the promotion process for females (2013 action).

(ii) Academic and research staff by grade on fixed-term, open-ended/permanent and zero-hour contracts by gender

Table 4.2.F: FBS Staff by contract type and grade
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>researcher</th>
<th>lecturer</th>
<th>teaching fellow</th>
<th>SL/AP/Reader</th>
<th>professor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Fixed Term</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72 61 133</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>72 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>12 4 16</td>
<td>25 7 32</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>26 12 38</td>
<td>30 7 37</td>
<td>93 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Funding</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84 65 149</td>
<td>26 8 34</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>26 12 38</td>
<td>30 7 37</td>
<td>166 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Fixed Term</td>
<td>86 94 139</td>
<td>4 13 6</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>86 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86 94 139</td>
<td>4 13 6</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>86 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Fixed Term</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72 67 139</td>
<td>1 3 4</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>72 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>8 0 8</td>
<td>20 8 28</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>29 12 41</td>
<td>28 7 35</td>
<td>85 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Funding</td>
<td>17 18 35</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>17 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78 66 144</td>
<td>21 12 33</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>29 12 41</td>
<td>157 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Fixed Term</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 48 101</td>
<td>1 4 5</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td>55 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>8 0 8</td>
<td>20 8 28</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>29 12 41</td>
<td>28 7 35</td>
<td>85 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Funding</td>
<td>17 18 35</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>17 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78 66 144</td>
<td>21 12 33</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>29 12 41</td>
<td>157 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Fixed Term</td>
<td>48 48 96</td>
<td>1 3 4</td>
<td>2 2 4</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td>52 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 0 6</td>
<td>17 9 26</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>30 10 40</td>
<td>30 10 40</td>
<td>83 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>6 0 6</td>
<td>17 9 26</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>30 10 40</td>
<td>30 10 40</td>
<td>83 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Funding</td>
<td>15 10 25</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>15 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69 58 127</td>
<td>18 12 30</td>
<td>2 2 4</td>
<td>30 10 40</td>
<td>31 10 41</td>
<td>150 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Fixed Term</td>
<td>44 47 91</td>
<td>2 1 3</td>
<td>1 5 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>47 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 0 6</td>
<td>22 8 30</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>27 11 38</td>
<td>30 10 40</td>
<td>85 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>6 0 6</td>
<td>22 8 30</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>27 11 38</td>
<td>30 10 40</td>
<td>85 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Funding</td>
<td>12 7 19</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>12 8  20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62 54 116</td>
<td>24 9 33</td>
<td>1 6 7</td>
<td>27 11 38</td>
<td>31 9 40</td>
<td>145 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Fixed Term</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44 47 91</td>
<td>2 1 3</td>
<td>1 5 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>47 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>6 0 6</td>
<td>22 8 30</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>27 11 38</td>
<td>30 10 40</td>
<td>85 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Funding</td>
<td>12 7 19</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>12 8  20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62 54 116</td>
<td>24 9 33</td>
<td>1 6 7</td>
<td>27 11 38</td>
<td>31 9 40</td>
<td>145 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Fixed Term</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49 40 89</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>4 5 9</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>54 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>4 0 4</td>
<td>22 10 32</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>27 11 38</td>
<td>31 9 40</td>
<td>84 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Funding</td>
<td>16 12 28</td>
<td>0 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>17 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69 52 121</td>
<td>23 12 35</td>
<td>5 6 11</td>
<td>27 11 38</td>
<td>31 9 40</td>
<td>155 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Fixed Term</td>
<td>71 77 74</td>
<td>4 8 6</td>
<td>80 83 82</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>35 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71 77 74</td>
<td>4 8 6</td>
<td>80 83 82</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>35 51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The percentage of women on fixed-term contracts has fallen (Figure 4.2.7). In 2011, 67% of women were on fixed-term contracts compared with 51% in 2016. However, only 35% of men are on fixed-term contracts, due to the higher proportion of males in more senior (i.e. permanent) roles.

In the period the number of females on permanent/permanent fixed funded contracts has risen by 5%, a positive sign. This was achieved by ensuring that all fixed-term contracts are reviewed regularly and where there is a successive 3-year contract or 3 years’ service we move to open ended/permanent contracts linked to fixed funding. No staff are employed on zero hours contracts. Fixed term contracts are only used in cases of maternity leave or long-term absence cover, secondment or where there is time-limited funding. We have a proactive redeployment scheme whereby members of staff who have been employed for 12 months receive priority consideration for all posts before external advertisement. Staff eligible for redeployment meet with a member of the Faculty HR team and support given to ensure they are redeployed to a post within the Faculty or wider University. If this is not possible, then those with more than 4 years’ service are eligible for enhanced redundancy.
(iii) Academic leavers by grade and gender and full/part-time status

Table 4.2.G: Percentage of turnover by staff category and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>Leavers</th>
<th>%Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The turnover figures show staff who have resigned or retired, not those whose fixed term contract/funding has finished. Turnover has remained stable since 2014. There is a higher turnover with researchers (14-19%) due to the short-term nature of research posts. Overall turnover of female researchers is slightly higher than for males, which is concerning and may be linked to differing attitudes to job security. There is a high turnover for teaching fellows (18%) but this equates to 2 staff leaving.

We ask all staff who leave to complete on-line exit interviews, and offer a face-to-face exit interview, however uptake is very low. A key action is to increase the response rate from staff who
leave, by making an appointment for them with HR and completing questionnaires together, and offering a chance to win a voucher if the online survey is completed.

Table 4.2.H: Leave destinations for staff who resigned since 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leave destination</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another University/Education Provider</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in regular employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Institute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Sector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of staff find employment within another university (Table 4.2.H), suggesting that they remain in academic roles. 4/7 (2/3 female) responses from academic and research staff stated their reason for leaving was a lack of career prospects and promotion opportunities at UoL. To inform and support young female scientists around issues like job security we plan discussion groups, led by newly appointed academics describing how they managed these issues.

Table 4.2.I: Part-time turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part-time staff turnover is very low and male part-time retirements relate to senior academics (Grade 9/10) taking normal retirement and returning briefly part-time. The four female part-time leavers were all researchers. More detailed Leaver’s surveys should identify and where possible address issues specific to part-time staff.

**Action**

2.1 Explore initiatives to increase greater completion of EXIT survey (ie by offering incentives such as winning a voucher)

**Word Count 2157**
5. SUPPORTING AND ADVANCING WOMEN’S CAREERS

Recommended word count: Bronze: 6000 words | Silver: 6500 words

5.1 Key career transition points: academic staff

(i) Recruitment

Table 5.1.A: Recruitment of researchers and academic staff across FBS (F=female, M=male, U=unknown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F  M  U</td>
<td>F  M  U</td>
<td>F  M  U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher</strong> (6,7,8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apps</td>
<td>192 304 63 34</td>
<td>180 240 1 43</td>
<td>315 526 2 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>37 63 4 36</td>
<td>37 49 0 43</td>
<td>74 103 1 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>10 6 2 56</td>
<td>20 13 0 61</td>
<td>25 36 0 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Fellow</strong> (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apps</td>
<td>8 3 4 53</td>
<td>45 47 0 49</td>
<td>21 19 0 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>4 0 0 100</td>
<td>13 12 0 52</td>
<td>5 7 0 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>5 1 0 83</td>
<td>2 2 0 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UAF</strong> (Grade 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apps</td>
<td></td>
<td>65 171 10 26</td>
<td>112 295 1 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 17 4 30</td>
<td>8 31 1 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 6 0 50</td>
<td>3 9 0 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic</strong> (8-9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apps</td>
<td>25 88 12 20</td>
<td>1 19 0 5</td>
<td>10 9 0 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>3 16 0 16</td>
<td>1 9 0 10</td>
<td>2 2 0 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>0 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 3 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor</strong> (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apps</td>
<td>1 3 2 17</td>
<td>2 6 0 25</td>
<td>2 4 0 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>0 1 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 100</td>
<td>1 0 0 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>0 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The percentage of those interviewed, who were female, is generally higher than the percentage of applications and the same with appointments, showing that when women apply they are more likely to be interviewed and offered the job. There has been an increase in the proportion of female applications, between 2013-2016, especially in academic positions. This may be due to a drive to increase research income, leading to an increase in research grants awarded, and a potentially more financially secure environment for young female scientists. The size of FBS and high-quality research environment means that it is possible after one research positions ends to find another suitable researcher position within FBS. The increase could also be attributed to 2013 AS actions (increasing unconscious bias training).

It is disappointing to see low levels of female applicants for researcher roles, considering national and local gender balance at PhD level. The PhD student survey indicates a higher proportion of male students (58%) than females (42%) plan to undertake an academic postdoc. More females were planning to go into industry (31%F, 26%M). This may relate to a greater desire on the part of female for job security, but other factors may also be involved.

There is an increase in the number of female professors appointed but the number of female applicants is still low, probably owing to the lower number of females at higher grades. Further action needs to be taken in order to address this gap, though impact is likely to take some years to accomplish, as the total number of females in academic roles throughout the sector increases. Currently FBS includes information about AS in job descriptions. We will also add additional content.
about flexible working and family friendly policies. Unconscious bias training will be compulsory interview panel members by 2018 (2013 Action 4.3).

Table 5.1.B: FBS UAF Recruitment Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shortlisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From UAF recruitment, we are encouraged by high female success rates, from 26% of applicants, to 30% interviewed and 50% appointed. Care was taken during the recruitment process to ensure that actions from 2013 (4.1, 4.2, 4.3) were applied, so we regard the success rates for females as evidence of impact.

After 2015 UAF recruitment, ASWG looked at ways to increase female applications. We looked at post titles and made them more generic; as studies [1] show than women are more likely to apply for a job that they feel they match 100%. In 2016 FBS advertised for a ‘UAF in Biology’ (Table 5.1.C). This broader advert attracted a higher proportion of female applicants (33%) and more applications in general, similarly to other general titled positions; “UAF in Neuroscience”. However, fewer females were appointed in 2016 compared to 2015.
Table 5.1.C: Applications for the UAF positions advertised in the 2016 round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UAF Title</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAF in Biology</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF in Cardiovascular Physiology/Cardiovascular Exercise Physiology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF in Cellular and Disease Biology</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF in Computational Biology</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF in Interdisciplinary Biology</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF in Neuroscience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF in Regenerative Medicine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF in Structural Molecular Biology (The Astbury Centre and Cellular and Disease Biology)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions**

2.2 Include information on flexible working opportunities, shared parental leave, family friendly policies, Stonewall Employer in the advert or job description.

