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28th October 2014

Dear Athena SWAN Assessment Panellists

Edinburgh Napier University Bronze Athena SWAN Award Submission

I am delighted to submit this application for an Athena SWAN award. When I joined the University last year, I was aware of the work of Equate Scotland (formerly the Scottish Resource Centre for Women in Science Engineering and Technology), established at Edinburgh Napier in 2006 to make a positive difference for women in science, engineering, technology and the built environment. I recognised the good practice in Edinburgh Napier where in some areas, a large proportion of senior roles are held by women. Furthermore, 28% of the professoriate are women, well above the national average. In light of this, I was surprised to learn that we did not hold an Athena SWAN award and committed to achieving this as a University priority. Consequently at the end of last year we advertised for and appointed an Academic Champion for Athena SWAN, and put in place our newly energised Self-Assessment Team (SAT), chaired by Vice-Principal, Professor Alistair Sambell. The team has been dedicated to compiling evidence to present our case for a bronze award.

Our submission document highlights our current strengths and weaknesses, many of which are common to the sector as a whole. We know that some of the issues can be addressed by making changes to existing processes and practices and as part of our general approach to provide effective career support and development through our system of Professional Development Review, while others require new initiatives. Our Action Plan outlines our commitment to change, and highlights how we will systematically capture data that will help us understand our position and monitor progress in the future. Some of this work is already underway. The Action Plan is a key component of changing cultures as it makes visible and explicit to all staff how we plan to enhance our environment to realise our commitment to gender equality in STEM subject areas.

I am aware that good outcomes are achieved where there is committed and effective leadership at the most senior levels. Our Athena SWAN work will retain the high profile that it has enjoyed in the University in the past year. I am confident that the members of the Edinburgh Napier SAT, supported by commitment from the University Leadership Team, will deliver significant outcomes from the Action Plan so that we will be in the position in three years’ time to submit for a silver award. In the meantime, I fully expect that our STEM schools will have achieved their own awards. I look forward to the outcome of this process and our future work to deliver gender equality across academia.

Andrea Nolan
Principal & Vice-Chancellor

Professor Andrea M Nolan OBE
Principal & Vice-Chancellor

Edinburgh Napier University is a registered Scottish charity Reg. No. SC018373

Inspiring Futures
www.napier.ac.uk
1 Preface

This document presents Edinburgh Napier University’s case for the bronze Athena SWAN award. The data analysed to support the case is drawn from a number of sources as noted in Table 1.

Table 1: Data sources for the submission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Data used in the submission</th>
<th>Application of data analysed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HR Connect                                      | Statistical data generated from the University’s Human Resources (HR) system, e.g. staff numbers | Section 3 Description of the University, p.21  
Section 4.5 Senior staff, p.50  
Annual data presented according to HESA year  
Unless specified otherwise, the audit date of snapshot data is 31st March 2014 |
| University policy documents                     | Detail of University policies, e.g. Flexible working policy, leave for parents              | Section 4.8 Flexibility and career breaks, p. 56                                            |
| STEMM school publicity material                 | Images                                                                                     | Section 4.7 Publicity, p.56                                                                   |
| Reports generated from previous internal analyses | Summary data, e.g. Employee Engagement Survey                                              | Section 3.4 Staff turnover, p.31  
Section 3.6 Equal pay, p.32                                                                     |
| Engagement activities with University staff      | Pointers to sources of information for the submission work, and opinion on its progress   | Table 6: Internal meetings and consultations January–October 2014, p.16                     |
| Athena SWAN focus group discussions October 2014 | Qualitative data to triangulate findings from the main data collection exercises          | Section 3.3 Female: male staff ratios, p.22  
Section 3.7 RAE and REF, p. 32  
Section 4.2 Promotions, p.42  
Section 4.4 Career development support, p.46  
Section 4.6 Workload, p.53                                                              |
| Athena SWAN survey results November 2014        | Qualitative and quantitative data to triangulate findings from the main data collection exercises | Section 3.3 Female: male staff ratios, p.22  
Section 3.7 RAE and REF, p. 32  
Section 4.2 Promotions, p.42  
Section 4.4 Career development support, p.46  
Section 4.6 Workload, p.53                                                              |
| Individual and group feedback on drafts of the bronze submission document | Further triangulation of the analysis                                                      | Throughout the document                                                                   |
The submission follows the instructions in the *bronze award application form* with a small number of adaptations as noted in Table 2.

**Table 2: Data set adaptations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptation</th>
<th>Reason for adaptation</th>
<th>Instances</th>
<th>Particular issue(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some data sets are presented at level of University rather than school</td>
<td>Figures are too low to generate meaningful analyses at school level</td>
<td><em>Turnover</em> figures in Table 12, p.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 3.5 <em>Fixed term contracts</em>, p.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 4.1 <em>Applications and appointments</em>, p.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Promotions</em> data in Table 22, p.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Senior staff ratios</em> in Table 27, p. 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some retrospective conversion exercises have been conducted on the data sets</td>
<td>To allow for comparisons to be made across years in this submission, and in future submissions</td>
<td>Section 3 <em>Description of the University</em>, p.21</td>
<td>Needed to accommodate staffing restructure that took place in January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some incomplete data sets are presented</td>
<td>Impossible to access/create data sets to present the ideal level of detail required</td>
<td>Section 4.1 <em>Applications and appointments</em>, p.36</td>
<td>Archived details of advertised job vacancies not classified according to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 4.8.1 <em>Flexible working</em>, p. 56</td>
<td>Gender of successful applicants not matched to posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional “expected total” data sets have been generated</td>
<td>To allow for female-male comparisons to be made. These data take into 45% female and 55% male gender split in research and academic posts of past three years</td>
<td><em>Turnover</em> figures in Table 12, p.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal and external web links are provided in the submission document</td>
<td>Intention to use submission document as an internal reference tool in the future</td>
<td>Links provided at first mention of source linked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For ease of reference, we include a glossary of terms and abbreviations used throughout the document.
### Table 3: Glossary of terms and abbreviations used in the document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Refers to</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>50th anniversary celebration</strong></td>
<td>Event organised by the SAT and <a href="#">Equate Scotland</a> to celebrate Edinburgh Napier University’s women in STEMM, held on Ada Lovelace Day 2014 at the Royal Society of Edinburgh</td>
<td>One of the largest events hosted under the banner of the <a href="#">University’s 50th anniversary celebrations</a>. 80 guests invited by the Principal: current staff and students, alumni, external stakeholders, and the press. Guest of honour and keynote speaker: <a href="#">Dame Jocelyn Bell Burnell</a> - newly appointed, and first ever female, President of the Royal Society of Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>Focus groups held between 1st and 15th October 2014</td>
<td>25 participants, 20 female, 5 male from all career stages and all three Napier faculties. Additional participant answered the focus group questions in interview format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October screensaver</td>
<td>Gender equality in science themed screen saver rolled out to all desktop PCs in October 2014 - see Figure 2 on p.20.</td>
<td>Designed by the SAT and timed to coincide with other engagement activities in October 2014: focus groups, survey, and 50th anniversary celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Staff who job titles include the terms “Research assistant” and “Research fellow”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>The University’s Athena SWAN Self Assessment Team</td>
<td>See Table 4 on p.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer/reader</td>
<td>Grade 7 roles</td>
<td>HR Connect does not distinguish between these roles therefore they are treated together in the analysis presented in the submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEMM</td>
<td>Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics and Medicine</td>
<td>STEMM (rather than STEM) used to include reference to colleagues in the <a href="#">School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Care</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>A survey comprising a mix of Likert scale and open ended questions made available for responses from research and academic staff between 28th October and 2nd November 2014</td>
<td>60 responses: 26 female, 13 male, 21 gender undeclared. Participants represented all career stages from research student to professor, all three Napier faculties, and staff working to a variety of different patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Refers to</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor’s Fringe performance</td>
<td>Women! Science is not for you! performed by a SAT member at the Edinburgh Fringe Festival on 14th August 2014</td>
<td>Presented as part of the Cabaret of Dangerous Ideas, organised by the Beltane Public Engagement Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>Those in research and academic posts who leave the University for jobs elsewhere, or retirement</td>
<td>Figures do not refer to promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Figures do not distinguish between open-ended and fixed term contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Video to promote and raise awareness of the University’s Athena SWAN work</td>
<td>Created by a student group from the School of Computing in summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word count</td>
<td>Word count of sections taking into account instructions of ECU issued by email on 31st October 2014</td>
<td>Graph and table titles, legends and action plan links/points are exempt from the word count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We have used colour to highlight action plan links/points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The self assessment process (word count 1080)

2.1 Self Assessment Team (SAT) description

The SAT comprises 16 members. Their roles within the University and on the SAT are summarised in Table 4.

*Table 4: SAT members*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School/department</th>
<th>University role</th>
<th>SAT role (and other relevant activity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Cruickshank</td>
<td>School of Computing</td>
<td>Research Fellow 2013/14; Lecturer 2014-</td>
<td>Member of stats sub-team (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Link to School of Computing (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributed to video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Kate Durkacz</td>
<td>School of Engineering and the Built Environment</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer and Senior Teaching Fellow</td>
<td>Member of stats sub-team Link to School of Engineering and the Built Environment (ongoing) (Academic liaison between the School of Engineering and the Built Environment and Equate Scotland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>School/department</td>
<td>University role</td>
<td>SAT role (and other relevant activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Hairstans</td>
<td>Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Creative Industries</td>
<td>Faculty Administrator</td>
<td>Maintains internal and external online presences related to the work of the SAT (on-going) Sets up and maintains records of SAT meetings (on-going) Link to Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Creative Industries (on-going) Member of organising committee for the 50th anniversary celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Hazel Hall</td>
<td>School of Computing</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>University Athena SWAN Academic Champion (on-going) Joint overall responsibility for bronze submission with Mohammed Hameed (Academic liaison between the School of Computing and Equate Scotland 2012-2014) (Active participation in events of BCSWomen and GirlGeeks) (Involved in Women in Computing activities since the early 1990s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Hameed*</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Diversity Partner</td>
<td>HR Athena SWAN lead (on-going) Formal report link between the SAT and the University’s Equality and Diversity committee (on-going) Joint overall responsibility for bronze submission with Hazel Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Moira Hughes</td>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Member of stats sub-team (on-going) Link to Business School (on-going) Member of focus group coordination team (Worked on the original GirlsGetSET project, organising workshops to encourage girls’ interest in science, engineering and technology subjects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Carles Ibanez*</td>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>EIS-ULA branch secretory (and lecturer)</td>
<td>Member of stats sub-team (on-going) Liaison with unions (on-going) Link to Business School (on-going) Opportunities for part-time staff (on-going) Member of focus group coordination team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>School/department</td>
<td>University role</td>
<td>SAT role (and other relevant activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Allison Johnstone*        | Equate Scotland                                  | Project Officer                      | Liaison with university consultations on (1) workload and (2) promotions (on-going)  
Link to Equate Scotland (on-going)  
Member of the policy audit sub-team: work-life balance  
Member of organising committee for the 50th anniversary celebration. (Athena SWAN Assessment Panel member and chair)  |
| Nessa McHugh*             | School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Care     | Lecturer                             | Action Plan sub-team (on-going)  
Link to School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Care (on-going)  
Coordinator of survey  |
| Agnieszka Piotrowska      | School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences         | Research student                     | Link to research student population (on-going)  
Member of focus group coordination team  
(Active member of ScienceGrrl Edinburgh)  |
| Dr Amy Poole*             | School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences         | Lecturer                             | Link to School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences (on-going)  
Liaison on researcher development (on-going)  |
| Professor Alistair Sambell* | Principal’s Office                                | Vice Principal and Deputy Vice Chancellor | Chair of SAT (on-going)  
Link between the SAT and the University Equality and Diversity Committee (chairs both – on-going)  
Link to University Court (on-going)  
Communication of news of Athena SWAN related activities to all staff through the regular Vice Principal’s newsletters  |
| Sally Smith*              | School of Computing                              | Head of School                       | Action plan sub-team (on-going)  
Contributed to video  
Link to School of Computing (on-going)  
(Member of the Scottish Informatics and Computer Science Alliance women’s networking group)  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School/department</th>
<th>University role</th>
<th>SAT role (and other relevant activity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Alastair Stupart      | School of Engineering and the Built Environment | Assistant Director | Member of the policy audit sub-team: publicity  
Link to School of Engineering and the Built Environment (on-going)  
(Athena SWAN Assessment Panel member)  
(Member of the Scottish Forest Industries Cluster Workforce Development Taskforce to build recognised career pathways and increase percentage of women in the workforce) |
| Dr Clare Taylor*      | School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences | Lecturer        | Link to School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences (on-going)  
Public engagement (on-going)  
Member of organising committee for the 50th anniversary celebration  
Member of the policy audit sub-team: raising the profile of female STEMM staff  
Designed University’s October 2014 screen saver  
Member of focus group coordination team  
Coordinator of survey  
(Coordinator of ScienceGrrl Edinburgh) |
| Professor Brian Webster | Faculty of Life, Health and Social Sciences | Assistant Dean  | Link to Faculty of Life, Health and Social Sciences (on-going)  
Action Plan sub-team (on-going) |

