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List of abbreviations used in the application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Earth Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD/HoD</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLB</td>
<td>Kathleen Lonsdale Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPS</td>
<td>Mathematical and Physical Sciences Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
<td>Research Excellence Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>Athena SWAN Self Assessment Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLU</td>
<td>University College London Union</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

The letter is an opportunity for the head of department to confirm their support for the application and to endorse and commend any women and STEMM activities that have made a significant contribution to the achievement of the departmental mission.
Endorsement from Head of Department of Earth Sciences for Athena SWAN Silver award

It is a pleasure to endorse our Athena SWAN Silver application for the Dept. of Earth Sciences. I am a father and a husband of an academic, and am delighted to see gender awareness growing in our Department.

Our self-assessment exercise showed some “glass ceiling” trends common to other science disciplines; while we achieve a good gender balance in our undergraduate and graduate students, there is a decline in the progression to postdocs and permanent positions. Of particular concern is that our gender balance among permanent staff has remained stubbornly low at 25% female over the past five years. This is despite positive action that led to recruiting 45 % female staff over the period. As discussed in our submission this is because three female staff members left in that period, but I was certainly hoping the ratio of permanent female academics would be heading towards 50:50. We anticipate progress towards this goal in the near future.

Moreover, the Department has evolved positively through the promotion and appointment of several female professors. Five years ago the Department had only one female professor (the first female professor in the Department in its 150+ year history), we now have four. Continued improvement of the overall gender balance of the Department is a priority for me.

I am personally very committed to the Athena SWAN process and I have ensured that the aims of Athena SWAN are considered in all Departmental decisions. For instance, the Swan Assessment Team (SAT) now audits all aspects of job allocation, promotions and hiring. Athena SWAN is a standing item at staff meetings and I expect an update at every meeting, as well as an update at our Management Committee. We have budgeted for a new maternity/paternity policy above and beyond that offered by UCL to make maternity/paternity leave simpler and more stress free, and female members of staff benefit from flexible working arrangements I am happy to support.

The Earth Sciences Department has brought in a number other changes in support of female academics. Our SAT changed UCL’s policy on claiming childcare costs while away on fieldtrips and conferences. Graduate students and postdocs will be offered a same sex mentor. The seminar timetable moved to a more family-friendly time, and for the second year in a row we have 50% female seminar speakers (up from an appalling record of only 3 female speakers out of 42 in the previous two years). Our website and advertising now include an appropriate balance of images and YouTube movies. A survey of PhD students highlighted the need for more discussions and forums on academic careers, and the need for more visible female role models, on which we have acted.

In summary, we have taken many positive steps towards improving and advancing the careers of women in our Department. I am wholly supportive of this initiative and in implementing our action plan.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Lars Stixrude
Head of Department
2. The self-assessment process: maximum 1000 words

Describe the self-assessment process. This should include:

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

The Earth Sciences SAT comprises nine people from all sections of the department. The panel has a varied experience of childcare and work/life balance, ranging from those with teenage children to those with no children, as well as flexible, part time and full time working. There is also a balance in partners, ranging from academic partners (including within the Dept.), partners outside of academic institutions, through to nonworking partners, or single people. One member of the panel works at UCL in the week but currently travels abroad to be with her family at the weekend.

At its inception two years ago, the SAT included four professors (two male, two female), one reader (female), two lecturers (one male, one female), one postgraduate (female) and the Departmental Manager (female). Since then the two lecturers have been promoted to reader/senior lecturer. We are supported by the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Team at UCL and are very open to learning from the wealth of good practice across UCL award holding departments. This is a sensible size committee for our size of department, covering all staffing areas, although there is currently no undergraduate or postdoctoral representation.