2.3 Provide access to case studies (Footsteps brochure/website) of female academics along with adverts

2.4 Ensure all new posts widely advertised, e.g. at conference

2.5 Actively support our female postdocs to apply for academic positions at University of Leeds and elsewhere through mentoring circles, Coffee & Careers seminars (ASWG): develop system to monitor post-doc destinations

(ii) **Induction**

In addition to UoL’s, FBS has a website for new starters. It contains useful information for new staff including details about AS, flexible-working policies, training, career progression and Postdocs at Leeds network.

On arrival staff are given a detailed induction pack, go through an induction checklist and receive an HR induction. FBS runs induction sessions every Tuesday. An online induction questionnaire is sent to new starters within one month of their arrival to seek feedback on the induction. Since introduction of feedback in 2015, 100% of staff surveyed reported that their ‘induction was helpful and informative’ and they ‘felt well informed and comfortable in their new role’.
(iii) Promotion

Table 5.1.D: Promotions data for male and female staff in FBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>% Success rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2013 survey revealed 45% of staff (50% female) found the promotion procedure unclear. In response to this, both FBS and UoL have reviewed and updated the promotion policy. The new process and criteria were launched in 2016, and applications can now be made year-round. FBS has simplified the criteria introducing a “pick and mix” approach for higher flexibility, accommodating staff with either research or teaching focus. ASWG had direct input into changing these FBS benchmarks. The suggestions for the type of evidence that might be put forward to show a candidate met the criteria for promotion were limited; some areas, which were not recognised (e.g. outreach) are activities more likely to be undertaken by females, and this might deter or disadvantage female staff. ASWG was instrumental in inclusion of a wider range of evidence for promotion. Now the proportion of those applying reflects the female population within academics (~30%).

A FBS-HR website was set up to provide easy access to all necessary information, forms, criteria and benchmarks required for the application. Moreover, FBS ran two information sessions and 1 focus group (2016) to provide information on procedures.

The total number of applications for promotions has dropped since 2013, as a result of changes to promotions procedures. During this transition period staff may have delayed putting in an application until the new promotions scheme was launched. The success rate from females was 100% whilst for males it was 67%, although actual numbers are very small. This suggests that we should be supporting more women to apply for promotions, with more structure provided through AAMs/SRDS.
Although female uptake of promotion information sessions has been good with support staff, it has not been successful in academic and research areas (Fig 5.1.2). To tackle this we will hold more sessions and target them at specific groups (late 2017).

Staff progression through promotion is discussed during AAMs and suitable candidates are encouraged to apply for promotion (2013 Action 4.4). Only 25% of applications are from female staff, which is lower than the proportion of female academics in FBS (37%). This may reflect that female staff, are more reluctant to put themselves forward for promotion, which will be addressed by coaching.

UAF tenure-track positions will ensure increased level of promotion to grade 9, with targets clearly laid out and discussed annually. All FBS UAFs have trained mentors to help support this process.

**Actions**

2.6 Target tailored promotion sessions at specific groups e.g. female early career research staff.

2.7 Promotion workshops for staff including input from staff who have successfully been through the new promotions process

2.8 Identify and encourage (via SRDS and AAMs) appropriate female staff to apply for promotion

2.9 ASWG to review recruitment and promotions figures and report to Dean/HoS and highlight any changes in gender balance

2.10 Ensure all staff involved in selection interviewing have received E&I and Unconscious bias training
(iv) Department submissions to the Research Excellence Framework (REF)
FBS performed extremely well in REF 2014, ranked 6th in UK for research impact.
Cardiovascular, Sport and Exercise Sciences ranked 1st in UK for "World Leading" 4* research.

Fig 5.1.3: Number of female and male academics who were returned (i.e. included) or excluded from REF in 2008 and 2014.

Female academics made up 37% of those submitted for REF 2014 (Fig 5.13), compared to 19% in 2008, a higher proportion of total females were included compared to males (85%F, 73%M in 2014). This demonstrates the high-quality research being performed by FBS female academics.
5.2 Key Career Transition Points: professional and support staff

(i) Induction

FBS induction of Professional and support staff is the same as for academic and research staff. This goes towards maintaining equality in inclusion and respect among all staff of the Faculty. See 5.2 (i)

(ii) Promotion

Table 5.2.A: Number and percentage of applications and successful promotions of professional and support staff across FBS by gender (P&M= Professional and Managerial)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>% Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The promotion process differs for support staff, in that for most roles there is no clear progression route. Progression is achieved though applying for a different role at a higher grade. Promotion only occurs when there is genuine progression within a role, required by FBS, which warrants the need for a role with more responsibility. New posts that are required are sometimes advertised within FBS as a development opportunity. One senior technician started in FBS as a grade 2 lab assistant, then applied for a grade 5 research technician, which was advertised internally. After two years in this post she applied for and was appointed to a grade 6 senior specialist technician post.

When promotion is appropriate, applications are authorised by the Dean. More females (7) have applied for promotion than males (1), which reflects the composition of support staff (66%F). All applications have been successful. However, results from surveys and focus groups suggest that many technical staff feel that promotion and career options are not available or clear to them. Professional services staff take advantage of secondment opportunities to up-skill and prepare for higher graded roles.
Actions

2.11 Set up mentoring for technical, professional and support staff to provide advice on and support with applying for roles at a higher level.

2.12 Discussion of availability and potential benefits of mentoring added to discussion points for all SRDS meetings
Summary of 2013 Action points and outcomes related to career transition, with future actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Future Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure equal opportunities during the recruitment process, and to identify whether actions can be taken to tackle gender imbalances at both application and shortlisting stages of recruitment</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Change UAF advert to more general areas – led to an increase in applications. Short-listing carried out by team, some of whom have had unconscious bias training.</td>
<td>33% improvement in the number of female applications.</td>
<td>2.9  ASWG to review recruitment and promotions figures and report to Dean/HoS and highlight any changes in gender balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure the documentation used when recruiting is appropriate to attract female academics</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>All adverts now have Athena Swan wording and say that they welcome applications from women. Some adverts have flexible working wording in but not all.</td>
<td>Not easy to assess in the short term. A general increase in female applicants to FBS roles should result, but multiple reasons might underpin this.</td>
<td>2.2. Include information on flexible working opportunities, shared parental leave, family friendly policies, Stonewall Employer in the advert or job description. 2.3. Provide access to case studies (Footsteps brochure/website) of female academics along with adverts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To inform and encourage staff to apply for promotion</td>
<td>4.3 (i)</td>
<td>Promotions workshops have been run in 2016 and 2017.</td>
<td>36 attendees so far but only 44% female attendance and only 3% female academic attendance.</td>
<td>2.6. Target tailored promotion sessions at specific groups e.g. female early career research staff. 2.7. Promotion workshops for staff including input from staff who have successfully been through the new promotions process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To minimise likelihood of bias in recruitment processes</th>
<th>4.3 (ii) Provide further training of those on promotion panels e.g. on unconscious bias.</th>
<th>Unconscious bias training has been done and continues to run.</th>
<th>In 2016 80% of interview panels had at least one panel member who had been trained in unconscious bias. 121 members of staff and PhD students have received Unconscious bias training of that number 59% were females.</th>
<th>2.10. Ensure all staff involved in selection interviewing have received E&amp;I and Unconscious bias training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure local benchmarks do not inadvertently act as a barrier to promotion for women.</td>
<td>4.9 Input to the University review of promotion criteria. Review local benchmarks linked to promotions criteria</td>
<td>Faculty benchmarks have been updated with ASWG involvement. Implemented in 2016 so expect to see impact in long term.</td>
<td>There have been 3 successful female promotion applications 2013-2016.</td>
<td>Action complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that new staff are fully informed about opportunities, policies &amp; practices in relation to gender equality in employment</td>
<td>4.11 Review induction packs/process to ensure: - all information is included in accessible format - consistency of approach - induction completed within required time frame</td>
<td>Induction feedback questionnaire introduced in 2015 which is regularly monitored</td>
<td>Although the number of respondents are low, we have received 100% positive feedback</td>
<td>Action complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Career development: academic staff

(i) Training
FBS provides varied training opportunities towards career development of staff via SDDU, Library, I.T., UoL Career Centre and local FBS training. Several programmes specifically to align career development activities with AS (Fig 5.3.1). Longer courses including “Springboard” and “Aurora” prepare female academics for leadership roles.

Fig 5.3.1: Examples of the broader areas of training offered to research and teaching staff of FBS towards enhancing career development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athena SWAN driven</th>
<th>Career progression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development for</td>
<td>Planning the next steps to your academic career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (Springboard)</td>
<td>Effective Research Student Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora programme</td>
<td>Overview of Research Student Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality and Inclusion (online, compulsory)</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising a Role</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Selection</td>
<td>Project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership development programme</strong></td>
<td>StrengthsFinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal leadership</td>
<td>Follow up to StrengthsFinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading collaboratively</td>
<td>Career Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading our university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Review and Development Scheme</td>
<td>Writing your Redeployment Skills Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Identifying your skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Planning a Career Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Developing a Positive</td>
<td>Selling yourself – getting the right CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Environment</td>
<td>CV Drop-In Clinics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Others</td>
<td>How to read and evidence a job advert?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media, Communications and Web Skills</td>
<td>Preparing for an Interview – tips and technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Essentials</td>
<td>‘LinkedIn’ or Locked Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to leadership &amp;</td>
<td>What is the selection process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>Me not We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading &amp; managing in the new</td>
<td>Using graphic facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic environment</td>
<td>Being effective at conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional skills</strong></td>
<td>Going Social: Raising your professional profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Resilience in Times of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Your Own Career Coach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress &amp; Pressure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training is offered by FBS on the principles of AS, including training modules on Equality and Inclusion (mandatory), Unconscious bias training, and recruitment. In addition to Leadership development courses (Fig 5.3.1), longer modules such as “Introduction to leadership and management” are also available.