**Key:** names marked with an asterisk indicate members identified in 2012/13.

The membership of the SAT demonstrates diversity on several counts including gender, career stage, and school/department affiliation. SAT members have relevant experience to support their understanding of issues pertinent to career progression in STEMM (Table 5).
Table 5: Relevant SAT experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>SAT members offering this experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time working</td>
<td>Durkacz; Johnstone; McHugh; Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible working, including job share roles</td>
<td>Hairstans; Hughes; Johnstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career breaks</td>
<td>Durkacz; Hughes; McHugh; Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-career families (with children):</td>
<td>Johnstone; Hughes; McHugh; Smith; Stupart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent experience of the recruitment and/or promotion processes from the perspective of applying for a post/promotion</td>
<td>Cruickshank; Durkacz; Hall; Hairstans; Poole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent experience of the recruitment and/or promotion processes from the perspective of participating in the interview and selection processes for new staff</td>
<td>Hall; Poole; Sambell; Smith; Taylor; Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental and institutional management responsibilities</td>
<td>Hall; Hughes; Sambell; Smith; Taylor; Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management experience</td>
<td>Sambell; Smith; Webster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Members of the Edinburgh Napier Athena SWAN SAT

Pictured from top to bottom: Professor Alistair Sambell, Nessa McHugh, Allison Johnstone, Emily Hairstans (right), Dr Amy Poole (centre), Agnieszka Piotrowska, Dr Moira Hughes, Alastair Stupart, Dr Clare Taylor, Professor Hazel Hall, Mohammed Hameed. (Not pictured: Peter Cruickshank, Dr Kate Durkacz, Dr Carles Ibanez, Sally Smith, Professor Brian Webster.)

2.2 The self assessment process

The SAT in its current form was established following the appointment of Professor Hazel Hall as the University’s Athena SWAN Academic Champion at the end of 2013.

The SAT’s members were first drawn from a group of twelve people who, in 2012/13, had expressed interest in working as a team towards a submission for the bronze award. In early 2014 the profiles of these twelve people were considered against the ECU’s recommended range of experience and diversity requirements. A number of overlaps and gaps were established. At this point four people stepped down from the initial group thus creating vacancies that were then filled by approaching
colleagues whose profiles complemented those of the existing team members. The approaches were either made directly or through heads of schools.

Since the beginning of 2014 the SAT has met on a monthly basis. The meetings are chaired by the Vice Principal and Deputy Vice Chancellor, Professor Alistair Sambell. A number of standing items feature on every SAT meeting agenda. These include: a report of progress on the bronze award application; internal and external engagement activities; a report on the SAT’s internal and external online presences; SAT member news; and notes of forthcoming events of relevance to women in STEMM in which the SAT members are involved. The SAT reports to the University’s Equality and Diversity Committee which, in turn, reports to Court.

Between meetings SAT members work on tasks as agreed. These are related to one-off activities or events, such as the creation of the video, and our 50th anniversary celebration. Other tasks are key to on-going responsibilities of the SAT members, such as Johnstone’s work to represent the views of the SAT in University consultations on workload and promotions, and Hairstan’s work to ensure that the channels used to promote Athena SWAN across the University are refreshed with new content on a regular basis, and kept up to date.

Most of the work of the SAT, however, has been directed towards the ambition of the University to achieve recognition of its work in supporting the careers of women in STEMM subjects through the achievement of a bronze Athena SWAN award. This has involved gathering and analysing data for the submission, and seeking feedback from the wider University on the processes and outcomes of this activity. This work has been led by Hall with Hameed, and assisted by the SAT members, drawing on their particular interests and skills. For example, four members with expertise in statistics served on the SAT stats sub-team to help with the analysis of the statistical data for the submission.

Between January and November 2014 a large number of meetings and consultations were held within the University, all of which fed into the work for this submission. The main purpose of this activity was twofold: (1) to raise the profile of the University’s ambition with regard to the Athena SWAN principles; (2) to gather information and feedback to contribute to the evidence presented in the bronze submission document and the University’s Athena SWAN Action Plan. The most significant internal consultations and meetings are summarised in Table 6.

The SAT met these two aims through the internal activities noted in the table in combination with its “presence” elsewhere in the University, for example the Athena SWAN intranet page, contributions to the News pages of the University intranet (e.g. news about the focus groups, 50th anniversary celebration and Taylor’s Fringe performance), the video, and email updates on progress towards the bronze award. The SAT’s ambition in the future is to keep gender equality in academia high on the University’s agenda (see Actions 19E to 21E).

In this period the SAT members also participated in externally hosted events, the majority of which had the broad purpose of networking with colleagues working on similar projects related to the Athena SWAN, and learning from their experience. The most significant of these are summarised in Table 7, with associated media coverage given in Table 8.
Other smaller meetings were held on an ad hoc basis, for example with James Lush of the Equality Challenge Unit, and with contacts at other universities for initial advice on preparing a submission. SAT members also attended events related to their specific interests. For example, Johnstone and Poole attended Vitae’s conference in Edinburgh in June 2014, and Johnstone and Stupart both served on Athena SWAN award assessment panels in this period. As the SAT’s practical experience of preparing and submitting award applications grows, its members will make a greater contribution to these external events. In addition, the SAT members engaged in external events to raise the profile of gender issues in STEMM. For example, there were large external presences at Taylor’s Fringe performance, and at the 50th anniversary celebration. Such external interest will be maintained through the establishment of an annual Ada Lovelace Day public lecture each October (Action 19E).
Table 6: Internal meetings and consultations January–October 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Internal consultation/meeting</th>
<th>SAT participants</th>
<th>Other participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 08/01/14 | *Meeting with University Principal*  
To formalise buy-in at the highest level to the University’s bronze award submission, and Athena SWAN and what it stands for | Hall, Hameed, & Sambell      | Assistant Dean of Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Creative Industries     |
| 03/02/14 | *University Equality and Diversity Committee*  
Formal report                                                                 | Hameed & Hall (speakers)     | Equality and Diversity Committee members from across the University              |
| 13/02/14 | *Executive Group of the Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Creative Industries*  
Presentation on Athena SWAN and work of SAT to date, followed by discussion | Hall (speaker)               | Dean, Assistant Deans, Heads of Schools                                           |
| 17/02/14 | *Business School Faculty Academic Strategy and Enhancement Committee*  
Presentation on Athena SWAN and work of SAT to date, followed by discussion | Hameed (speaker)             | Committee members drawn from academic and support staff in the Business School    |
| 17/02/14 | *Executive Group of the Business School*  
Presentation on Athena SWAN and work of SAT to date, followed by discussion | Hameed (speaker)             | Dean, Assistant Deans, Heads of Schools                                           |
| 17/02/14 | *Faculty of Engineering Computing and Creative Industries Faculty Academic Strategy and Enhancement Committee*  
Presentation on Athena SWAN and work of SAT to date, followed by discussion | Hall (speaker)               | Committee members drawn from academic and support staff in the Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Creative Industries |
| 11/03/14 | *Executive Group of the Faculty of Life, Health and Social Sciences*  
Presentation on Athena SWAN and work of SAT to date, followed by discussion | Hameed (speaker)             | Dean, Assistant Deans, Heads of Schools                                           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Internal consultation/meeting</th>
<th>SAT participants</th>
<th>Other participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/04/14</td>
<td><strong>Faculty of Health, Life and Social Sciences Postgraduate Research Conference</strong></td>
<td>Taylor (speaker)</td>
<td>Research staff and students from the Faculty of Health, Life and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation on Athena SWAN and work of SAT to date, followed by discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/04/14</td>
<td><strong>School of Computing Board meeting</strong></td>
<td>Cruickshank (speaker)</td>
<td>School of Computing staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation on Athena SWAN and work of SAT to date, followed by discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/05/14</td>
<td><strong>Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Creative Industries Academic Board</strong></td>
<td>Hall (Speaker)</td>
<td>Committee members drawn from academic and support staff in the Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Creative Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation on Athena SWAN and work of SAT to date, followed by discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/05/14</td>
<td><strong>Faculty of Health, Life and Social Sciences Faculty Academic Strategy and Enhancement Committee</strong></td>
<td>Hameed (speaker)</td>
<td>Committee members drawn from academic and support staff in the Faculty of Health, Life and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation on Athena SWAN and work of SAT to date, followed by discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/05/14</td>
<td><strong>“Let’s talk about sex” conference</strong></td>
<td>Durkacz, Hall,</td>
<td>100 academics and professionals from across Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major event to launch the rebranding of the Edinburgh Napier-based Scottish Resource Centre for Women in Science, Engineering and Technology as Equate Scotland.</td>
<td>Hameed, Johnstone (speaker), Piotrowska, Smith, &amp; Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This gave SAT members an opportunity to network with colleagues from other organisations working on similar projects related to the Athena SWAN charter and for the University to demonstrate its commitment to gender equality in STEMM through the work of Equate Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/06/14</td>
<td><strong>Teaching Fellows Conference</strong></td>
<td>Durkacz (speaker)</td>
<td>Teaching fellows from across the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation on Athena SWAN and work of SAT to date, followed by discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/14</td>
<td><strong>Executive Group of the Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Creative Industries</strong></td>
<td>Hall (speaker)</td>
<td>Dean, Assistant Deans, Heads of Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation on Athena SWAN and work of SAT to date, followed by discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Internal consultation/meeting</td>
<td>SAT participants</td>
<td>Other participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/06/14</td>
<td>University Equality and Diversity Committee Formal report</td>
<td>Hameed (speaker), Sambell</td>
<td>Equality and Diversity Committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10/14</td>
<td>Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Creative Industries Athena SWAN focus group</td>
<td>Durkacz, Hall &amp; Hameed</td>
<td>Staff from the School of Computing, and the School of Engineering and the Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/14</td>
<td>Faculty of Life, Health and Social Sciences Athena SWAN focus group</td>
<td>Piotrowska &amp; Taylor</td>
<td>Staff from the School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Care, and the School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/14</td>
<td>Celebrating Edinburgh Napier’s Women in STEMM event Part of 50th Anniversary of Edinburgh Napier University celebrations to raise awareness of Napier’s past support of women in STEMM, and its commitment to this in the future</td>
<td>Cruickshank, Durkacz, Hall (speaker), McHugh, Hughes, Johnstone, Piotrowszka, Poole, Smith, &amp; Taylor</td>
<td>Guest list of staff, students, alumni, and University stakeholders invited by the Principal, with newly appointed President of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Dame Jocelyn Bell Burnell as guest of honour and keynote speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/10/14</td>
<td>Business School Athena SWAN interview</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Staff from the Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/10/14</td>
<td>University Leadership Team meeting</td>
<td>Hall (speaker)</td>
<td>Members of the University Leadership Team: the Principal and Vice Chancellor, the Vice Principal and Deputy Vice Chancellor, the University Secretary, the Deans, the Finance Director, the Director of HR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: External meetings and consultations March-November 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>External consultation/meeting</th>
<th>SAT participants</th>
<th>Other participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/03/14</td>
<td><strong>Scottish Athena SWAN network meeting</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hosted by Queen Margaret University, Edinburgh</td>
<td>Hall &amp; Hameed</td>
<td>Other members of the Scottish Athena SWAN network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/04/14</td>
<td><strong>Workshop on making a bronze award submission</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hosted by Equality Challenge Unit, London</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Representatives from other universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Valuable to develop an understanding of the submission, and assessment process, as well as network with colleagues working on Athena SWAN award submissions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/06/14</td>
<td><strong>Scottish Athena SWAN network meeting</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hosted by Abertay University, Dundee</td>
<td>Hall, Hameed, Johnstone, &amp; Stupart</td>
<td>Other members of the Scottish Athena SWAN network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/14</td>
<td>&quot;Women! Science is not for you!&quot;&lt;br&gt;Performance at the Edinburgh Fringe</td>
<td>Taylor (speaker)</td>
<td>General public – with the goal of raising general awareness of issues facing women in STEMM careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hall, McHugh, Piotrowska, Poole, Smith &amp; Webster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/09/14</td>
<td><strong>Scottish Informatics and Computer Science Alliance (SICSA) Athena SWAN group</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hosted by the University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>Hall (speaker)</td>
<td>Representatives from other Scottish universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/11/14</td>
<td><strong>Scottish Athena SWAN network meeting</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hosted by the University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>Hameed &amp; Stupart</td>
<td>Other members of the Scottish Athena SWAN network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/11/14</td>
<td><strong>Women in technology conference</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hosted by GirlGeekScotland, Harvey Nash and Scotland Silicon Valley Link, Edinburgh</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Women in technology from business and academia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8: Media coverage of Women in STEMM activities of SAT January - November 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SAT participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/09/14</td>
<td>Scotsman news feature “The code for future success investing in our graduates to solve Scotland’s technology gap” (pp. 30-31)</td>
<td>Smith (author)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/14</td>
<td>Conversation article “Mind the gap: why women must still fight for equality in science” (reprinted in Holyrood Magazine science supplement, November 2014)</td>
<td>Hall (author)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/10/14</td>
<td>Edinburgh Evening News article “Let’s hear it for the smart girls”</td>
<td>(Article by Napier graduate Gina Davidson, guest at the 50th anniversary celebration)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: October screen saver**
2.3 The future of the SAT