Table 1. Profile of the SAT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Current major role in SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bown</td>
<td>Professor &amp; Director of Teaching</td>
<td>Oversees undergraduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brodholt</td>
<td>Professor &amp; Director of Research</td>
<td>Chair of SAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisa Clemente</td>
<td>Departmental Manager &amp; HR</td>
<td>Responsible for staff data, hiring policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Edgington</td>
<td>Post-graduate representative</td>
<td>Organised postgraduate survey, organised career talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Ferreira</td>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>Staff mentoring scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjali Goswami</td>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>Advertising and images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Jones</td>
<td>UCL Athena-SWAN policy advisor</td>
<td>Advises on good practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Lithgow-Beattelloni</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Postgraduate recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Pogge Von Strandmann</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Oversees postgraduate mentoring scheme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) an account of the self assessment process: details of the self assessment team meetings, including any consultation with staff or individuals outside of the university, and how these have fed into the submission

The SAT was established Spring 2014 and meets termly (including the summer) as a whole. The meetings are two hours and cover all aspects of improving women’s careers within the department, as well as improving and supporting the careers of those with families. The UCL Athena SWAN policy advisor attends our meetings and provides advice, and we are now supported by a second member of UCL’s Diversity and Equality team. Sub-groups with particular actions meet more regularly.

The Chair is a member of the Department Management Committee and reports monthly to that. Athena SWAN is a standing item on our termly Staff Meeting agenda.

Currently there are only 8 female members of permanent academic staff in our Department (out of a total of 33) and four of these are on the SAT. It seemed, therefore, inappropriate to run a survey since only four female members of academic staff are not actively engaged in the process and the small numbers might reveal individuals. One of those has spent all of last two years abroad, but the others have been consulted in person about all Athena SWAN activities. Moreover, UCL ran its university wide survey recently and we were concerned that our staff would be put off by yet another survey. The SAT reviewed the departmental data from the UCL-wide staff survey which influenced the development of our action plan (2013: 40 respondents, 29M and 11F; 2015: 28 responses, 18M, 8F and 3 prefer not to say). We will conduct a survey of all staff in the future (Action 5.1).

The Chair of the Earth Sciences’ SAT is a member of the recently formed MAPS Faculty Diversity and Equality group, where Athena SWAN activities are an agenda item. This is a useful forum for sharing good practice.

Gender data on student and staff was collected and analysed from the inception of the of the SAT and was used to guide actions on staff and student recruitment. This data is reviewed annually. A postgraduate survey was held after one year and with actions implemented from this (26 respondents, 14 female, 12 male). Staff views were given at the SAT itself, via personal interactions and at dedicated discussion at staff meetings.

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

The SAT will continue to meet formally as a whole four times a year. This has worked well over the last two years and we see no strong reason to increase the number of meetings. We are a smallish department and opportunities for personal interactions are many.

The SAT will monitor progress on the implementation of the action plan at every meeting and continue to set future milestones, goals and actions, as appropriate. Individuals or small groups responsible for specific actions will report progress to the SAT at its meetings.
and/or via email. Subgroups within the SAT responsible for particular actions may meet more regularly, as before.

The SAT now have a number of regular responsibilities, including auditing the Departmental workload, running the mentoring schemes, overseeing the promotions process, running focus groups and surveys, and raising the profile and aims of Athena SWAN. The Sat will continue to report monthly to the Department Management Committee.

Since the SAT has only been running for two years, there are as yet no concrete plans for committee member replacement and rolling on and off. This will become a focus of the next self-assessment period. Similarly, length of term and succession planning for the Chair will be decided, with a term of 3 to 5 years. The two lecturers have been promoted during the current self-assessment period, but we feel the views of junior staff are already well represented on the committee and so see no need to take specific action to replace them except as part of the regular replacement schedule. We are, however, planning to recruit an undergraduate and postdoctoral researcher to the team (Action 5.6).

(915 words)

3. A picture of the department: maximum 2000 words

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

Earth Sciences is part of the Faculty of Mathematics and Physical Sciences (MAPs). It is currently 6th in our UoA in the REF. We are situated in the main quad of the Bloomsbury campus of UCL in the heart of London. Our main building (Kathleen Lonsdale Building – named after the famous female chemist) is being refurbished and work is due to finish in 2017.

The Department has about 33 permanent academic staff, and is a medium size for UK earth science departments. We are part of a Research School with Earth Sciences at Birkbeck located nearby. One of the SAT has a joint appointment, giving us an opportunity to share good practice across the departments. We have ~170 undergraduate students, ~60 PhD students, and ~26 postdocs.

The Department is managed by the HoD, supported by a Management Committee and the Departmental Manager. The academic members of the Management Committee are all male.