The uptake of training has varied between 2013-2017. Analysis reveals a consistent improvement in the relative participation of female academic staff (Fig 5.3.2).
Staff and students are informed about these training opportunities through communications from SDDU and FBS line managers, particularly during probation and review meetings. Opportunities targeting female academics are disseminated via Women at Leeds Network (WaLN), ASWG and Dean’s communication emails.

FBS monitors effectiveness of training at several levels; uptake and reach to staff of different genders, Schools and appointment levels are documented and analysed. ASWG monitors the effectiveness of training through FBS Researcher Skills Senior Training and Development Officer. Leadership training has had a tremendous impact on the careers of females in FBS (Case Study 2).

UAFs have a tailored development programme run at UoL level, which incorporates leadership Development, e.g. How to run a research group. Julie Aspden (co-chair of ASWG) has already benefitted from these sessions, which have helped her lead her research group.

(ii) Appraisal/development review

FBS offers an annual SRDS/AAM to all staff who have passed probation and FBS has a dedicated person responsible for ensuring SRDS/AAMs are completed appropriately and recorded. During meetings, training and career development are discussed, and a training and development plan for the year is recorded. For the past four years FBS has exceeded the university target of 90% of staff having a review (2013 Action 3.3). All AAM/SRDS reviewers are required to have undergone training. FBS run courses every year to train new reviewers.
Table 5.3.A – Percentage of staff who have had an annual review – all staff categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2016 survey 80% of staff feel that they are provided with a helpful annual staff review, a large improvement from 50% in 2013 (female staff 54% to 85%). So females are obviously getting more from these annual meetings than they did previously, as a result of reviewer training and formalising the AAM/SRDS process (2013 Action 3.3).

Staff on probation are not required to have an SRDS. Focus groups suggests that some researchers feel disadvantaged as probation discussions tend to focus on current work and they do not have an opportunity to discuss career progression early in of their role.

Action

3.1 Career development to be included in discussion points at probation review meetings
3.2 Explore feasibility of creating a postdoc champion (academic) post to support postdocs.

(iii) Support given to academic staff for career progression
All new FBS academics are matched with a mentor, whilst existing staff can sign up to UoL mentoring scheme. 74% (81%F) of staff agreed that they had access to mentoring in 2016, compared to 53% (54%F) in 2013 (Table 5.3.B).

Table 5.3.B: Current mentoring arrangements for academics across schools within FBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mentees</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>% of Female academics being mentored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBMS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCB</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2017 ASWG introduced a circle-mentoring scheme for postdocs (2013 Action 3.2). Each circle consists of two academic mentors and four postdocs, who meet regularly to focus on key career development issues. Both mentors and mentees within each group are 50% female. We will run these circles for a year and then gather feedback to assess their impact.
Female postdoc in mentoring circle

“It will help me develop my career”…..“go over CVs”…….”to look how we can prepare for fellowship applications” “Having a mix of female and male PIs and post docs in the group is really useful”

Postdocs have set up their own network, PAL, which has strong links with ASWG. A number of PAL events have been sponsored by AS including the successful ‘speed dating for careers event’ (2015) and the ‘coffee and careers’ seminar series. These “coffee and career” events 1/month attract ~60 attendees to hear FBS alumni discuss their careers outside academia, providing a range of staff and students with information on varied science related careers. Engagement with females is high (~50-60%, Table 5.3.C) and these events are already impacting the way female students and staff see their career options. We will measure the impact of this in future surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Total attendees</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Postdoc</th>
<th>Technical staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biotechnology scientists</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jan 2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent Law</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Feb 2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female attendee from Coffee and Careers

“seminar was well hosted, informative and inspiring. A breath of fresh air to the world of academics”.

Fig 5.3.3: Photographs from Coffee and Careers events, sponsored by FBS Athena Swan
Since 2013 mechanisms have been put in place to increase awareness of training courses. A Dean’s communication bulletin has been introduced, which includes details of WaLN activities, SDDU courses and FBS career development opportunities (2013 Action 4.5). The impact of this can be seen in an increased awareness of WaLN with women especially from 65% in 2013 to 94% in 2016. The proportion of women engaging with these activities has also increased from 14% to 31%.

FBS postdocs actively take part in career development opportunities such as presenting their work at seminars. Many career development activities take place within research groups such as writing papers. PAL also arrange techniques-focused seminars to help improve postdoctoral understanding.

Leadership

Until 2015 UoL ran a leaders development programme “tomorrow’s leaders”. Nominations for attendees were put forward by HoSs and there was gender parity across attendees (Table 5.3.D). In 2016 this was replaced by ‘Leadership Excellence Programme’, and only two male academics have taken part in this scheme so far, who were selected mandatorily from the senior management team, which at the time was all male. Next year we aim to have a 50:50 gender balance. FBS has sent a number of women on Aurora leadership training since 2014, from various roles within FBS. Participants report that it is extremely worthwhile (Case Study 2). In addition to the single UoL funded place on Aurora, FBS funds 1-2 additional candidates each year. Individuals are nominated from across FBS, by themselves or line-managers

Table 5.3.D: Summary of individuals who have benefitted from formal leadership training programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomorrow’s Leaders/Leadership Excellence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springboard</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iv) Support given to students (any level) for academic career progression

FBS implements a range of support networks for students through academic programmes, supplementary training on career development skills and employability activities, developed through the Employability Working Group. These have resulted in improvement in employment outcomes of female and male students (Fig 5.3.4)

**Fig 5.3.4:** Percentages of female and male graduates of 2012-2015 academic years with positive employability outcomes (i.e. with graduate prospects or graduate-level employment) in first two years following graduation.

Undergraduates: All programmes include a strong focus on skill development towards employability, practical laboratory and industrial experience. These offer students opportunities to develop and apply scientific and professional skills, fostering self-confidence and personal growth. FBS provides professional development modules and a discovery module “Skills in communicating research beyond the university”. We offer resilience training to UG students. FBS provides a range of activities to develop career prospects (Table 5.3.E).

Postgraduates: Activities such as informal events on postgraduate and postdoctoral careers and, local support for interviews and job applications (Table 5.3.E) have been successful in building employability, tracked through FBS alumni pages. Crucially, postgraduate researchers are offered training courses (Table 5.3.E) on career progression. FBS has maintained strong uptake of these courses amongst female postgraduate students (Fig 5.3.5).
Table 5.3. E: Activities within FBS targeting career development of undergraduate and postgraduate students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Postgraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBS careers page dedicated for internships</td>
<td>Coffee and Career events for phd students and Postdoctoral staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly employability newsletter with quick links to opportunities</td>
<td>Mock interviews, CV and cover letter writing support integrated as summative assessments into the Masters level curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS Employability Facebook page</td>
<td>PhD talks at the Annual Faculty Careers Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Faculty Careers Fair</td>
<td>FBS-based support targeting postgraduate/PhD scholarships (RCUK and Leeds Anniversary Research Scholarships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS career counselling sessions (additional to the University’s Career Centre)</td>
<td>Training courses offered by FBS and SDDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Model FBS Graduate” web-based skills matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetabled employability lectures, workshops and networking events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with CV writing/application/mock interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Careers Centre drop-ins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with year-in-industry placements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about internships, summer placements and volunteering opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting employer events/workshops/guest speakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni networking events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources including placement brochures, careers literature, company information and work experience booklets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to national placement and graduate fairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage with prospective employers via Industrial Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 5.3.5: Percentage of postgraduate students participating in training who are female
The impact of these career development opportunities is currently not measured so it is difficult to determine which are useful and what is missing. Our action to survey PhD students with detailed AS specific survey annually, will start in Oct 2017 and address this.

UG wishing to continue onto doctoral studies are supported through scholarship schemes such as Leeds Anniversary Research Scholarships. FBS offers support developing interview and application writing skills. The Annual Careers Fair includes talks by current PhD students in FBS, which promote PhD opportunities.

The FBS undergraduate mentoring scheme has been highly successful in drawing on professionals (both academic and industrial) to provide students with the opportunity to enhance their employability, expand their professional networks and increase their confidence. The impact of the mentoring is significant on student career plans (Fig 5.3.6).

Fig 5.3.6: Feedback from UG mentorship programme

It was fascinating to see it on an industrial scale and see how drug candidates are determined….more informed about the pharmaceutical industry with an insight into a future career option.”

UG mentee Helen Clough

Action

3.4 Use PG survey to investigate PGR career aspirations, and whether/how (and why) these change during PhD.

3.5 Stronger advertisement of nation-wide events supporting smaller subsets of students (e.g. LGBT-STEMinar symposia at York University)

(v) Support offered to those applying for research grant applications

FBS offers a range of support to staff applying for research grants including mentorship. Schools implement internal grant peer-review systems and mock-interview panels. FBS Pro-Dean of Research facilitates quarterly lunch discussions to foster new collaboration and awareness of the project grants available to new academics. He also runs training on how RCUK panel meetings work especially for new academics. External applicants benefit from support when writing fellowships to come to FBS. Senior postdocs can receive mentorship to transition to fellowship application through both through their own research groups and via the Wellcome Trust Institutional Support Strategy Fund (WTISSF). This runs a small fellowship scheme to help postdocs transition to independence and postdoc mentoring circles also discuss fellowship writing.
To achieve efficient targeting of relevant funding opportunities, FBS Research and Innovation provide monthly email digests on upcoming funding deadlines, specific support on unconventional funding sources and advise staff on developing specific aspects of applications via one-on-one feedback.

These activities have underpinned a steady increase in the number of funding applications submitted and the value awarded to both female and male academic staff (Fig 5.3.7). Whilst the proportional difference between female and male staff in each of these analyses has not changed significantly since 2014, the proportional increase in the applications made and funding (£) received is notably larger for females than males.

Fig 5.3.7: Comparisons of applications made and successful grants (left) and requested values and funded grants (right) of female and male academic staff.

The current funding climate means that success rates for grant applications are generally low and specifically lower for females (Fig 5.3.7). To help increase the success rate we will implement additional support for grant writing including a grant writing session once a month in a quiet space within FBS.