Beyond November 2014 the full SAT will meet three times a year - primarily to monitor the implementation of the Action Plan - while continuing to report on its activities to the University’s Equality and Diversity Committee (Action 2A). SAT members will also work in sub-groups during this period to work on particular tasks between full SAT meetings. When the University has achieved the bronze award, its next priority will be to make plans so that the four STEMM schools are in a position to work towards, and achieve, awards of their own (Action 3A). As soon as three of the four STEMM schools have achieved an award, one of which will be at silver level (anticipated to be Computing), work will start on preparing our silver award submission document.

The expectation is that once the University has prioritised the order in which the applications are to be made, and allocated adequate resources to support this (Action 1A), the STEMM school SAT members will champion the work towards the submissions for their schools, working closely with the University’s Diversity Partner, and with the support of the University’s Academic Champion for Athena SWAN. Specific engagement activities will follow the pattern established in the work towards the bronze award submission. As part of this work, we will complete a mid-term review of the implementation of the bronze award tenure in 2017 (Action 5A).

3 Description of the University (word count: 1080)

3.1 University summary

The University is one of the largest higher education institutions in Scotland. Its vision is to be “an enterprising and innovative community renowned internationally, with an unrivalled student learning experience”. The range, focus and quality of Napier’s degree programmes, partnerships, research, links with business and highly valued graduates have led to a strong reputation for employability, widening access and innovation. The University is a member of the Million+ mission group.

The high profile of inclusion in “an environment where everyone involved feels proud, challenged and supported” driven by a strategy that is informed by principles that include “[promoting] diversity in [the] student and staff community” articulates well with the Athena SWAN principles of access and equality. The University strategy states the ambition for the University to be known as “a great place to work”. Equally it commits to improving its processes and communications. The implementation of our Athena SWAN Action Plan will contribute to meeting these ambitions. The University’s goal to achieve Athena SWAN bronze status is noted explicitly in its 2014/15-2016/17 outcome agreement with the Scottish Funding Council.

The majority of teaching and research staff (831) work in the eight schools across three faculties: Business School; Engineering, Computing and Creative Industries; and Health, Life and Social Sciences. A number of academics and researchers (78) also work in roles unaffiliated to a particular school (e.g. senior managers in the faculties). The academic community is supported by just over one thousand other staff in professional services and technical roles (1081). The number of students matriculated in 2013/14 was 18,436 (UK and abroad).
3.2 STEMM schools

There are four STEMM schools (see Table 9). They represent 57% of the University (472/831) in terms of research and academic staff numbers. The University hosts Equate Scotland, Scotland’s centre of expertise on gender equality in science, engineering, technology and the built environment.

Table 9: STEMM schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of research and academic staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Computing and Creative Industries (FECCI)</td>
<td>School of Computing</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Engineering and the Built Environment</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Life, Health, and Social Sciences (FLHSS)</td>
<td>School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Care</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL staff in STEMM schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>472</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Female: male staff ratios

Table 10 provides research and academic staff numbers for the past three years by gender. Figures 2-8 show this in graphical format.
Table 10: Female-male ratios in job roles by school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio researcher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio lecturer</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio senior lecturer/reader</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio professor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total by gender by year</strong></td>
<td>315</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage by gender by year</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Benchmarked against 2011/12 ECU data*


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio researcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio lecturer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio senior lecturer/reader</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total by gender by year</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage by gender by year</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ratios – School of Engineering & Built Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio researcher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio lecturer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio senior lecturer/reader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by gender by year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage by gender by year</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ratios – School of Life, Sport & Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio researcher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio lecturer</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio senior lecturer/reader</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by gender by year</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage by gender by year</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ratios – School of Nursing, Midwifery & Social Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio researcher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio lecturer</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio senior lecturer/reader</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by gender by year</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage by gender by year</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio researcher</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio lecturer</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio senior lecturer/reader</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by gender by year</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage by gender by year</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio researcher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio lecturer</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio senior lecturer/reader</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by gender by year</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage by gender by year</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In general men and women are represented at all levels of the workforce in line with national benchmark data.

There are gender imbalances in three of our four STEMM schools: Computing; Nursing, Midwifery and Social Care, and Engineering and the Built Environment. With the exception of the School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Care this, however, matches closely with the national picture, as shown in Table 11.
Table 11: Gender imbalance in three STEMM schools benchmarked against national figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Computing</th>
<th>Napier</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matched with “IT and system sciences, computer software engineering” on page 48 of <em>Equality in higher education: statistical report 2013 part 1 – staff</em></td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Care</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matched with “Nursing and paramedical studies” on page 48 of <em>Equality in higher education: statistical report 2013 part 1 – staff.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering and the Built Environment</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matched with “General engineering” on page 48 of <em>Equality in higher education: statistical report 2013 part 1 – staff.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The change in the percentage split of female and male staff in the STEMM schools over the past three years is also worth noting. This shows a trend towards a more equal gender balance in all four STEMM schools, and provides some evidence of a pipeline for the future.

As has been reported elsewhere, Napier struggles to attract female candidates to apply for roles in the STEMM schools. The SAT’s analysis of focus group and survey data shows that the staff see this as an issue that is largely outside the control of a single institution. With the exception of mentions of retaining female staff, all other explanations offered for gender imbalances in STEMM subjects related to external societal pressures.

Our contribution to address the general issue of attracting women into academic STEMM roles is to devise a good practice guide that includes details of strategies to encourage higher numbers of female job applicants, and then to implement its recommendations (Action 13D). We also anticipate that our actions geared towards making it publicly visible that the University values gender equality will make the University a more attractive employer for women in STEMM (Actions 12C and 19E).

Our latest figures show that 28% of the University’s professoriate is female, and just over a fifth in the STEMM subjects (6/28 or 21%). These are better than the national benchmark\(^1\) of 20.5% across all subjects, and the figures for both full-time and part-time SET professors (16.0% and 19.6% respectively). We discuss the question of women in promoted posts in STEMM on p. 42.

---

\(^1\) National figures from 2011/12 compiled by ECU and published on page 51 of *Equality in higher education: statistical report 2013 part 1 – staff* in 2013.
3.4 Staff turnover

Table 12 shows turnover data for the past three academic years.

**Table 12: Turnover in research and academic posts since 2011/12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>3 year total</th>
<th>Expected total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer/reader male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer/reader female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>231</strong></td>
<td><strong>231</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 3-year figure for female staff who leave lecturer posts is higher than expected, and due to a “spike” in departures in 2012/13. Our self assessment work to date has not identified the reason for this. Given that the retention of female staff also featured in focus group discussions and survey responses (see p. 30) and “retaining talented employees” is an area for improvement identified in the latest Employee Engagement Survey results, we intend to complete further research into this issue to discover the reason(s) for this and address it (them) as appropriate (Action 6B).

3.5 Fixed term contracts

The number of staff on fixed term contracts in the past three academic years is shown in Table 13. The percentage of fixed term contracts amongst female staff (9.4%) is just slightly higher than that for male staff (8.8%). This reflects the national picture as reported by Equality Challenge Unit in its *Equality in higher education: statistical report 2013 part 1 – staff* (p. 40), and not considered a cause for concern. (Zero hours contracts are discussed on p. 45.)

**Table 13: Fixed term contracts – female to male ratios**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratios whole university</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio fixed term researcher</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M fixed term ratio lecturer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio fixed term senior lecturer/reader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio fixed term professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Equal pay

The University undertook its most recent equal pay audit in 2013. Gender was considered and equal pay confirmed.

3.7 Research Assessment Exercise 2008 (RAE) and Research Excellence Framework 2014 (REF)

In November 2013 108 staff were submitted to REF: 44 (41%) were female and 64 (59%) male. These figures are slightly out of line with the University’s 45:55 gender split amongst research and academic staff.

The detail of the REF submission for the STEMM schools is given in Table 14, with historic data on RAE2008 provided for comparison.

**Table 14: Submissions to RAE2008 and REF2014 by STEMM schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research assessment submissions ratios in STEMM schools</th>
<th>RAE2008 F</th>
<th>RAE2008 M</th>
<th>REF F</th>
<th>REF M</th>
<th>% F staff 2013/14 (calculated from Table 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Computing</td>
<td>9 (25.0%)</td>
<td>27 (75.0%)</td>
<td>4 (28.6%)</td>
<td>10 (71.4%)</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering and the Built Environment</td>
<td>6 (10.9%)</td>
<td>49 (89.1%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
<td>26 (81.2%)</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences</td>
<td>6 (35.3%)</td>
<td>11 (64.7%)</td>
<td>9 (40.9%)</td>
<td>13 (59.1%)</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Care</td>
<td>13 (92.9%)</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td>6 (66.7%)</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of Napier staff entered from STEMM schools 122 (female 34, male 88) 77 (female 25, male 52)

Percentage of female STEMM staff entered - Napier 27.9% 32.5%

Percentage of female STEMM staff entered - National benchmark figures (p.15) 30.0% Unavailable

Although the percentages of female staff submitted in both exercises is low when compared with those for male staff, the University’s RAE figure is close to the national benchmark, and there has been an overall improvement in the percentage of female participation from RAE2008 to REF which brings it above the available benchmark. In addition, when the REF2014 percentages are matched against the percentage of female staff in post in 2013/4, it can be seen the representation of female staff in one of the STEMM schools (Computing) is particularly strong.

Possible underlying reasons why men are generally more likely to be submitted to research assessment exercises in STEMM subjects, and related actions, are given in Table 15. It should be
noted that none of the explanations are related to the how the University handles selection of staff for research assessment returns. For the most recent exercise, for example, the University followed an explicit code of practice as required by the *REF2014 Assessment framework and guidance on submissions* (paragraph 40c). This ensured that all staff were aware of their eligibility for REF2014 and were treated in a fair, equitable, and transparent manner where the *quality of research outputs* was the basis for decisions on inclusion (or non-inclusion).
### Table 15: Possible reasons for low of submissions of female staff to RAE/REF in STEMM subjects and actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible reason</th>
<th>Source(s) of evidence</th>
<th>Issue(s)</th>
<th>Relates to other elements of this submission</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of research time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Lower research allowance for research-active women than for men in two thirds of STEMM subject groups</td>
<td>4.6 Workload, p. 53</td>
<td><strong>Action 9C</strong> Include policy and practice statements with the implementation new workload allocation model to ensure gender equality issues are taken into account when it is operational, and that issues of work-life balance are taken into account. Ensure that attention is drawn to these in training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of panels that allocate research time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Lack of gender balance on panels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of admin &amp; pastoral roles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Higher burden of such roles for women in two STEMM schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards research within the University</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Sometimes viewed as a “personal” time activity</td>
<td>4.6 Workload, p. 53</td>
<td><strong>Action 9C</strong> Include policy and practice statements with the implementation new workload allocation model to ensure gender equality issues are taken into account when it is operational, and that issues of work-life balance are taken into account. Ensure that attention is drawn to these in training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Prioritisation of teaching activity – especially for part-timers/returners from career breaks</td>
<td>4.4 Career development support, p. 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible reason</td>
<td>Source of evidence</td>
<td>Issue(s)</td>
<td>Relates to other elements of this submission</td>
<td>Action(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy to submit only best output to RAE/REF</td>
<td>SAT ✓</td>
<td>Survey ✓</td>
<td>Focus groups ✓</td>
<td>Senior, established (predominantly male) staff mainly selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk of research potential left under-developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for networking to support internal research collaborations</td>
<td>SAT ✓</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Focus groups ✓</td>
<td>Difficulties in building relationships - especially for new appointees and those on fixed-term contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of mentoring</td>
<td>SAT ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4 Supporting and advancing women’s careers (word count 4010)

4.1 Applications and appointments

Table 16 provides an overview of the number of applications for, and appointments to, advertised job vacancies in the past three academic years. In this period 304 appointments were made from 3485 applications.
Table 16: All applicants to and appointees for advertised job vacancies 2011/12-2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertised position</th>
<th>Declared gender</th>
<th>2011/12 applicants</th>
<th>2011/12 appointees</th>
<th>2012/13 applicants</th>
<th>2012/13 appointees</th>
<th>2013/14 applicants</th>
<th>2013/14 appointees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer/reader</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>698</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>1595</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>1192</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 gives the gender of the applicants as totals for the three year period, and as percentages.
Table 17: Applicants to advertised job vacancies by grade 2011/12-2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertised position</th>
<th>Declared gender</th>
<th>2011/12 applicants</th>
<th>2012/13 applicants</th>
<th>2013/14 applicants</th>
<th>Total applicants</th>
<th>Total applicants %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer/reader</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>3485</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More men than women apply for research and academic posts at the University, as summarised in Table 18.

Table 18: Applicants to advertised job vacancies over 3 year period - gender summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3485</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data also show that although the applications for positions from female candidates are healthy at researcher level, they start to tail off at lecturer level, and drop further at the level of senior lecturer/reader and professor. Around a quarter of applications for the most senior posts are from women. These findings are illustrated in Figure 10.
Figure 10: Total proportions of applicants to advertised job vacancies by grade and gender over 3 year period

Table 19 gives the gender of the appointees to the advertised job vacancies as totals for the three year period, as both actual numbers and as percentages.

### Table 19: Appointees to advertised job vacancies by grade 2011/12-2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertised position</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2011/12 appointees</th>
<th>2012/13 appointees</th>
<th>2013/14 appointees</th>
<th>Total appointees</th>
<th>Total appointees %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer/Reader</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More men than women are appointed to research and academic posts at the University. Figure 11 provides summary information on this finding by showing appointments by grade.
The total gender split for appointments in the three year period is given in Table 20.

**Table 20: Appointments to advertised job vacancies over 3 year period - gender summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>304</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures here are unsurprising given that a higher proportion of applications come from male candidates. However, when the proportion of applications from women given in Table 18 (42.3%) is matched against the figure for female appointment success (49.3%) it can be seen that female candidates perform better in general in the application-to-appointment process for advertised posts than do their male competitors.

This female success is not uniform across all role levels. Table 21 shows, for example, that female candidates perform particularly well when making applications at lecturer and senior management levels. In addition, when presented as percentages, our data infer that female applicants may be disadvantaged when it comes to the appointment of senior lecturers/readers and professors. However, the figures here are so small that these findings related to the more senior roles should be treated with caution. This possible factor will be taken into account with the implementation of Action 13D.
Table 21: Percentages of applications and appointees by gender in the 3 year period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertised position</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total applicants %</th>
<th>Total appointees %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer/reader</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 21 and Table 16 is re-presented in Figure 12 and Figure 13 according to gender.

Figure 12: Female applications and female appointee percentages over 3 year period
The analysis of applications and appointment data strengthens the argument for **Action 13D**: to enlarge the pool of applicants, especially for senior roles. Given that our data here also shows that women are generally more successful than men when they do make job applications (see Table 20) and we have some evidence of female staff applying for jobs beneath their level of expertise (for example, to fit around caring duties), we also expect that a number of other actions that we have identified will raise the confidence levels of potential internal job candidates so that they are encouraged to make applications (**Actions 10C, 16E, 17E and 18E**).

A further action of relevance here relates to the University’s record keeping and reporting mechanisms. A more detailed analysis of applications and appointment data will be achieved in the future when the University’s records held by HR routinely include the detail of opportunities by school, and the gender of successful applicants. It will also be worthwhile for HR to issue reports on applications, shortlisting, interview and appointment decisions by gender so that a fuller picture of the current situation is known, and appropriate actions can be taken on the basis of this. These actions are incorporated in the detail of **Action 4A** *Set up and implement routines to collect and disseminate data sets from the HR Connect system additional to those that were available for preparing the bronze award submission.*

### 4.2 Promotions

The University currently operates an annual promotions round. It is up to individuals to put themselves forward for this. (At the time of writing in November 2014 new pathways and criteria for academic career progression from Senior lecturer/reader to professor, endorsed in principle by the University Leadership team, are under consultation. The SAT has contributed to the consultation.)

The outcomes of the three most recent rounds for which data is available are summarised in Table 22.
Table 22: Promotion success by grade in annual rounds 2011-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual promotions round</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>% successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Succ</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Succ</td>
<td>App</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer to reader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female candidates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male candidates</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer to senior teaching fellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female candidates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male candidates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From any post to professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female candidates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male candidates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial regrades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female candidates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male candidates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer to reader (title change only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female candidates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male candidates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer to senior teaching fellow (title change only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Summary of promotion success by gender 2011-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Successful applicants</th>
<th>Percentage of successful applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total female candidates</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total male candidates</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all candidates</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our analysis shows that female candidates for promotion are more successful than their male colleagues: in the past three years just under a third of women who applied for promotion were successful, as compared with just under a fifth of men. (NB the number of applications from women and men reflects the gender balance at the University. It is not the case, for example, that a disproportionate number of women apply for promotion. The 77:99 split in applicant numbers represents a 45:55 percentage split.) This finding reflects the evidence of the relative success of female job applicants (see Table 20). This may also add to the evidence that women generally delay
making applications until they are certain of their case, whereas men are more likely to take a
chance in making more speculative attempts at career progression.

The promotions data also show that it is difficult for lecturers (regardless of gender) to climb up from
the bottom rung of the career ladder. There are indications that it is “easier” for female lecturers to
achieve promotion by applying for a senior teaching fellowship: a quarter of female applicants
achieved this in the three year period, whereas not a single male applicant was successful.

This figure hints at possible (unconscious) channelling of career routes by gender. If it is the case that
female staff find it easier to seek promotion on the basis of teaching excellence, then this may help
explain the low number of female STEMM staff involved in RAE/REF (see p. 32). In these
circumstances efforts will be directed towards teaching rather than research-driven roles. This could
be reinforced in a PDR process if subject group leader reviewers prioritise discussions of the
reviewees’ contribution to teaching over wider career development plans that encompass research
ambitions. This was noted in the focus group discussions. In addition, analysis of responses to two of
the survey questions — one that asked about optimism about chances of promotion and the other
about feedback from line managers — indicates that the interaction between line manager and staff
managed is important to how staff view their opportunities to develop and progress their careers.
Mentoring for promotion thus needs to become part of the PDR process. This is incorporated into
Action 10C Include gender equality issues as relevant to development as component of Professional
Development Review (PDR) in training for both reviewers and reviewees.