**Action**

3.6 Supplement internal peer-reviews with panel/group discussions of applications in the pre-submission stages

3.7 Develop a repository of successful grant applications to support early career researchers

**5.4 Career development: professional and support staff**

**(i) Training**

FBS staff are encouraged to apply to the Faculty Training and Development Policy for funding for training courses/workshops conferences. Many members of the Student Services Team have taken advantage of this. Longer periods of training and study are also offered; PhD, MSc and degree level options are available to support staff as are personal development courses such as Springboard. Training needs are identified in SRDS meetings. However, we currently do not have formal monitoring of career development activities for Professional and Managerial Staff but SRDS could provide an opportunity for this.
FBS is highly supportive of the development of technical staff. We are currently supporting 3 female technicians to undertake PhDs in FBS whilst carrying out their technical role, and 2 female technicians to study for MSc degrees (2013 Action 2.4). Given that the majority of technical staff are female, the lack of males in these groups is unsurprising. The support offered is both financial, (FBS training fund), and career orientated. Before funding is granted, the technician has a one-to-one discussion with the senior technical services manager to discuss the impact on their workload and their work-life balance. Any potential barriers are discussed thoroughly before funding is granted.

Some common needs are addressed by bespoke training developed using either in-house (FBS) or external suppliers. Due to the diversity of the training records of external training have not always been kept. Training has been loosely categorised into Vocational and Professional.

**Fig 5.4.1 Number of Professional and support staff taking advantage of training**

In general, more female staff take advantage of both types of training opportunities. 64% of staff taking up training in 2016 are female, which reflects the composition of 62% female professional and support staff. More people, both genders are taking vocational training. The impact of this training help staff perform better and make them feel more confident in their skills.

**(vi) Appraisal/development review**

The SRDS is used for all staff including professional and support. In 2016 staff survey 87% of support staff agree that they are provided with a useful annual staff review (90%F) an increase of from 2013.

SRDS discussions include identifying training opportunities and suggesting specific training that they should focus on the following year. 80% of support staff agree that they have benefitted from training and development opportunities in the faculty (82%F).

**(ii) Support given to professional and support staff for career progression**

All staff are encouraged to develop their career both within FBS or wider community as appropriate, e.g. achieve registered status via their sector body, providing funding and time release Staff at the lower grades are more easily able to develop their careers in-house and have significantly more opportunity to so do than those at a higher grade. This is because progression for senior support staff relies upon a position becoming available and there is a limited requirement within FBS for
these senior roles. Quarterly FBS meetings and annual technicians’ symposium help disseminate career progression opportunities. For Professional Staff there is the admissions network, Continuous improvement training and Lean for Leaders. These types of network activities empower people to feel that they contribute to FBS community.

Fig 5.4.2: Comments from the Technicians’ Symposium 2016

Support staff member attending Technicians’ Symposium
“I don’t know many technicians, especially teaching technicians, and I would like to get to know them more in the future, so an event like this is perfect that. I think this way we can help each other and be more useful for the University”

Support staff member attending Technicians’ Symposium
“helped to focus in on what the core issues are for technical and support staff, which can inform more detailed analysis and discussion elsewhere.”
### Rationale
Address the underrepresentation of women at higher academic grades through the offering of guidance and support, and to ensure that the guidance and support offered is structured and unbiased.

### Action points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action points</th>
<th>Progress 2013-2016</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Future Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Roll out a one-to-one mentoring scheme for all academic staff &amp; researchers with clear description of mentor role, guidance and training for mentors and an agreed process for assigning mentors</td>
<td>All new staff are appointed a mentor</td>
<td>74% of staff agree that the Faculty provides them with access to mentoring opportunities compared to 53% in 2013. (81% female agree)</td>
<td>2.11 Set up mentoring for technical, professional and support staff to provide advice on and support with applying for roles at a higher level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Increase awareness of the role of SRDS reviewers concerning supporting &amp; advising staff on their career development &amp; promotion opportunities.</td>
<td>Increase in people trained Improvement in perception of SRDS Closer links between AAM and SRDS</td>
<td>80% of staff agree they are provided with a helpful annual staff review (85% female) compared to 50% (54% female) in 2013.</td>
<td>Will continue to provide training sessions for new reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure SRDS &amp; Staff academic review processes link to each other more effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of 2013 Action points and outcomes linked to career development, with future actions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To ensure that female staff actively engage and are made aware of personal development and management training opportunities to aid with career transition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued participation from FBS staff on Springboard and Aurora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To ensure career progression and courses aiding career progression are relevant to the audience, therefore enabling them to develop career strategies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held local promotion information sessions. Had a focus group on career progression.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To ensure that employees who are looking at career progression/transition have easy access to relevant information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced career architect training for early career researchers Speed dating for careers event Coffee and careers seminar series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To ensure the Faculty are employing best practice in relation to induction processes and support opportunities through accessible information that is available to all Faculty employees.

| **4.10** | Ensure that all training & support opportunities are visible & known to staff at all levels. Make this information available to new staff through the Induction process and through the Athena-SWAN website | Training opportunities go out in the Dean’s communication and are visible on plasma screens. Managers are encouraged to discuss training and development opportunities through SRDS. Details of training courses and seminars are advertised on the Athena Swan website | 89% of staff agree that they can access appropriate training and development opportunities when needed (96% female staff) |
5.5 Flexible working and managing career breaks

(i) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: before leave

Before taking maternity or adoption leave, an HR representative will discuss and explain formal policy and answer questions. HR arrange a pregnancy health and safety risk assessment. If the individual is on a fixed-term contract, the implications of this will also be discussed. In some cases contracts can be put on hold whilst the member of staff is off and then when they return they have the full amount of time remaining on the contract. The majority of fixed-term contracts are linked to external research grant funding so this depends on the policy of the funding body.

(ii) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: during leave

Staff are entitled to 10 Keep-In-Touch (KIT) days whilst they are off. These can be used to attend meetings, training or to just keep in touch with work. Staff are kept informed of training or career development opportunities by email, letter or other preferred modes of contact, agreed with line managers.

I used KIT days to handover work from my replacement before I returned to work, which made my return much easier.

Return to Work Focus Group Participant

(iii) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: returning to work

2013 Action 5.6 was to provide support for staff returning from a career break. In 2013 ASWG set up a funding scheme, to cover the cost of a conference or training course that would help them in their return to the workplace. It can also fund childcare to enable staff to attend a conference or training course. So far we have only had only application, which was granted to pay childcare so a technician could go on a training course. In 2013 ASWG developed a new guidance document for all staff returning from long-term leave. For academic staff, prior to their return-to-work they meet with HoS and discuss a temporary reduction in teaching load, allowing research active academics to ensure their research is well supported. Staff are entitled to apply for flexible-working (Flexible working policy). These arrangements are at the discretion of HoSs. Therefore, our new action is to write specific guidelines for a more structured phased return of teaching responsibilities for academic staff. Staff who participated in the return to work focus group said that their line managers had been happy to accommodate a change in hours on their return but the reduction in hours did not always reflect a reduction in workload. To address this, a more formal checkpoint will be included in AAM/SRDS meetings.

"When my first aid certificate was due for renewal, AS funding enabled me to pay for the extra childcare I needed to go on the re-qualification course. This meant I was able to continue my contribution as a first aider at work despite the course taking place outside my new part-time hours. Thank you!"

FBS Technician
(iv) Maternity return rate

Table 5.5.A: Number of staff taking maternity leave and returning or not returning to work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff role</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Research</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenced Maternity Leave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not return from Maternity Leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff remained in post, 6 months after return</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff remained in post, 12 months after return</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff remained in post, 18 months after return</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2014, 22 staff took maternity leave, with a small increase over the period (Table 5.5.A). The recruitment of junior female academics might lead to an increase in the numbers since many wait until they have secured such a position before starting a family [2]. The majority of staff (94%) returned to work following maternity leave and remained in post at least 18 months. However, one person did not return to work (2014) because their fixed-term contract expired and one in 2015 who returned to work for 8 months until their fixed-term contact ended. So, all those not returning to work/remaining in post left as a result of fixed-term contracts. In the 2016 survey 61% of people (66% of females) were confident that taking a period of absence from work, like maternity leave, would not affect their career progression, up from 36% in 2013. Actions to improve this will include protection from teaching requirement and a return to work buddy system.

In FBS when an individual’s fixed-term contract will expire during their maternity leave, their contract is automatically extended until the end of their statutory maternity pay period. They are also offered the opportunity to join the UoL redeployment service. HR will prepare the documentation for this with the individual’s CV and provide a high level of help. The two individuals that did not return (2014) or remain in post (2015), were provided with the same opportunity through our redeployment but unfortunately were unsuccessful in securing another role. From our survey, many people are still unclear on the logistics of taking maternity leave with fixed-term contracts. We are tackling this by having HR drop-in desks and writing a simplified guide to maternity leave policies, to be hosted on the AS website. The AS website is being expanded to be an easy to understand focal point for AS related HR policies.
Action

4.1 Monitor uptake, directly email everyone who goes on maternity leave/career break/family leave details of guidance for return to work, and details of “returners fund”

4.2 Monitor uptake of the “returners fund” to support those staff returning from maternity, shared parental leave, adoption leave etc.

4.3 Include leaflet about the guidance for return to work and details for the “returners fund” in all maternity leave letters

4.4 Introduce return to work buddy system

4.5 Provide designated room for breast feeding/expressing with fridge

4.6 Develop guidelines in consultation with HoS on recommendation for phased return to teaching for research active academics

4.7 Guidance to be provided for line managers & SRDS reviewers to address these issues of workload and flexible or part time working

4.8 AAM/SRDS meetings to include discussion of appropriateness of workload for staff on flexible working

(v) Paternity, Shared Parental, Adoption and Parental Leave Uptake:

Table 5.5.B: Number of staff taking leave (apart from maternity leave)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Leave</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paternity Leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Parental Leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption Leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 staff have taken paternity leave since 2014 (Table 5.5.B) and although there have not been any applications for adoption leave or unpaid parental leave, UoL has a formal Adoption/Surrogacy Leave policy that reflects our generous maternity leave entitlements. No females have opted to share their parental leave, but 2 male staff opted to take shared parental leave. UoL has been one of the first universities to implement Shared Parental Leave.