The SAT has spent some time discussing the question of part-time staff and promotions. In addition,
opportunities for part-timers to take positions of authority were discussed at one of the focus
groups with reference to “missing out” when specific activities take place on non-working days. We
suspect that those on fractional contracts are disadvantaged by the promotional structure (and
indeed the appointments process if they wish to increase their hours). We intend to examine this
issue in Action 7B.

4.3 Transition point policies

Female and male staff benefit from the same support at career transition points. The most
important of these are incorporated in (a) induction training and (b) the PDR process.

(a) Induction

Induction events are the first part of the process of welcoming new staff to the University. A
half-day workshop Working at Edinburgh Napier, followed by a lunch with the Principal, is
organised by the University’s Corporate Learning and Development function. It is open to all
new staff joining the University and offers a chance to find out about the background to the
University, discuss strategy, values and culture, and gain an overview of health and safety
and learning and development opportunities. A full day event is also organised for new
lecturers by Academic Professional Development. This focuses on the fundamentals of
learning, teaching and assessment. Part 2 offered 6-9 months later provides an opportunity
for participants to share and reflect on their experiences of their academic role.
Any academic staff new to lecturing are afforded a two-year induction period throughout which they are provided with support from the relevant subject group leader. If newly appointed staff have previous relevant experience, the two-year period may be shortened. As part of the induction process each new member of staff is assigned a mentor.

In addition, the University has produced a booklet that provides guidance and a checklist designed to provide helpful hints to new or inexperienced staff: *Starter for ten: your introduction to learning, teaching and assessment in the higher education*.

Schools add to this provision with local initiatives. For example, within the School of Computing, new staff may also be afforded a reduced teaching timetable and coaching, and special mentoring is also extended at induction time to new staff who wish to apply for teaching fellow or senior teaching fellow posts.

(b) PDR

The induction process is designed to fit with the University’s PDR scheme. The scheme provides an opportunity for staff to discuss and agree with their line manager their development as related to the University’s priorities.

The University is currently developing data sets on the HR system to track each aspect of staff employment from appointment to departure. One such development task is an analysis of PDR take-up to establish whether or not there are any inequities or anomalies according to characteristics such as gender of post-holder or contract type. This task contributes to Action 4A.

Evidence gathered for other sections of this submission document point to means of improving the practical *implementation* of the PDR process. For example, one of the recommendations for improving the number of returns to REF by female staff noted in 4.2 is to make better use of the career review process so development (achieved and required) is considered at PDR meetings (Action 10C). More explicit discussion of career ambitions may pave the way for greater participation in development opportunities (see 4.4) and increased numbers of job applications (from men and women) for more senior roles (see p. 42). It is anticipated that the exercise related to PDR take-up will also identify good practice in certain areas that can be replicated across the University and thus provide the support required to help all progress with their careers.

The University employs a number of lecturers on zero hours contracts. Given their relatively high numbers it is worth considering the support to which these staff are entitled. The breakdown of zero hours lecturing staff by gender is noted in Table 24.
Table 24: Zero hours lecturers, July 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Gender split percentage zero hours lecturers</th>
<th>Gender split percentage overall (2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratio of female to male staff on zero hours contracts (49.8 to 50.2) does not match with the overall ratio for research and academic staff (45.8 to 55.2 in 2014). In addition, in two of our STEMM schools the proportion of female staff on zero hours, as opposed to “regular” contracts is out of line with their local gender profiles, as shown in Table 25.

Table 25: Zero hours lecturers in the School of Computing and School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences, July 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of zero hours staff</th>
<th>Local gender split percentage (2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Computing</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are well-documented concerns about the use of zero hours contracts. However, their deployment is a means of supporting those who wish to work in academia, and for whom a full-time permanent contract is not suitable, for example specialist lecturing staff who maintain other roles elsewhere. The University recognises its commitment to the support of staff on these contracts. The provision to ensure that zero hours lecturers receive fair treatment is articulated in a set of published guidelines. These include provision for zero hours lecturers of induction and PDR. **Action 7B will Investigate the question of career opportunities (including promotion) for those on fractional and zero hours contracts, and devise and implement strategies to address any issues uncovered.**

4.4 Career development support

4.4.1 Researcher career support and training

All staff benefit from researcher career support and training, with some gender issues related to take-up discussed below.

The University received the [HR Excellence in Research Award](http://example.com) from the European Commission in December 2010. This recognises support for the career development of researchers, and commitment to implementing the [Concordat to support the career development of researchers](http://example.com). We
successfully retained the award after a mid-term review in 2012, and continue to develop our support in this area with the intention of resubmitting for reaccreditation in December 2014.

Our support and training for researchers draws on a University initiative entitled A strategic approach to effective researcher development, developed in 2011. This has established an inclusive approach to early career researchers, including research students. It uses a co-ordinated, cross-university approach to education, training and professional development to create a sense of community amongst researchers, and to raise awareness amongst, and provide development for, principal investigators and research supervisors. This strategic approach also led to the establishment of a full-time Researcher Developer role within the Academic Professional Development team, based within HR. The establishment of this role demonstrates the commitment of the University to supporting the career and professional development of the researcher community.

Also in 2011 we conducted a gap analysis of our training and development provision for researchers. This highlighted that many areas are well-supported within the University by a number of programmes developed by three University groups: Academic Professional Development; Corporate Learning and Development; Academic Practice.

All our research-focused events are mapped against Vitae’s Researcher development framework (RDF) to ensure that we provide balanced provision for researchers. The University’s Researcher development web site provides advice and resources to support the career and professional development of researchers. This uses Vitae’s RDF as an interactive portal to relevant events and resources for each domain, thus allowing researchers to understand the linkages between our resources and the RDF. Our involvement with Vitae also includes hosting events and co-facilitating courses. This increases the opportunities for our researchers to network with others across the sector.

The University is also a key funding member of the Beltane Public Engagement Network. This has helped increase our support for researchers involved in public engagement activity. Since 2009 three Napier researchers have been awarded public engagement fellowships by Beltane.

A number of activities ensure that all new researchers are aware of the support and training offered by the University. All are contacted on arrival by the Researcher Developer, who highlights the resources and events relevant to their roles. The Researcher Developer also offers one-to-one meetings to help with career development planning. Enhanced induction procedures, including a new online learning module that includes specific information for researchers, have been developed. In addition research activity is discussed during academic induction events.

We have implemented HR Connect as our system to monitor uptake of events. The system has also been used to facilitate enhanced engagement with the PDR process, ensuring that PDR discussions can be documented and reviewed easily.

It can be seen that there is much support for researchers in the University. The issue for members of staff who would like to take advantage of this provision is the lack of earmarked time available to do
so: the results of the survey show that this issue is more commonly recognised by female staff. This will be addressed in **Actions 9C and 10C**. Our self assessment work also reveals that there is a lack of awareness of the range of support on offer. Hence we include **Action 15D Conduct review into the means by which individuals learn about development opportunities and devise a policy for implementation to ensure that those who would benefit from them hear about them**.

### 4.4.2 Mentoring, networking and coaching

**(a) Mentoring**

All new academic staff are provided with a mentor. There is also a mentoring programme that focuses on teaching and learning, culminating in the achievement of the [Edinburgh Napier Mentoring and Coaching Award (ENMCA)](http://example.com). Since 2012 four female STEMM staff have completed this programme. There are, however, currently no such official schemes within the University for research staff, or specifically aimed at those who work in STEMM subjects.

Responses to the survey and discussions in the focus groups revealed an appetite for improved mentoring to cover all aspects of research and academic roles. We have therefore committed in our action plan to a new scheme that offers mentoring to staff in teaching, supporting learning and research. This will contribute towards achievement of key aspects of the [University’s strategy to 2020](http://example.com), such as professional recognition, academic leadership and researcher development for its staff. This is demonstrated in **Action 16E Devise and implement an academic mentoring scheme for all that encompasses the whole academic role and contributes towards the achievement of professional recognition, academic leadership and researcher development**.

**(b) Networking**

The University encourages its female STEMM staff to participate in networking with external groups. However, it does not currently support any formal internal networks for this set of staff. Discussions at the focus groups highlighted the advantages of setting up a formal network to bring female STEMM staff together. These included overcoming physical barriers of an institution based on three main campuses. Further to this, the large gathering of female STEMM staff at the 50th anniversary celebration expressed enthusiasm for meeting on a regular basis. This intention has been captured in **Action 17E Set up a formal Women in STEMM network for academic staff across the University with the expectation that this will also foster mentoring relationships** with the goal of launching it at the first public lecture on Ada Lovelace Day 2015 (**Action 19E**).

**(c) Coaching**

Equate Scotland, hosted by Napier, offers coaching to female staff in STEMM. 135 staff have signed up to the mailing list to receive updates on a range of events. 2013/14 uptake for these was as follows: four individuals attended career clinic appointments; eight attended workshops; and two participated in the [Coaching for success](http://example.com) programme. We believe that many more female staff could take advantage of these coaching opportunities if (a) they were better publicised, and (b) resources were made available for such development activities (see Table 26). **Actions 1A (on resources), 9C (on workload allocation), 10C (on PDR), and 15D (on publicising development sessions)** are all relevant here.
Table 26: Reasons for low uptake of development opportunities and actions to address these

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible reason for low uptake</th>
<th>Source(s) of evidence</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness of existing opportunities (such as courses offered by Equate Scotland)</td>
<td>Identified by SAT Low number of female STEMM staff on the Equate Scotland mailing list</td>
<td><strong>Action 15D</strong>: Conduct review into the means by which individuals learn about development opportunities and devise a policy for implementation to ensure that those who would benefit from them hear about them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Staff unable to take advantage of the available opportunities | Identified by SAT Raised by participants in focus group discussions (with particular reference to workload and PDR) | **Action 9C**: Include policy and practice statements with the implementation of the new workload allocation model to ensure gender equality issues are taken into account when it is operational, and that issues of work-life balance are taken into account. Ensure that attention is drawn to these in training.  
**Action 10C**: Include gender equality issues as relevant to development as component of Professional Development Review (PDR) in training for both reviewers and reviewees. |
| Alternative forms of development may be more suitable than those currently offered | Identified by SAT Raised by participants in focus group discussions Mentioned in free text responses in survey | **Action 16E**: Devise and implement an academic mentoring scheme for all that encompasses the whole academic role and contributes towards the achievement of professional recognition, academic leadership and researcher development.  
**Action 17E**: Set up a formal Women in STEMM network for academic staff across the University with the expectation that this will also foster mentoring relationships.  
**Action 18E**: Increase uptake of opportunities for female members of staff to participate in the Aurora programme offered by the Leadership Foundation. |

4.4.3 University activities to raise the profile of women in STEMM generally, and help women raise their own profiles

Currently academic staff are formally supported in work to raise the profile of women in STEMM in two ways: (1) the School of Computing and the School of Engineering and the Built Environment have Academic Champions to liaise with Equate Scotland; (2) the University appointed an Athena SWAN Academic Champion in 2013. **Actions 1A to 5A** (all of which have been agreed to establish and formalise processes to support the University’s Athena SWAN work and ambition to achieve further award), will direct further formal support to raising the profile of women in STEMM.
There is further evidence of relevant activity of this nature across the University. The work of Equate Scotland is particularly important here. Equate Scotland’s portfolio includes workshops on topics such as media training, and coaching support and advice, as well as hosting larger events such the Let’s talk about sex conference held in May 2014, which brought together 100 professionals and academics to discuss the culture change in academia required to ensure gender equality in STEMM subjects. The 50th anniversary celebration represented a significant investment in raising the profile of women in STEMM at the University.

Recent examples of individual success of female STEMM staff Napier in profile-raising activities include: the appointment of the Head of the School of Computing as Chair of the UK Council of Heads and Professors of Computing for the two-year term 2014-16; the appointment of one of the School of Computing Professors to the Panel Advisory Board of the Research Councils UK Digital Economy programme in April 2014; and invitations accepted by a research student in School of Computing, and a Lecturer in the School of Life, Sport and Social Sciences, to present their work at events during the 2014 Edinburgh Fringe. In these cases it is generally individual motivation and local support that has underpinned such successes. The good practice observed will be formalised into policy as noted in Action 14D Devise University policy on promoting women in STEMM and ensure that this is implemented at the level of schools as they move towards departmental awards. Action 19E Host an Ada Lovelace Day lecture annually each October as part of the University’s public lecture series, is also of relevance here.

4.5 Senior staff

4.5.1 Senior staff ratios

Table 27 gives the senior staff ratios for the past three academic years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio Head of School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio Assistant Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio Dean</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Engineering, Computing and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio Head of School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio Assistant Dean</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:M ratio Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of female staff in senior roles has remained steady over the past three years. A gradual erosion in the proportion of female staff in the period has occurred as more male staff have been appointed at senior levels with the outcome that the most recent figure does not match the overall gender profile of research and academic staff. It should be noted, however, that the figures that generate these percentages are very small so any change means a dramatic drop or increase in the percentage. Furthermore, the majority of senior roles in the faculties that host STEMM subjects in the past three years have been held by women. A number of actions identified will ensure that women continue to be supported to achieve senior roles at the University, the most important of which are Actions 10C, 13D, 15D, 16E and 18E.

4.5.2 Gender balances on the University’s senior management team and influential committees

The gender balances on the University senior management team and influential committees are shown for the past three academic years in Tables 28-Table 30.

Table 28: Gender balances on the University’s senior management team and influential committees 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Leadership Team</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Enhancement and Strategy Committee</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29: Gender balances on the University’s senior management team and influential committees 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Leadership Team</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Enhancement and Strategy Committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: Gender balances on the University’s senior management team and influential committees 2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Leadership Team</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Enhancement and Strategy Committee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the overall percentages are matched with those in Table 10, it can be seen that the gender balance on senior management committees as a whole generally reflects the gender balance of the University across the past three years, with a closer match in 2011/12 and 2013/14. It is also worth considering the figures for each committee in isolation to identify particular trends and areas for attention.

(a) University Leadership Team – all positions ex officio

The University Leadership Team (ULT) shows a shift in the gender profile of its membership in favour of men over the past three years. Given that ULT membership is ex officio, this is a reflection of the changing profile of staff in senior posts. This, in turn relates to attracting applications for senior appointments (see p. 42) and mentoring for promotion (see p. 44) to be addressed in Actions 13D and 10C respectively.

(b) Court – internal positions ex officio, elected or appointed by other body

Court’s overall membership may be considered to display an imbalance in favour of men in the past three academic years. A significant factor in the low percentage of female
members lies with the eight internal membership places which are ex officio, elected or appointed by an external body over which Court itself has no control. Seven of these places were held by men in 2013/14. As regards to the nominations for membership that it can make itself, Court is conscious of, and committed to, enhancing its diversity, and in 2014/15 33% of its lay members are female. Actions 13D and 10C are also of relevance here.

(c) Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee – majority of positions ex officio

The University Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee has comprised mainly men over the past three academic years. This can explained on the basis that most of the positions on this committee are ex officio. Thus the membership of the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee is a reflection of the figures for research active staff, as evident in the numbers of women and men submitted for RAE/REF as discussed in Section 3.7. Actions 9C, 10C, 13D, and 17E as summarised in Table 14 will instigate change that, it is anticipated, will have an impact here.

(d) Academic Strategy and Enhancement Committee – majority of positions ex officio

The figures for the University Academic Strategy and Enhancement Committee show an imbalance in favour of female staff. Like the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee, most of the positions on this committee are ex officio. This finding is related to the success that female staff enjoy in appointment as teaching fellows (see p. 44).

We intend to address the question of gender balance on all committees in Action 11C: Review University policy on committee membership representation and propose and implement changes where appropriate.

4.6 Workload

Since 2010 the University has operated a workload allocation model (WAM) for academic staff, the details of which are given in the University’s Workload allocation framework. The WAM was designed to capture all elements of the academic role, and operate in a fair, equitable, consistent and transparent way. However, a recent review, to which the SAT has made a formal contribution drawing attention to issues of particular relevance to workload and the Athena SWAN principles, has confirmed that many staff believe that the WAM does not meet all these principles. This view was also evident in focus group discussions and free text responses to the survey.

Despite the recognised limitations of the WAM, heads of school are able to point to good practice in workload allocation. Examples are provided in Table 31.
Table 31: Good practice in workload allocation in the STEMM schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good practice</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Applies to</th>
<th>Within the following school(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New staff</td>
<td>ECRs ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload allocation takes into account career stage, contract type, or return from maternity, paternity, parental or disability related leave</td>
<td>Provision of additional research time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of reduced initial workload</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement of new pattern of work to fit with changed circumstances</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconsideration of duties to fit with changed circumstances</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/activities ensure organisation/culture in STEMM schools is supportive of female staff</td>
<td>Recognition &amp; support of work of Equate Scotland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduling of school-wide meetings in core hours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation of request system for blocking off timetable slots to fit with caring commitments</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² ECR = early career researchers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good practice</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Applies to</th>
<th>Within the following school(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New staff</td>
<td>ECRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload allocation caters for work on women and science</td>
<td>Workload allocation for member of staff to liaise with Equate Scotland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload is taken into account at appraisals</td>
<td>Workload allocation covers all duties &amp; forms part of PDR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload allocation caters for pastoral and admin duties</td>
<td>Rotation of duties managed according to personal preferences, requests and “natural turnover”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While it has been possible to point to such examples of good practice that support gender equality, few are codified as formal University policies. The current review of WAM provides an opportunity for the University to develop and embed principles to underpin good practice in its new articulation of the WAM, and will be incorporated into the work to be undertaken in Action 9C.

The connection between promotion and workload is not made explicit in the current version of WAM. In short, promotion is based on merit, and the currency of merit is performance. However, it is recognised that if staff are not given the opportunity to achieve merit in their work, for example in the case where school responsibilities are not rotated on a regular basis, then staff may be denied the chance to develop their skills. A further issue is the general expectation that additional work is required to secure a promoted post (which, when achieved, often then entails more work). This reinforces the notion of a long hours culture in academia, which is often one that is less conducive to the careers of female staff. These factors will be addressed in Actions 9C and 10C.

4.7 Publicity

The SAT’s audit of images used to illustrate STEMM subjects, both in hard copy and online, revealed that a disproportionate number of images of men feature in the pictures. The imbalance is due to the low ratio of female to male images in publicity for two schools: the School of Engineering and Built Environment (1.0 to 6.0), and the School of Computing (1.0 to 3.7). (For the STEMM schools in the Faculty of Life, Health and Social Sciences the position is better where the female to male ratio is 1.0 to 0.6.) Action 12C Develop content on the portrayal of gender to add to International, Development and External Affairs’ branding policy documentation, and apply this to an audit of existing images in publicity material (both online and print) will start to address this issue.

4.8 Flexibility and career breaks

4.8.1 Flexible working

The University’s Flexible working policy is designed to allow all staff the greatest possible choice in working in a manner conducive to managing work and personal responsibilities within a mutually beneficial framework. The option to apply for flexible working is communicated to staff through the intranet, and complemented through regular contact between line managers and HR Client Partners.

Uptake of flexible working is recorded centrally by HR. HR staff have recently reviewed and updated the Flexible Working Tracker to ensure that future Athena SWAN (and equality outcomes) monitoring is accurate and fit-for-purpose.

In the period from April 1st 2011 to 31st March 2014 a total of 39 flexible working arrangements were formally agreed with academic and research staff, the majority for women. The breakdown of figures is given in Table 32, with the equivalent figures for other staff provided for comparative purposes. It has not been possible, however, to access the number of requests for flexible working. This issue will be addressed for future Athena SWAN submissions in Action 4A.
Table 32: Formal uptake of flexible working April 2011 to March 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic and research staff</td>
<td>31 (79.5%)</td>
<td>8 (20.5%)</td>
<td>39 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff</td>
<td>89 (86.4%)</td>
<td>14 (13.6%)</td>
<td>103 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120 (84.5%)</td>
<td>22 (15.5%)</td>
<td>142 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the size of the academic and research workforce at the University, these figures appear to be low. However, flexible working requests are only logged centrally when a change is required on a permanent basis. These figures do not include local agreements where, due to the nature of academic and research work, flexible working is the norm, and an atmosphere of collegiality makes this possible.

Another possible explanation for the low numbers may relate to a culture of “presenteeism” in academic environments, where staff are reluctant to ask about flexible working arrangements in case this signals low commitment to their work or team. We do not, however, have strong evidence for this from the work of the SAT in 2014.

Given that a perceived lack of access to flexible working arrangements did not come up as an issue for concern in the staff engagement activities undertaken by the SAT in preparation for the bronze submission, it would appear that the former explanation (as opposed to the latter) is more convincing. Nevertheless we believe it worthwhile to investigate this issue further as part of **Action 8B Investigate issue of low numbers of staff who (a) take advantage of flexible working and (b) take maternity leave, including benchmarking these against other similar institutions as appropriate.**

### 4.8.2 Leave for parents

The University has policies for **maternity, paternity, parental**, and **adoption** leave. While no additional funding is provided to schools to support parents, the provision of support is generous.

In addition to statutory entitlements, the University offers ten “keeping in touch” (KIT) days to women taking a career break to have a baby. Taking up this offer is voluntary and does not affect statutory pay or leave entitlement. KIT day activities include, for example, attendance at conferences, training or team meetings. There is no requirement to work a “whole day”: one hour’s activity is sufficient to count as a “day”. The option the change the pattern of work after maternity leave is outlined in the **Flexible working policy**.