Since surveys indicated understanding and uptake of these policies is low, FBS ASWG will provide information on them more easily through HR-drop sessions and policy page on AS website, and more visible inclusion in job adverts. Shared parental leave will also help attract academics, whose partners are also academics. 83% of female STEM academics have academics for partners, compared to 54% for males [3], so these type of actions to support both careers are critical in support of young female academics.
Table 5.5.C: Grade of staff taking paternity and Shared Parental Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paternity by Grade</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Support Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Research Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Parental Leave by Grade</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Support Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Research Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2014, 79% of those who have taken paternity or shared parental leave are academics (Table 5.5.C), reflecting the distribution of male staff across FBS.

**Action**

4.9 Provide and publicise successful role models for staff utilising flexible working

4.10 Monitor requests for flexible working arrangements annually

4.11 Monitor awareness of flexible working arrangements via culture survey

(vi) **Flexible working**

FBS actively promotes UoL’s Flexible Working Policy and ensures that staff are aware of it; through HR website, Dean’s weekly emails and AS coffee mornings/HR drop-in. UoL has a formal policy to support all members of staff who wish to request flexible working. There is a clear application and appeals process, together with guidelines with a range of flexible working approaches.

There are also many informal flexible-working arrangements that are agreed with HoS. To ensure everyone has access to this flexibility, we will action this to be a formal discussion point during AAMs/SRDS. FBS has a remote desktop service where staff can access their files remotely enabling working from home. As a result of a suggestion at an AS sponsored FBS Coffee Morning, guidelines on how to use remote desktop are available on AS website. We have a suggestions box at coffee mornings to gather feedback regularly. Informal flexible working is supported across FBS especially within in support functions e.g. flexible hours for to ensure staff can do school pick up.

2013 Action 5.8 was to increase knowledge of flexible-working and record applications. There has been a large increase in recorded requests since 2013 when there were only 7 (Table 5.5.D).

Table 5.5.D: Number of staff requesting flexible working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have encouraged staff and managers to inform HR about their flexible working even if it is arranged informally so we can monitor uptake and embed flexible working into our culture. The majority of requests come from females but the proportion of requests from males has increased over last 3 years. Despite the increase in the number of people working flexibly, being part-time and working flexibly are still viewed in a detrimental way. In 2016 survey 47% of staff (46% of female staff) thought that staff who use flexible working arrangements are viewed to be less career focussed than their peers. This is of concern and we will address this by show-casing role models who work flexibly and contribute substantially to success of FBS. We will extend the Footsteps booklet with additional examples.

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

Whilst there is no formal policy to enable staff to transition from part-time back to full-time work after a career break, this is done on an individual basis following consultation between the individual and their line manager. Staff can use holiday that they have accrued so that they have a phased return to the workplace (Case Study 1). Alternatively staff can reduce their FTE for an agreed short period of time.
Summary of 2013 Action points and outcomes related to flexible working, with future actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Progress 2013-2016</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Future Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure there is support to enable women to readjust when they return from maternity leave, and to minimize the impact of maternity leave/career break on future career aspirations &amp; promotion.</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Consider the development of a policy to support academic staff on or returning from maternity leave or career break</td>
<td>We have had one member of staff successfully apply for a payment since the policy was introduced.</td>
<td>4.1 Monitor uptake, directly email everyone who goes on maternity leave/career break/family leave details of guidance for return to work, and details of “returners fund”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In 2015 guidance document designed outlining options for staff returning from family leave or a career break, including flexible working, working from home.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Include leaflet about the guidance for return to work and details for the “returners fund” in all maternity leave letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASWG successfully applied for faculty funding to set up small grants for returning staff to facilitate training, conference attendance etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WTISSF return to work fund set up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that employees know that the Faculty offers flexible working and work life balance options.</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Increase awareness amongst staff of the flexible working/work life balance policies and opportunities.</td>
<td>Survey shows increase in line managers supporting requests for flexible working from 58% in 2013 to 69% in 2016</td>
<td>4.11 Monitor awareness of flexible working arrangements via culture survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure uptake &amp; duration of maternity/paternity/ adoption leave &amp; identify reasons for lack of uptake.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HR clinic at coffee mornings</td>
<td>All focus group participants (8 people attended) said they had a positive experience when they went on maternity leave and were</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Footsteps brochure sent to all members of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy overview on AS website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular updates in Dean’s communication email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| To identify the gender makeup of flexible working and approval requests, to assess whether employees are aware of the flexible working policy and to maximise transparency & minimise impediments | Focus group on returning to work in 2017 to assess effectiveness of policies. | impressed with the support given. | Flexible working requests have increased from 15 in 2014 to 25 in 2016, 68% female applications
Improved IT support for flexible working from home to access faculty it resources. | 4.10 Monitor requests for flexible working arrangements annually |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.8</strong> Review and monitor the gender of staff requesting flexible working arrangements (both formal and informal) and the approval rates</td>
<td>Flexible working requests are recorded and reviewed annually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6 Organisation and Culture

(i) Culture

FBS considers equality and inclusion across all activity and is embedded into how FBS operates at all levels. This is facilitated through FBS’s Equality & Inclusion Committee (FBS E&I; Fig 5.6.1), which meets quarterly and incorporates representatives from different groups that work and study in FBS. E&I ensures that FBS protects and upholds the interests of all people providing a learning/working environment that is free from barriers. Co-Chairs of ASWG are automatically members of FBS E&I. One important area of discussion recently has included provision of non-gendered toilets in the design of a refit of FBS. This will ensure adequate toilet facilities for transgender students and staff. Chair of FBS E&I (Dean) also sits on the University committee. Examples of best practice and areas of discussion are reported through this network as appropriate e.g. FBS footsteps booklet was shared at UoL E&I. Co-chairs of FBS AS and HR manager are also members of UoL ASWG, which meets regularly to share best practice and work on University-wide initiatives. ASWG uses a variety of mechanisms to highlight its work and embed gender equality across FBS (Table 5.6.1).

Table: 5.6.A: Summary of activities taking place in FBS, overseen by ASWG and FBS E&I separated into categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication of activity and impact</td>
<td>Athena Swan sponsored faculty coffee mornings (4/year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updates/notices in weekly “Dean’s Communication” email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twitter account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Plasma screens to advertise events (strong visual identity in faculty-wide social space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS pull-up banner to use for events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Unconscious bias training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Equal Opportunities Guidelines for Seminar Organisers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role models</td>
<td>Postdoc circle mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women in Science Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women of Achievements awards in FBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Footsteps booklet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Irene Manton Women in Science Lecture (~100 attendance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Zone Athena Swan stand (outreach event for school children): discussion and women in science activities in March 2017. Run by PhD student AS representatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These activities have significant impact on individuals and FBS culture. At a coffee morning, we had a question regarding the UoL Trans Policy. This was in response to ASWG highlighting this newly developed policy and its inclusion on the AS website. ASWG see this sort of discussion as important in extending Trans activity at UoL to FBS.

To determine the cultural impact of AS actions we undertook a staff “culture” survey (Oct 2016) of all staff. We received 162 (50%) out of 498 (33% return-rate), up from 100 in 2013. The survey included questions on the profile of AS, policies and behaviours. It was a UoL survey adapted for our use. Analysis has shown that we need to ask more specific question to measure the impact of actions specifically targeted to different staff groups. We are developing new surveys tailored to different groups. This is particularly important going forward to represent Professional, Managerial and Support staff. We will also develop PhD student and UG surveys.
Importantly, results of 2016 survey reveal an increased awareness of AS activity, from 68% in 2013 to 92% in 2016. We have also conducted a survey of our PhD students in which we got 45 respondents out of 312 (14% response level). 58% of female PhD students have attended an AS event and 42% of males students. At the 2017 FBS student award ceremony, the E&I Award was presented by AS co-chairs. Integration of AS with this type of event raises the profile of AS with UG students.

Table 5.6.B: Survey results show increase in awareness and cultural shift in gender equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>% agree all</th>
<th>% agree male</th>
<th>% agree female</th>
<th>% agree all</th>
<th>% agree male</th>
<th>% agree female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the Athena SWAN initiative (its principles and aims) in my Faculty and university</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the principles and aims of the Athena SWAN initiative in my Faculty/University</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupportive language and behaviour are not acceptable in my Faculty</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate images that stereotype women or men are not acceptable in my Faculty</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the Women at Leeds (formerly WiSET) network within the university – its principles and aims</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I engage in Women at Leeds activities within the university</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During my time in this Faculty, I have experienced a situation(s) where I have felt uncomfortable because of my gender.</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have considerably updated and improved the AS website to provide up-to-date information. Sections on the website include postdoc/PhD section, funding, policies, events and mentoring. The FBS AS twitter account has helped publicise this, started Nov 2016, we now have 81 followers. These tools help embed gender equality into the culture of FBS staff and students.
(ii)  HR policies

HR policies are UoL negotiated and FBS ensures information about them are available both through FBS intranet pages and links to UoL HR website. FBS HR team keep a confidential case log of both formal and informal cases related to grievance, disciplinary, harassment etc, and annual reports are made to Senate on cases within formal procedures.

FBS HR team are present at quarterly FBS AS coffee mornings, with an open surgery to discuss policies and procedures, and respond to any general HR issues or queries. Our FBS HR intranet webpages ensure that any updates to University HR policies are available, and any such changes are communicated through the Dean’s weekly communication email. In the staff survey 69% of staff agreed that faculty policies are accessible (77% of females, up from 47% in 2013). This FBS HR website provides an overview of policies, as well as copies of policies, contact details for more information. HR held several update sessions on the new Promotions Process and Criteria (2016) to ensure staff and managers are aware of the changes. Several Probation/Objective setting workshops have taken place aimed at PIs to raise awareness of the Probation Procedures and how to set objectives. We will continue to run these regularly and advertise them more effectively to those who line-manage.