The total number of women in research and academic posts who took maternity leave in the past three academic years is eleven. Of these, six returned to work full-time, and five part-time. For eight their hours remained the same, for two they decreased, and for one they increased. The SAT regards this figure of eleven to be low. Possible reasons for the low figure are presented in Table 33.
Table 33: Possible explanation for low incidence of maternity leave uptake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible explanation</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female academics and researchers are discouraged from having children for the sake of their careers</td>
<td>Evident in the well-documented “children versus career” debate. See, for example Jaschik, S. (2008, May 23).Does academe hinder parenthood? Inside Higher Ed. Available at: <a href="https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/05/23/nokids">https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/05/23/nokids</a>. Focus group discussion of reluctance of some to speak openly about plans for having children, and taking advantage of provision that supports this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female staff at lecturer level prefer to leave the University and then have a child, rather than stay in post and take maternity leave</td>
<td>Possibility raised by SAT membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University happens to employ a disproportionate number of women who never wanted children in the first place</td>
<td>No evidence from the self assessment work completed to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The age profile of women who work in academic and research posts at the University</td>
<td>No evidence: the age profile was checked by HR and shows that there is a cohort of female staff of child-bearing age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further research into this question is required to understand what are the actual factors at play here, and is noted in Action 8B Investigate issue of low numbers of staff who (a) take advantage of flexible working and (b) take maternity leave, including benchmarking these against other similar institutions as appropriate.

All parents benefit from the University’s recognition that emergencies sometimes occur in households where there are children. There is thus provision for up to two days of leave to deal with problems related to children who are injured or sick, or an unexpected breakdown in childcare arrangements. The full provision is described in the Time for dependent care policy.

4.8.3 Childcare

In recognition of the substantial costs of childcare, and its potential impediment to career progression, the University provides an elective childcare voucher system. This operates as part of a salary sacrifice process. It is managed by Sodexo. Its availability is promoted on the staff intranet alongside other family benefits. Uptake of the scheme in the past three years is shown in Table 34.

Table 34: Uptake of childcare voucher scheme 2011/12-2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total past 3 years</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.4 Work-life balance

Although the University does not have a policy on work-life balance, there are instances of good practice in operation across the institution. For example, in the School of Computing (1) staff meetings such as Teaching Management Team and School Management Team are held in the middle of day; (2) one of the first acts of the current (female) head of school when first appointed was to school board meetings to 3pm from 4pm; (3) a system is operated by which staff can make specific timetabling requests (to allow for duties such as taking children to/from school). In the School of Life, Sports and Social Sciences the members of one subject group have agreed not send email between 17:30 and 09:00 unless the content of the message is urgent. Action 9C Include policy and practice statements with the implementation of the new workload allocation model to ensure gender equality issues are taken into account when it is operational, and that issues of work-life balance are taken into account. Ensure that attention is drawn to these in training will include codifying the current good practice, investigating other strategies to ensure work-life balance, and using these findings to improve the implementation of the workload allocation model.

5 Other comments (word count 267)

5.1 Building on Edinburgh Napier University’s work with female students

The bronze award submission does not require evidence related to students. However, the SAT would like to draw the attention of the panellists to the University’s recent work related to the networking and mentoring of female students in the STEMM departments.

Of particular note is the lively Connect networking group in the Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Creative Industries. This grew out of a support forum for female students studying science, engineering, technology and built environment subjects. Established in 2006, the network has won a number of funding awards from bodies such as the Doris Gray Trust administered by the Women’s Engineering Society, and Women into Science and Engineering (WiSE).

The success of Connect as a local initiative led to the establishment of InterConnect, the network for women studying science, engineering and technology subjects in Scotland, which is administered from the University through Equate Scotland.

Both Connect and InterConnect make it possible for female STEMM students to build links with industry, meet qualified women working in their areas of professional interest, mix with other female STEMM students, improve their employability through developing their CVs and keeping up to date with news and events in their field, and promote their subjects to younger students. This contributes to the pipeline of women in STEMM.

We will draw on our experience of these groups in the creation of the network for Women in STEMM (Action 17E), and use it to inform the new mentoring scheme (Action 16E).
5.2 Engaging our colleagues

The SAT is keen to highlight that some of the resource to be allocated as a result of Action 1A will relate to building on the engagement of University staff around what the Athena SWAN bronze award stands for and how we can build on our achievement to date to further promote gender equality in the workplace. Action 3A (which adds the ambition for departmental awards to school agendas) and Actions 20E and 21E (which bring the theme of gender equality to major internal events) will build upon the engagement activity in 2014.

We are particularly pleased that the mix of internal communications (see Table 6, p.16) have prompted colleagues to consider gender equality at work more readily. This has prepared the ground for our work to update, and create, new policy, as indicated in the Action Plan (Actions 9C-12C and 13D-15D).
6 Action Plan

6.1 Ownership and responsibilities associated with the Action Plan

The Action Plan is owned by the SAT, and led by Vice Principal and Deputy Vice Chancellor Professor Alistair Sambell. The plan shows a person/group responsible for each action. In addition, each action will have a SAT sponsor. It will be that SAT sponsor’s responsibility to liaise with those charged with completing the action, and provide regular reports on the work being undertaken towards each action’s goals.

The progress of all actions will be a standing agenda item at the three full SAT meetings per year (January, April and October). The progress reported here will then be conveyed to the Equality and Diversity Committee (also chaired by Professor Sambell) at its three meetings per academic year (February, May and November), and then to University Court (on which Professor Sambell also serves).

6.2 Levels of priority

1. Actions essential to underpin the continuation of the University’s commitment to gender equality and recognition of this through the achievement of further awards. These provide the necessary infrastructure for actions labelled priority 2 and 3.

2. Actions that are key to (1) directly responding to findings uncovered during the course of the self assessment work in 2014, (2) making explicit the University’s commitment to gender equality, and (3) instigating positive change.

3. Actions that contribute to upholding the Athena SWAN principles at Edinburgh Napier University. While these may not be considered essential when compared with the actions labelled priority 1 and 2, their outcomes will contribute to the overall impact of the University’s efforts in promoting gender equality.

It should also be noted that we view the Action Plan as a “live” document and implementation tool. **Action 22F Review and refresh Action Plan on an annual basis** thus provides flexibility to update the plan as circumstances change. For example, in 2016 new actions will be generated from **Action 3A Devise University policy on promoting women in STEMM and ensure that this is implemented at the level of schools as they move towards departmental awards**. The actual detail of these new actions will emerge from the stated commitment of the schools towards achievement of the departmental awards, as presented at the second SAT meeting in 2015/16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>References in bronze submission document</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Initiation of action</th>
<th>Completion of action</th>
<th>Person/group responsible</th>
<th>Progress monitored by</th>
<th>Measure of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Agree and commit resources required to maintain University level of commitment to Athena SWAN awards programme through to 2017/18</td>
<td>To ensure that this work is adequately resourced in the future to deliver this Action Plan</td>
<td>p.21, p.49, p.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>January 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>July 2015 (end of financial year 2014/5)</td>
<td>Chair of University Leadership Team</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development Progress reported to Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Resources are provided through to 2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Plan and hold three full SAT meetings times a year(^3) to align with dates of the University Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>To monitor the implementation of Action Plan and generate reports for the Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>p.21, p.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Annually at April SAT meeting</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Chair of SAT</td>
<td>Chair of Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>9 SAT full meetings held 2015-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Devise plans for prioritising Athena SWAN departmental award applications</td>
<td>To ensure that the University commits to a systematic process for preparing departmental submissions and allocates adequate resources for this</td>
<td>p.21, p.49, p.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>April 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By second SAT meeting of 2015/16 (January 2016)</td>
<td>Heads of the four STEMM schools</td>
<td>Deans(^4), with progress reported to Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Plans in place by January 2016, and further actions identified to deliver on these plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) With sub-meetings of the SAT members to address particular tasks between the main meetings.

\(^4\) In the current structure (under review at the time of writing, and which may change in 2015/16).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>References in bronze submission document</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Initiation of action</th>
<th>Completion of action</th>
<th>Person/group responsible</th>
<th>Progress monitored by</th>
<th>Measure of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Set up and implement routines to collect and disseminate data sets from the HR Connect system additional to those that were available for preparing the bronze award submission</td>
<td>To allow for more detailed analysis of statistical data when later submissions are made, to improve baseline against which progress can be monitored, and to provide evidence upon which action can be taken to improve the environment for gender equality within the University</td>
<td>p.7, p.42, p.45, p.49, p.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>January 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By April 2015 SAT meeting</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development</td>
<td>Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Generation of useable data sets that are accessed throughout the three year period of the award and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Conduct a mid-term review of bronze award tenure</td>
<td>To ensure that progress is being made and to prepare for bronze renewal (or silver submission)</td>
<td>p.21, p.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>January 2017 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By October 2017 SAT meeting</td>
<td>Diversity Partner and Athena SWAN Champion(s)</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development Progress reported to Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Completion of interim report to cover academic years 2014/15 and 2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>References in bronze submission document</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Initiation of action</td>
<td>Completion of action</td>
<td>Person/group responsible</td>
<td>Progress monitored by</td>
<td>Measure of success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Complete further research to establish the reason for the “spike” in female lecturer leavers in 2012/13 and address these as appropriate</td>
<td>To understand the figures gathered during the self assessment process and, if found to have a root cause that can be addressed by the University, consider appropriate strategies</td>
<td>p.31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>January 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By October 2015 SAT meeting</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development</td>
<td>Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Fuller understanding of the issues so that plans can be put in place to address these as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>Investigate the question of career opportunities (including promotion) for those on fractional and zero hours contracts, and devise and implement strategies to address any issues uncovered</td>
<td>To establish whether or not those on fractional contracts (many of whom are women) are disadvantaged by the promotional structure in place and, if so, address this question, e.g. by reviewing promotional pathways for this group of staff</td>
<td>p.44, p.45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By January 2016 SAT meeting</td>
<td>Diversity Partner with Union rep SAT member</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development</td>
<td>Progress reported to Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>References in bronze submission document</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Initiation of action</td>
<td>Completion of action</td>
<td>Person/group responsible</td>
<td>Progress monitored by</td>
<td>Measure of success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>Investigate issue of low numbers of staff who (a) take advantage of flexible working and (b) take maternity leave, including benchmarking these against other similar institutions as appropriate</td>
<td>To establish the reasons for the findings made in the course of the self assessment process and address these as appropriate</td>
<td>p.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>October 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By April 2016 SAT meeting</td>
<td>Diversity Partner</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development Progress reported to Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Completion of report on statistics in question and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>References in bronze submission document</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Initiation of action</td>
<td>Completion of action</td>
<td>Person/group responsible</td>
<td>Progress monitored by</td>
<td>Measure of success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C</td>
<td>Include policy and practice statements with the implementation of the new workload allocation model to ensure gender equality issues are taken into account when it is operational, and that issues of work-life balance are taken into account. Ensure that attention is drawn to these in training.</td>
<td>To address the barriers to the advancement of the careers of female staff identified in the self assessment process which relate to the implementation of the current workload model and the upholding of its principles. (This is a major piece of work that contributes to a wider project within the University.)</td>
<td>p.48, p.49, p.53, p.56, p.59, p.60 Table 31, p.53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>January 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By April 2015 SAT meeting</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development and Dean of Faculty of Life, Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Materials and training for reviewers and reviewees is in place prior to allocation of workload for 2015/16 There is evident impact of action to report in bronze renewal/silver award submission in 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 These actions will be informed by existing good practice evident from the self assessment work completed in 2014.