(iii)  Representation of men and women on committees

There are 11 major FBS committees spanning research, education, safety, planning, E&I and building management (Fig 5.6.1). Table 5.6.C and Fig 5.6.2 contain summaries of the gender balance on the committees (2013/14-2016/17), with average percentage of female staff and students on committees for each year (penultimate row). The last row is the average percentage of female academic or academic-related staff across the committees.
Fig 5.6.1: Schematic diagram of Faculty of Biological Sciences Committee and their relationships
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Table 5.6.C – Summary of the number of female and male staff and students in committees from 2013/14-2016/17. The School Management Committees have been combined into one row but are expanded on further in tables 5.6.E and 5.6.F. The last two rows are calculated from the total number of females and males in all committees in each academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Executive Committee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Board</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Equality and Inclusion Committee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Safety Subcommittee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management Committees</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Taught Student Education Committee</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Taught Student Education Committee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Student Recruitment Group</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School Committee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Taught Student Education Committee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/Academic-related average</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig 5.6.2: Gender break-down of major committees within FBS over last 4 academic years

Summary of Female and Male staff and students in committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Executive Committee</td>
<td>Faculty Board</td>
<td>FRIC</td>
<td>Faculty Equality and Inclusion Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total F</td>
<td>Total M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6.D: Membership of general management committees from 2013/14 broken down by gender and grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F Prof</th>
<th>F G9</th>
<th>F G8</th>
<th>F G7</th>
<th>F G6</th>
<th>F G5</th>
<th>F G3</th>
<th>M Prof</th>
<th>M G9</th>
<th>M G8</th>
<th>M G7</th>
<th>M G6</th>
<th>M G5</th>
<th>M G4</th>
<th>M G2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Executive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Board</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Equality and</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 5.6.3: Gender and grade break-down of general management committees within FBS over last 4 academic years
Table 5.6.E – Membership of general management committees from 2013/14 broken down by gender and staff type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F Acad</th>
<th>F AR</th>
<th>F Res</th>
<th>F Tech</th>
<th>F Cler</th>
<th>F Stu</th>
<th>M Acad</th>
<th>M AR</th>
<th>M Res</th>
<th>M Tech</th>
<th>M Cler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Executive Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Board</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Equality and Inclusion Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 5.6.4: Gender and staff type break-down of general management committees within FBS over last 4 academic years
Table 5.6.F – Membership of health and safety committees from 2013/14 broken down by gender and grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F G9</th>
<th>F G8</th>
<th>F G7</th>
<th>F G6</th>
<th>F Student</th>
<th>M Prof</th>
<th>M G9</th>
<th>M G8</th>
<th>M G7</th>
<th>M G6</th>
<th>M Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6.G – Membership of health and safety committees from 2013/14 broken down by gender and staff type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F Aca</th>
<th>F AR</th>
<th>F Res</th>
<th>F Tech</th>
<th>F Cler</th>
<th>F Stu</th>
<th>M Aca</th>
<th>M AR</th>
<th>M Res</th>
<th>M Tech</th>
<th>M Cler</th>
<th>M Stu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 5.6.5: Break-down of Health and Safety Committee by A) Gender and grade and B) Gender and staff type
Table 5.6.H – Membership of School Management Committees from 2013/14 broken down by gender and grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Biology</th>
<th>F Prof</th>
<th>F G9</th>
<th>F G8</th>
<th>F G7</th>
<th>F G6</th>
<th>F G5</th>
<th>M Prof</th>
<th>M G9</th>
<th>M G8</th>
<th>M G7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>F Prof</td>
<td>F G9</td>
<td>F G8</td>
<td>F G7</td>
<td>F G6</td>
<td>F G5</td>
<td>M Prof</td>
<td>M G9</td>
<td>M G8</td>
<td>M G7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Molecular and Cellular Biology</td>
<td>F Prof</td>
<td>F G9</td>
<td>F G8</td>
<td>F G7</td>
<td>F G6</td>
<td>F G5</td>
<td>M Prof</td>
<td>M G9</td>
<td>M G8</td>
<td>M G7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6.F – Membership of School Management Committees from 2013/14 broken down by gender and staff type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Biology</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F Aca</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F AR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Res</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Tech</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Cler</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Aca</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Res</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Tech</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Cler</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Biomedical Sciences</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F Aca</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F AR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Res</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Tech</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Cler</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Aca</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Res</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Tech</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Cler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Molecular and Cellular Biology</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F Aca</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F AR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Res</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Tech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Cler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Aca</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Res</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Tech</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Cler</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 5.6.7: Break-down of School Management Committees by gender and grade

School Management Committees - Gender and Grade

- **School of Biology**
  - 2013/14:
    - Prof: F
    - G9: F
    - G8: M
    - G7: M
  - 2014/15:
    - Prof: F
    - G9: F
    - G8: M
    - G7: M
  - 2015/16:
    - Prof: F
    - G9: F
    - G8: M
    - G7: M
  - 2016/17:
    - Prof: F
    - G9: F
    - G8: M
    - G7: M

- **School of Biomedical Sciences**
  - 2013/14:
    - Prof: F
    - G9: F
    - G8: M
    - G7: M
  - 2014/15:
    - Prof: F
    - G9: F
    - G8: M
    - G7: M
  - 2015/16:
    - Prof: F
    - G9: F
    - G8: M
    - G7: M
  - 2016/17:
    - Prof: F
    - G9: F
    - G8: M
    - G7: M

- **School of Molecular and Cellular Biology**
  - 2013/14:
    - Prof: F
    - G9: F
    - G8: M
    - G7: M
  - 2014/15:
    - Prof: F
    - G9: F
    - G8: M
    - G7: M
  - 2015/16:
    - Prof: F
    - G9: F
    - G8: M
    - G7: M
  - 2016/17:
    - Prof: F
    - G9: F
    - G8: M
    - G7: M
Fig 5.6.8: Break-down of School Management Committees by gender and staff type
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Student</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Education Committee</td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Student</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Student</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Education Committee</td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Student</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Group</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Student</td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Group</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School Committee</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Student</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Education Committee</td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School Committee</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Education - Gender and Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Taught Student Education Committee</td>
<td>F Prof</td>
<td>M Prof</td>
<td>F G9</td>
<td>M G9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Taught Student Education Committee</td>
<td>F G8</td>
<td>M G8</td>
<td>F G7</td>
<td>M G7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Student Recruitment Group</td>
<td>F G6</td>
<td>M G6</td>
<td>F G5</td>
<td>M G5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School Committee</td>
<td>F G4</td>
<td>M G4</td>
<td>F G3</td>
<td>M G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Taught Student Education Committee</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6.K – Membership of Education Committees from 2013/14 broken down by gender and staff type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F Aca</th>
<th>F AR</th>
<th>F Res</th>
<th>F Tech</th>
<th>F Cler</th>
<th>F Stu</th>
<th>M Aca</th>
<th>M AR</th>
<th>M Res</th>
<th>M Tech</th>
<th>M Cler</th>
<th>M Stu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Taught Student Education Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Taught Student Education Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taught Student Recruitment Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate School Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masters Taught Student Education Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Education - Gender and Staff Type

- Undergraduate Taught Student Education Committee
- Faculty Taught Student Education Committee
- Taught Student Recruitment Group
- Graduate School Committee
- Masters Taught Student Education Committee

Legend:
- F Academic
- F Academic-Related
- F Research
- F Technical
- F Clerical
- F Student
- M Academic
- M Academic-Related
- M Clerical
- M Student
The total percentage of females (35%) within committees has not changed since 2013/14 and is representative of the percentage of female academics/professional and managerial staff in FBS (37%). While the gender balance as a whole reflects the composition of FBS, there are areas with poor gender balance. The committees with the greatest gender imbalance are the Health and Safety Committees. The members of these committees is based upon permanent job positions and there has been no turnover in these. Education committees are female dominated due to the student education service staff being mostly female. E&I committee is currently well gender balanced.

Male committee membership in is predominantly Professors but there is a greater spread of female grades (Fig 5.6.3). Across the four management committees in 2016/17 there is only one female Professor. This is likely due to many of the leadership roles, being held by male Professors.

FBS does not currently advertise every role for committee members. Some positions are linked to roles (e.g. DoR) and there is limited turnover. Other positions staff are recruited by advertisements (e.g. Faculty Equality representative on E&I Committee) or directly approached because of their expertise or experience. Student positions are advertised on an annual basis. From the culture survey it is clear that some staff perceive that when leadership roles are not advertised openly that they become “jobs for the boys”. A major action point is to advertise all School management roles. Support for this initiative has come through senior management including the Dean and E&I committee.

**Action**

5.7 Improve number of high grade females and lower grade males in committees.

5.8 Do this by increasing the succession planning of membership in these committees that are not tied to specific roles within the Faculty

5.9 Recruit all School level roles (e.g. DSE, DoR) and committee positions by advertisement.

(iv) Workload model

The workload model developed in 2012, is updated regularly by FEC, and implemented/reviewed by HoSs and HR. The model allocates academics time for different activities, but is not designed to track every hour, more help share workloads. “It is used as an indicator of workload” HoS.

Newer staff have lighter administrative roles than more established academics, so that research activity can be built up. To ensure fairness jobs are assigned fixed hourly allocations. The model includes averages for schools and faculty for context. The model makes allocation of teaching and responsibilities more transparent. The average number of hours spent on teaching, supervising PhD students and research, is very similar between the genders (Table 5.6.L). In general, female academic staff do slightly more PhD student supervision, whilst males have slightly more research and teaching commitments. The differences that exist between schools are larger than these differences between genders. We will analyse data comparing between gender within Schools and at different grades in the future.
Table 5.6.L: Average workload model hours by gender across FBS academics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>FBS average</th>
<th>Female average</th>
<th>Male average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research grant hours</td>
<td>312.6</td>
<td>320.3</td>
<td>336.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact hours for teaching</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of PhD supervision</td>
<td>177.2</td>
<td>217.2</td>
<td>205.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action**

5.10 Ensure that all positions of responsibility are recognised within workload model, with appropriate FTE allocation.

(v) **Participation on influential external committees**

Many academic staff sit on external committees e.g. funding bodies. From profiling the grade and gender of these contributions (Fig 5.6.9A) and individuals (Fig 5.6.9B) it is clear that such activity is not distributed evenly.

Figure 5.6.9: Representation of women on external committees (A) Number of external committees on which females and males of each academic grade sit. (B) Number of individuals in each grade serving on external committees.
Female Professors sit on more external committees (Fig 5.6.9A) even though there are fewer of these individuals and sitting on external committees (Fig 5.6.9B). This means female Professors end up with a higher workload than male counterparts. In contrast, there are far more contributions by male grade 8/9 academics than females. This could negatively impact female careers because this type of activity is required for promotion. Membership to sit on these types of external committee and panels is mainly by invitation, and academic staff are encouraged to engage with such activity during AAMs. To tackle the inequality we will make external committees/panels part of the checklist to always be discussed at AAMs.

(vi) **Timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings**

We strive to ensure all FBS meetings and Away Days fall within core hours 10–4pm. In the 2016 staff survey, 95% of staff (97%F) agreed that formal meetings are completed in core hours, a large increase from 60% in 2013.

(vii) **Visibility of role models**

Diversity is strongly considered in publicity materials, which is almost entirely aimed at students. Across all brochures, leaflets and banners that the FBS marketing team produce 59% of the people featured are female, accurately reflecting the Faculty’s student population.

In December 2016, ASWG launched the ‘Footsteps’ booklet that was distributed to staff and in recruitment packages. This booklet highlights various career paths that scientists within FBS have taken. There are profiles of 6 women and 2 men, including interviews, photographs and a timeline of their career milestones.

FBS runs a variety of seminars (Fig 5.6.10) and ASWG aim keep the proportion of speakers >40% who are female to ensure there are role models for junior scientists. While SM CB have actively been improving in the proportion of female speakers, most are dominated by male speakers. Both SB and SBMS both have ~30% female speakers. To address this a ‘Seminar Guidelines’ document was developed by ASWG and sent to all FBS seminar organisers. It highlights the importance of gender balance and diversity in seminars, and reminds staff to keep this in mind when inviting speakers. While SB seminar series are the lowest of the three schools they also host several specific seminars that are more balanced (Fig 5.6.11). Given
the lack of female speakers in Astbury 2016/17 series, we spoke to the organiser highlighting the issue and the schedule for next semester is ~50% female.

ASWG organised 2 events for UN Day of Women and Girls in Science; a research seminar and a discussion panel on ‘Role Models’ including both male and female academics at a variety of careers stages from grade 8-10, with different career paths. This was attended by ~35 staff and students, ~95% of whom were female.

ASWG introduced the annual Irene Manton lecture in 2015, sponsored by the Linnaean Society, this lecture showcases the work of successful female academics, and is followed by a social event. These lectures have been well attended by staff and students.

**Action**

5.11 Expand “Footsteps” brochure and ensure that Case Studies are made available via AS website

---

**Fig 5.6.10 School Seminar Speakers**
(viii) Outreach activities

Outreach activity is organised in FBS, across UoL and independently. This makes it difficult to accurately measure, however activities run through FBS are reported here.

Fig 5.6.12: Percentage of staff involve in outreach who are female and male (right) and proportion of females contributing to outreach by roles (left)
Outreach is recognised within citizenship in the workload model, along with other contributions. Therefore, not every academic is taking part in outreach. Gender is considered in outreach activities, both of those performing and those taking part. Overall, 60% of the faculty members organising and running the outreach are females (Fig 5.6.12, left). Amongst academic staff, ~30% of those performing outreach are female reflecting the composition of academic staff. There is an over-representation of post-gra and support staff females in our outreach (Fig 5.6.12, right). This potentially has both positive and negative consequences; positive female scientific role models are being provided for young people but there is uneven distribution of workload on female young scientists. The preponderance of females may also discourage interest from prospective male students, so improved gender balance is required.

The majority of time contributed to outreach is by female postgrads and support staff (Fig 5.6.13). This could potentially negatively impact their research productivity setting them at a disadvantage to their male counterparts.

**Fig 5.6.13: Hours contributed to outreach activities for different groups with Faculty**

The beneficiaries of outreach activity are spread over different school types (Fig 5.6.14-15), the majority being community and academy schools. Single sex schools represent a very small proportion of this outreach. Importantly students in disadvantaged catchment areas are being reached. Numbers are only included for the last two years when we have reliable data and overall there has been an increase in the number of students benefiting from outreach. Hopefully this will continue to encourage young people to pursue science after school.
Fig 5.6.14: Percentage of students FBS interacted with by outreach

Fig 5.6.15: Number of students in contact with outreach at different school types
Action

5.12 Encourage all academic staff to contribute to citizenship by having 2.5% allocated on the workload model and another 2.5% evidence of “citizenship” activity.
6. Case Studies

Dr Philippa (Pip) Garner

After graduating from Leeds with a BSc in Medical Sciences I became a high school teacher, returning to FBS in 2008 to start a PhD. I successfully wrote an EPSRC Prize Doctoral Fellowship, 2012-2014, then became a Teaching Fellow in Neuroscience, a 3-year fixed-term contract in 2014.

I have benefitted from excellent mentorship throughout my career. When preparing my fellowship application, a number of academics, peers and technical staff provided invaluable support. During my Fellowship I was encouraged to find a mentor, which was really helpful. I have a team of unofficial mentors, whom I access regularly. Recently students and postdocs have approached me for mentorship regarding applications for academic teaching positions and fellowships.

I took maternity leave in October 2016 and have since secured a permanent Teaching Fellow position. My husband also works in FBS and when I return, he will take shared parental leave. This has meant that we could make decisions based on what is best for our family, rather than being dictated by financial pressures or fear that my career could be negatively affected. UoL has fully supported the concept of shared leave i.e. my husband gets paid whatever proportion of salary I would be entitled to at that stage of the parental leave period, which I am told is not the practice in most organisations. I plan to phase my return to work, ensuring I will be in place for UG recruitment, which is key to my role. The flexibility of keep-in-touch days allowing me to bring my baby with me has been a bonus, because he is exclusively breastfed.

I am keen to apply for promotion in the near future. I would appreciate support from an appropriate "promotions champion".

I joined FBS ASWG in 2012, and have noticed a change in culture of FBS over the years in terms of gender equality. I have attended several WISNET events at UoL. The supportive environment enables me to ask for advice and support from colleagues. The support during my maternity leave has been excellent. I was asked what level of communication I would like during my leave, and this has mainly been respected. I also valued the encouragement provided by my DSE during my application for a permanent position. Just before I took maternity leave, before my permanent contract was in place, I was impressed that HR would put together a redeployment profile for me. When I return from leave I will provide ASWG with recommendations to improve support given to staff going on maternity leave.

I intend to request flexible working hours and hope to get a ‘return to work buddy’ to advise in this process. I will also apply for financial support from the AS fund, to pay for my husband and baby to join me at a conference in Manchester, to allow continued breastfeeding.
Dr Karen Birch

I am a Reader in Exercise Science, in the School of Biomedical Sciences. I joined UoL as a Lecturer in 2002. Having held the role of Senior Lecturer at Manchester Metropolitan University I wanted to move to a RG university but took a cut in salary to achieve this. Within 12 months, I was promoted to Senior Lecturer, to Reader in 2011, and was appointed as Head of School in 2016 to commence April 2017.

I have always had a strong research, teaching and administrative portfolio. My publications have been submitted for each REF, which helped achieve the Number 1 in UK for 4* papers in Sport and Exercise Science in 2014.

I have served on numerous internal committees, including Faculty Research and Innovation committee, University Research Ethics Committee and now Faculty Executive. I have also been an active member for the University promotions college.

In 2008 I took 7 months maternity leave and returned to work full-time. Both my partner (also an academic) and I work flexibly, allowing us to maintain a good work-life balance. Since I started in FBS the culture supporting people returning after maternity leave has improved but further work is needed, e.g. a buddy system to help adjust and discuss issues that many people face. After returning to work I felt I was trying to prove my credibility. Now I know I can’t do everything at 100%, all the time, but rather parts of my life and work take priority at different times, my partner doing the same. There was limited support when I returned, and I think the financial support now available through Athena Swan, is an excellent way to help.

During my career, I have not encountered barriers due to my gender. However, I do feel the culture within the faculty has become more supportive for female leaders. I have always enjoyed the challenge of leadership and have taken opportunities for personal and professional development e.g. through the Staff Development Unit. In 2016 I was nominated by the Faculty to take part in Aurora; “developing future leaders for higher education” female-only program. This was extremely inspiring and thought provoking. I learnt the value of self-reflection which was instrumental in my application for Head of School. I really value the importance of different management styles, which comes by having males and females in leadership roles.

In 2009 I became Director of Research for the School. This was supported and encouraged by my Head of School and has been great preparation for me becoming Head of School. When I applied for this role, I was concerned that I was not yet a Professor, but was encouraged by colleagues and mentors. I will apply for promotion in the near future and still believe women tend to wait until we are totally ready before applying. The review of the promotion system, which Athena Swan played a role in, has improved the path to promotion and hopefully this will encourage more women to apply. My mentoring experiences within the Faculty have been very positive and I now enjoy mentoring and providing support, direction and guidance to male and female staff and students.
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### 1. Student Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Need/Rationale</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible person/group</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
<th>Measures of Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decreasing proportion of male students entering via Access routes from 46% to 30% over 5 years: need to prevent trend continuing.</strong></td>
<td>1.1 Recruit male Ambassador Plus students from September 2017 <em>(page 17)</em></td>
<td>Student Education Service</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Increase male entry via Access programmes to ~ 35-40% Expect to see impact commencing 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over 70% of acceptances to SBMS programmes are female: need to encourage more males apply/accept places on programmes</strong></td>
<td>1.2 2017-18 brochures will be modified to include equal emphasis on male and females in illustrations and Case Studies <em>(page 17)</em></td>
<td>Student Education Service in conjunction with DSE SBMS and Marketing team</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Increase number of male applicants /acceptances to SBMS. Expect to see impact on applications/acceptances from 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Review number of male and females hosting open days, and promotional materials to attract male students, particularly in SBMS <em>(page 19)</em></td>
<td>Student Education Service</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SES undergraduate applications and acceptances increasing, but this has not yet led to overall increase in registrations</strong></td>
<td>1.4 Monitor ongoing effects of changes to strategies and materials on SES registrations <em>(page 27)</em></td>
<td>Athena Swan Working Group</td>
<td>Commence September 2017</td>
<td>Registration of female students to SES programmes increases in line with changes to acceptances over next 3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female undergraduates persistently outperform their</strong></td>
<td>1.5 Joint project will be undertaken with Faculty of Arts, Humanities &amp; Cultures to</td>
<td>Student Education Service</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Project to report in 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>male counterparts at degree level: investigate interventions to address this.</strong></td>
<td>investigate causes of male underperformance: actions may be taken depending on outcomes. <em>(page 30)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females form a smaller % of PGR than national/RG averages: encourage more females to apply to FBS.</strong></td>
<td>1.6 Review research postgraduate website and advertising materials for good gender balance. Create ‘Women in Science’ video <em>(page 36)</em></td>
<td>Marketing team</td>
<td>Commence 2017</td>
<td>Review &amp; Case Study development during 2017-18 for 18-19 application cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 Develop female PhD case studies for PG recruitment material <em>(page 36)</em></td>
<td>Student Education Service</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Expect to see impact commencing 2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8 Ensure even gender balance of staff and students hosting postgraduate open day/evening events <em>(page 36)</em></td>
<td>Student Education and Head of Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expect to see impact commencing 2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9 Survey UG/PhD students to identify barriers/issues affecting experience of males and females to identify gender-related issues relating to career aspirations, application and completion <em>(page 37)</em></td>
<td>Athena Swan Working Group Undergraduate &amp; postgraduate reps</td>
<td>Commence Summer 2017</td>
<td>Survey annually from 2017. Trends and issues for action reported to Athena Swan Working Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some evidence that female PhD completion rates are lower than for males

1.10 Monitor completion rates: investigate causes of slightly poorer completion rates for females if necessary (page 38)

Athena Swan Working Group/Student Education Service

Commence September 2017

Monitor part time PGR students’ completion rates 2017-2020. Report any emerging trend to ASWG/FDSE.