6 These would include reference to, for example, ensuring that panels that allocate research time have gender equality, unconscious bias training.

7 Currently charged with leading the review into the workload allocation model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>References in bronze submission document</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Initiation of action</th>
<th>Completion of action</th>
<th>Person/group responsible</th>
<th>Progress monitored by</th>
<th>Measure of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Include gender equality issues as relevant to development as component of Professional Development Review (PDR) in training for both reviewers and reviewees.</td>
<td>To draw attention to PDR as a review of development and to make plans for individuals that take into account their specific circumstances to ensure that reviewers have the opportunity to reach their full potential, e.g. to participate in REF2020, to apply for senior roles</td>
<td>p.42, p.44, p.45, p.48, p.49, p.51, p.52, p.53 p.56, p.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By October 2015 SAT meeting</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development and Management Development Partner</td>
<td>Progress reported to Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Training programme includes new component from academic year 2015/16. There is evident impact of action in mid-term review conducted in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>Review University policy on committee membership representation and propose and implement changes where appropriate⁹.</td>
<td>To devise strategies so that all staff are appropriately represented on University committees</td>
<td>p. 53, p.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By October 2015 SAT meeting</td>
<td>Head of Governance and Management Services</td>
<td>University Secretary Progress reported to Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>More equal representation of men and women on committees than that reported in the University’s bronze submission document by 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁸ These actions will be informed by existing good practice evident from the self assessment work completed in 2014.

⁹ For example, a strategy for the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee could be to fill the seven nominated non ex officio places with female staff (with the proviso, of course, that women are not simply pulled in to boost numbers with the result that they are over-burdened with committee work). Another strategy might be to introduce a scheme whereby deputy members are used on committees. At the same time that this addresses the gender issue, this facilitates career development. Equally
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>References in bronze submission document</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Initiation of action</th>
<th>Completion of action</th>
<th>Person/group responsible</th>
<th>Progress monitored by</th>
<th>Measure of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12C</td>
<td>Develop content on the portrayal of gender to add to International, Development and External Affairs’ branding policy documentation, and apply this to an audit of existing images in publicity material (both online and print)(^{11}).</td>
<td>To ensure that the University’s own representation of itself is consistent with its commitment to equal opportunities across all subject areas</td>
<td>p. 30, p.56, p.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By October 2015 SAT meeting</td>
<td>Director of International, Development and External Affairs (IDEA), supported by Diversity Partner</td>
<td>Progress reported to Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>More equal representation of men and women in images that represent the University by 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) Unconscious bias training could be offered to committee chairs to ensure that committee membership vacancies are filled fairly (thus addressing free text comments in survey returns that indicated that this is not always believed to be the case).

\(^{11}\) These actions will be informed by existing good practice evident from the self assessment work completed in 2014.

\(^{11}\) The audit could also incorporate attention to the portrayal of other groups that may be under-represented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>References in bronze submission document</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Initiation of action</th>
<th>Completion of action</th>
<th>Person/group responsible</th>
<th>Progress monitored by</th>
<th>Measure of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13D</td>
<td>Devise and implement good practice guide for the recruitment and promotion of women in STEMM subjects(^{13})</td>
<td>To address the issue of low numbers of female applicants to posts in STEMM subjects advertised by the University, and lower numbers of female staff in senior roles</td>
<td>p. 30, p. 40, p.42, p.51, p. 52, p.53, p.60, Table 15, p. 34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By October 2015 SAT meeting</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development and Diversity Partner</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development Progress reported to Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Good practice guide implemented by start of 2016 Improvement in figures for the recruitment and promotion of women in STEMM subjects by the time of the mid-term review 2017, with further improvement evident by time of bronze renewal/application for silver award in 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{12}\) These actions will be informed by existing good practice evident from the self assessment work completed in 2014.

\(^{13}\) To include, for example, care with wording of text in job advertisements (see, for example, research reported by the Technische Universität München summarised at [https://www.tum.de/en/about-tum/news/press-releases/short/article/31438/](https://www.tum.de/en/about-tum/news/press-releases/short/article/31438/)) and placing the advertisements in fora where they are likely to attract the attention of women as well as men.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>References in bronze submission document</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Initiation of action</th>
<th>Completion of action</th>
<th>Person/group responsible</th>
<th>Progress monitored by</th>
<th>Measure of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 14D | Devise University policy on promoting women in STEMM and ensure that this is implemented at the level of schools as they move towards departmental awards | To formalise good practice where it already exists into, and encourage additional good practice so that the profile of women in STEMM is raised across the University | p. 49, p.60 | 2 | April 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action) | By October 2015 SAT meeting | Director of International, Development and External Affairs (IDEA), supported by Diversity Partner | Progress reported to Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee | Good practice guide implemented by start of 2016
|  | | | | | | | | Improvement in audit figures by the time of the report on the mid-term review in 2017, with further improvement to report in bronze renewal/silver award submission in 2018 |

---

14 These actions will be informed by existing good practice evident from the self assessment work completed in 2014.
15 This will include: (1) development of a policy to formalise equality of opportunity when the University is invited to provide speakers for the media, combined with media training targeted at female STEMM staff (to be delivered by Equate Scotland in conjunction with the National Union of Journalists); (2) centralised monitoring of all nominations e.g. to public/professional bodies, for awards/prizes/honorary degrees; (3) extension of the school Academic Champion role to schools in the Faculty of Life, Health and Social Sciences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>References in bronze submission document</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Initiation of action</th>
<th>Completion of action</th>
<th>Person/group responsible</th>
<th>Progress monitored by</th>
<th>Measure of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15D</td>
<td>Conduct review into the means by which individuals learn about development opportunities and devise a policy for implementation to ensure that those who would benefit from them hear about them</td>
<td>To provide access to all to the many development opportunities that are available at the University, but currently run with low participation numbers. This work will also allow for the monitoring of uptake of opportunities according to employee characteristics, including gender.</td>
<td>p.48, p.49, p.51, p.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>January 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By October 2015 SAT meeting</td>
<td>Head of Academic Professional Development with Equate Scotland</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development Progress reported to Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>New policy implemented by start of 2016 Greater uptake of development opportunities by female staff evident by the time of the report on the 2017 mid-term review with further improvement evident by time of bronze renewal/application for silver award in 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 These actions will be informed by existing good practice evident from the self assessment work completed in 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>References in bronze submission document</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Initiation of action</th>
<th>Completion of action</th>
<th>Person/group responsible</th>
<th>Progress monitored by</th>
<th>Measure of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16E</strong></td>
<td>Devise and implement an academic mentoring scheme for all that encompasses the whole academic role and contributes towards the achievement of professional recognition, academic leadership and researcher development</td>
<td>To strengthen the opportunity for all staff to be supported across all aspects of the academic role and be supported in the achievement of ambitions for success in areas in addition to teaching and learning</td>
<td>p.42, p.48, p.51, p.59 Table 3, p.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>January 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By 2018</td>
<td>Head of Academic Professional Development</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development</td>
<td>Academic mentoring scheme in place with uptake amongst female STEMM staff with evident impact of mentoring activity by time of bronze renewal/application for silver award in 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17E</strong></td>
<td>Set up a formal Women in STEMM network for academic staff across the University with the expectation that this will also foster mentoring relationships.</td>
<td>To satisfy the appetite for such a network as evident from the results of the self assessment process, and build on this to widen opportunities for female staff to progress their careers in STEMM at the University</td>
<td>p.42, p.48, p.53, p.59 Table 15, p.34 Table 26, p.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>January 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By October 2015 - network launched on Ada Lovelace Day 2015</td>
<td>Head of Academic and Professional Development, supported by SAT members</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development</td>
<td>Network is established and self-sustaining by 2018, with mentoring relationships evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>References in bronze submission document</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Initiation of action</td>
<td>Completion of action</td>
<td>Person/group responsible</td>
<td>Progress monitored by</td>
<td>Measure of success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18E</td>
<td>Increase uptake of opportunities for female members of staff to participate in the Aurora programme offered by the Leadership Foundation.</td>
<td>To develop female staff for senior roles where, on the whole, they are under-represented</td>
<td>p.42, p.51, Table 26, p.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annually in May 17</td>
<td>Annually in April</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development and Management Development Partner</td>
<td>Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Greater numbers of female staff take part in the programme with impact evident in growth of applications from female staff for senior roles by the time of the report on the mid-term review in 2017, and with further improvement evident by time of renewal/application for silver award in 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19E</td>
<td>Host an Ada Lovelace Day lecture annually each October as part of University’s public lecture series</td>
<td>To generate further internal and external awareness of gender issues in STEMM, and to demonstrate the University’s commitment to addressing these, building on Ada Lovelace event held in October 2014</td>
<td>p.15, p.30, p.48, p.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plan annually in April (2015, 2016 and 2017)</td>
<td>Deliver annually in October (2015, 2016, 2017)</td>
<td>Director of International, Development and External Affairs (IDEA), supported by the SAT</td>
<td>Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Delivery of 3 lectures in the period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 To tie in with PDR cycle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>References in bronze submission document</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Initiation of action</th>
<th>Completion of action</th>
<th>Person/group responsible</th>
<th>Progress monitored by</th>
<th>Measure of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20E</td>
<td>Make gender equality in academia a key theme of the University's learning, teaching and assessment conference</td>
<td>To generate further internal awareness of gender issues in STEM, and to demonstrate the University's commitment to addressing these, building on engagement activity initiated in 2014</td>
<td>p.14, p.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>April 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>Deliver by February 2017</td>
<td>Head of Academic and Professional Development, supported by Teaching Fellows who serve on the SAT</td>
<td>Director of HR and Development</td>
<td>Gender equality is a theme of one of the forthcoming winter conferences (February 2016 or 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21E</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities for gender equality to feature as a theme in forthcoming University conferences related to research</td>
<td>To generate further internal awareness of gender issues in STEM, and to demonstrate the University's commitment to addressing these, building on engagement activity initiated in 2014</td>
<td>p.14, p.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>January 2015 (agenda item at SAT meeting for further action)</td>
<td>By October 2015 SAT meeting</td>
<td>University Director of Research and Innovation</td>
<td>Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Gender equality is a theme of University conference(s) related to research in 2015/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 At the time of writing: Dr Kate Durkacz and Sally Smith.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>References in bronze submission document</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Initiation of action</th>
<th>Completion of action</th>
<th>Person/group responsible</th>
<th>Progress monitored by</th>
<th>Measure of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F: ACTION TO ENSURE THE VALUE OF THE ACTION PLAN OVER THE THREE YEAR PERIOD</td>
<td><strong>22F</strong> Review and refresh Action Plan on an annual basis</td>
<td>To ensure that the Action Plan is treated as a “live” document and implementation tool, with flexibility to adapt to new developments and circumstances</td>
<td>p. 61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annually each October (agenda item at SAT meeting)</td>
<td>Annually each October (agenda item at SAT meeting)</td>
<td>Diversity Partner and Athena SWAN Champion(s) with SAT Action Plan sub-team members</td>
<td>Chair of SAT and Equality and Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Action Plan, and individual actions, continue to be SMART throughout the bronze award period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>