Determine any barriers to completion for female students from PGR survey and develop actions if appropriate.

2. Key Career Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Need/Rationale</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible person/group</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
<th>Measures of Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information obtained from EXIT surveys is limited currently</td>
<td>2.1 Explore initiatives to increase greater completion of EXIT survey (ie by offering incentives such as winning a voucher) (page 54)</td>
<td>Faculty HR team</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>50% Increase in completion of EXIT surveys or EXIT interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females are under-represented in academic staff particularly at grades 9 &amp; 10; encourage both recruitment and promotion of female staff.</td>
<td>2.2 Include information on flexible working opportunities, shared parental leave, family friendly policies, Stonewall Employer in the advert or job description (page 58)</td>
<td>Faculty HR team</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3. Provide access to case studies (Footsteps brochure/website) of female academics along with adverts (page 58)</td>
<td>Faculty HR team</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>Increase of female staff at grades 9 in a 5 year period by 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4. Ensure all new posts widely advertised, e.g. at conference (page 58)</td>
<td>All academic staff, led by ASWG)</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5. Actively support our female postdocs to apply for academic positions at University of Leeds and elsewhere through mentoring circles, Coffee & Careers seminars (ASWG): develop system to monitor post-doc destinations (page 58)

ASWG  
March 2017  
Increased success for FBS postdocs in gaining academic positions over 5 year period

2.6. Target tailored promotion sessions at specific groups’ e.g. female early career research staff. (page 60)

Faculty HR team  
2017  
Increased applications of promotion from females by at least 50% over 5 year period.

2.7. Promotion workshops for staff including input from staff who have successfully been through the new promotions process (page 60)

Faculty HR team  
2017

2.8. Identify and encourage (via SRDS and AAMs) appropriate female staff to apply for promotion (page 60)

Faculty HR team, Dean, HoS  
May 2017

2.9 ASWG to review recruitment and promotions figures and report to Dean/HoS and highlight any changes in gender balance (page 60)

ASWG  
January 2018

2.10. Ensure all staff involved in selection interviewing have received E&I and Unconscious bias training (page 60)

Faculty HR team  
July 2018

Professional, support and technical staff (most of whom are female) report lack of clarity about opportunities for promotion, development and progression

2.11 Set up mentoring for technical, professional and support staff to provide advice on and support with applying for roles at a higher level. (page 63)

Faculty HR team and Professional Service Managers  
From 2017 (Technical Staff)  
2018 (Professional and support staff)  
55% of staff engaged in mentoring
2.12 Discussion of availability and potential benefits of mentoring added to discussion points for all SRDS meetings *(page 63)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Career Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of Need/Rationale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers on probation feel that they need more opportunity to discuss career development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdocs’ training needs and access to career development opportunities are poorly understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of numbers from PhD to postdoc (particularly of females)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Additional support is required to further increase the success of female academic staff applying for external grant funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.6 Supplement internal peer-reviews with panel/group discussions of applications in the pre-submission stages <em>(page 74)</em></th>
<th>Dean, Pro Dean for Research</th>
<th>From September 2017</th>
<th>Increased number of applications for grants from female staff over the next 2-3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Develop a repository of successful grant applications to support early career researchers <em>(page 74)</em></td>
<td>Pro Dean for Research and School Directors of Research</td>
<td>From September 2017</td>
<td>Increased success rate for female staff in applying for funding over the next 2-3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Flexible working and managing career breaks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Need/Rationale</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible person/group</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
<th>Measures of Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some staff who take absence from work (e.g. maternity leave) perceive that this affects their career progression</strong></td>
<td>4.1 Monitor uptake, directly email everyone who goes on maternity leave/career break/family leave details of guidance for return to work, and details of “returners fund” <em>(page 82)</em></td>
<td>Faculty HR team</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>Improved satisfaction around these issues from staff who have taken a period of absence in annual culture survey over the next 2-3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Monitor uptake of the ”returner’s fund” to support those staff returning from maternity, shared parental leave, adoption leave etc. <em>(page 82)</em></td>
<td>Faculty HR team/ASWG</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Include leaflet about the guidance for return to work and details for the “returners fund” in all maternity leave letters <em>(page 82)</em></td>
<td>Faculty HR team</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Introduce return to work buddy system <em>(page 82)</em></td>
<td>Faculty HR team/HoS</td>
<td>End of 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 Provide designated room for breast feeding/expressing with fridge <em>(page 82)</em></td>
<td>Dean, Facilities manager</td>
<td>End of 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Develop guidelines in consultation with HoS on recommendation for phased return to teaching for research active academics <em>(page 82)</em></td>
<td>Faculty HR team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff who have flexible working arrangements (many of whom are female) report that workload reduction was not always commensurate with agreed decrease in hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Guidance to be provided for line managers &amp; SRDS reviewers to address these issues of workload and flexible or part time working <em>(page 82)</em></td>
<td>Faculty HR team, HoS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence June 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased awareness and improved satisfaction around these issues from staff who are part time/ use flexible working arrangements in annual culture survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 AAM/SRDS meetings to include discussion of appropriateness of workload for staff on flexible working <em>(page 82)</em></td>
<td>HoS, Directors of Research, Directors of Student Education, Service Managers, Faculty HR Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some staff who have flexible working arrangements perceive that they are regarded as less career-focussed than full time staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Provide and publicise successful role models for staff utilising flexible working <em>(page 83)</em></td>
<td>ASWG, HoS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved satisfaction around these issues from staff who have taken a period of absence in annual culture survey over the next 2-3 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Monitor requests for flexible working arrangements annually <em>(page 83)</em></td>
<td>Faculty HR team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Monitor awareness of flexible working arrangements via culture survey <em>(page 83)</em></td>
<td>ASWG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Organisation and culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Need/Rationale</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible person/group</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
<th>Measures of Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff have limited opportunities to feed back on their perceptions of issues on the AS agenda</strong></td>
<td>5.1 A bespoke AS survey will be developed and undertaken annually to gather the views of staff on their working environment and its culture. Surveys will be designed to include questions relating to different roles and grades as required (e.g. for postdocs and PGR students) <em>(page 89)</em></td>
<td>ASWG</td>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>Information obtained from staff in relation to AS activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Outcomes from the survey will be considered at AS &amp; E&amp;I committees and will be used to inform development of action plans. <em>(page 89)</em></td>
<td>ASWG Chair</td>
<td>Survey annually from 2018</td>
<td>This will allow monitoring of success of action plan, and the development of new actions as required on an annual basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&gt;20% of female staff report instances where they feel uncomfortable because of their gender</strong></td>
<td>5.3 Continued roll-out of unconscious bias training for staff and students <em>(page 89)</em></td>
<td>Faculty HR team, Student Education Service</td>
<td>Ongoing in 2017</td>
<td>All staff, postdocs and PGR students to have completed unconscious bias training. Decreased reporting of such incidents in 2-3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 New mandatory E&amp;I online training modules currently being developed by UoL address inappropriate behaviours <em>(page 89)</em></td>
<td>UoL Equality Policy Unit</td>
<td>End of 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited actions in place to make undergraduate/PGT students aware of AS. Improve UGT/PGT awareness of AS</strong></td>
<td>5.5 Plans to enhance UG &amp; PGT awareness include introduction of a lecture on AS/unconscious bias/, and Equality &amp; Inclusion training as part of induction programmes. <em>(page 89)</em></td>
<td>Student Education Service</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>Success will be monitored by changes in awareness as shown by survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Assessment of awareness/support for AS amongst UG/PGT students will be introduced, and monitored annually. <em>(page 89)</em></td>
<td>Student Education Service</td>
<td>Survey annually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is an imbalance of gendered seniority on some Faculty and School committees</strong></td>
<td>5.7 Improve number of high grade females and lower grade males in committees. <em>(page 107)</em></td>
<td>Dean, Pro Deans, Faculty HR team</td>
<td>From May 2017 all Faculty and</td>
<td>Success will be monitored by improved gendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement in outreach activities is not gender-balanced (predominantly female).</strong></td>
<td>5.10 Ensure that all positions of responsibility are recognised within workload model, with appropriate FTE allocation. <em>(page 108)</em></td>
<td>Dean, HoS</td>
<td>Commence June 2017</td>
<td>Improved gender balance in staff outreach activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some staff feel that their contributions are not recognised by the current workload model</strong></td>
<td>5.11 Expand “Footsteps” brochure and ensure that Case Studies are made available via AS website <em>(page 110)</em></td>
<td>Dean, Pro Deans</td>
<td>End of 2017</td>
<td>Improved satisfaction around these issues in annual culture survey over the next 2-3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More positive role models for females, and for staff who have flexible working arrangements, and/or who have taken career breaks are needed.</strong></td>
<td>5.12 Encourage all academic staff to contribute to citizenship by having 2.5% allocated on the workload model and another 2.5% on evidence of “citizenship” activity allocated. <em>(page 114)</em></td>
<td>ASWG</td>
<td>Commence Summer 2017</td>
<td>Long term goal to see increase in female staff at higher grades via increased recruitment and promotion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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