The SAT audits all the Management Group’s decisions in relation to workloads, promotions and requests for flexible working. The major restructure currently being considered is the replacement due to retirement of the Undergraduate Tutor and her significant teaching duties.

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

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

Earth Sciences does not provide access or foundation courses.

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

The number of students in our undergraduate programmes has increased by 50% in five years. During this time the percentage of female students has stayed fairly constant at around 40%. This compares favourably with the sector average in the UK (34% in Geology, HESA), but we are concerned that we are not yet heading in the right direction towards a 50:50 gender balance. However, as shown below (Figure 4), the gender balance of applicants, offers and acceptances is almost exactly 50% in 2015/16. This tells us that our reputation, advertising and UCAS days are attracting female students to UCL with appropriate predicted grades, but that the percentage of females not making those grades is slightly higher than males. It is unclear what we can do about this since we rely on predicted grades when making offers. We hope this disparity is anomalous for this year and will monitor for trends.

Given that our gender balance for applicants, offers and acceptances is 50:50, we predict that our UG ratio will also become 50:50 within three years.

The number of part-time students is small: 2% female and 3% male. This has been steady over the last five years.

(iii) **Postgraduate male and female numbers completing taught courses** — full and part-time — comment on the female:male ratio compared with the national picture for the discipline. Describe any initiatives taken to address any imbalance and the effect to date. Comment upon any plans for the future.
Figure 2: Graph showing proportion of male and female taught postgraduate (MSc) students for the last five years.

Postgraduate student numbers in taught courses has nearly doubled in the last five years, with a gender balance of 50:50 in each MSc course. These numbers are well above the sector average of 38% (taught + research). Our success is driven by successful recruitment in the new Institute of Risk and Disaster Reduction (IRDR) MSc, the Hazards program and the considerable improvement in our MSc Geosciences program.

The Hazards MSc and Geoscience MSc both traditionally attract a 50:50 gender balance. The newer IRDR MSc contains significant non-science content and is also attractive to both male and female students. As shown in Figure 5, the gender balance of applicants, offers and acceptances into taught postgraduate degrees are all 50:50 for the last five years. We have not, therefore, put in specific actions to increase female applicants, but have concentrated on recruiting student numbers in general. As discussed below, this is not true for undergraduate degrees where we made significant changes to our recruitment procedure to directly increase female numbers.

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

Figure 3: Proportion of male and female postgraduate research students (PhD) for the last five years
Postgraduate research student numbers also increased strongly in the last five years, while maintaining a near 50:50 gender balance in all years. This is interesting since, as shown in Figure 6, over the last five years we attract slightly fewer female than male candidates to apply, and moreover, of those that accept an offer, only 40% are female. On the face of it, the two sets of data do not seem to be consistent, but in fact they say something interesting; slightly more men than women accept a PhD position, but then don’t turn up. We have no obvious explanation for this. Nevertheless, recruiting 50:50 students is a priority and below we discuss the measures in place.

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

Undergraduate degrees

The ratio of female applicants, offers and acceptances to undergraduate degrees have all climbed steadily over the last five years, and this year the percentage of female students is ~50% in all three categories.

We are confident we can maintain this 50:50 gender balance since we attribute our success to specific changes made in the recruitment processes: (i) the involvement of female undergraduates in UCAS days, ii) the increased visibility of successful female academics actively participating in UCAS days, iii) a better gender balance in advertising (including videos made by our students, often female, to advertise these degrees on our YouTube page (see Figure 5)), iv) accepting Geography A level as a science recognizing that this is a choice often made by female applicants, v) admission without interviews, to
avoid unconscious bias in the process, and iv) increased social media presence (Twitter and Facebook). The Athena SWAN SAT will meet annually with the UG Recruitment Officer to ensure this parity continues (Action 1.1). We also have a strong outreach programme, including summer schools, internships and school visits which may contribute, including a strong presence of female PhD students and postdocs in our summer masterclasses (see section 4(v) below).

The one area for concern is that in 2015/16 we found that a slightly greater proportion of female candidates did not make their target A-level grades. As mentioned before, it is not clear what we can do about this since offers are made almost entirely on predicted grades, is gender blind, and there is no interview component. Hopefully this is a one-off, and we will monitor this to see if it is a recurring factor.

Figure 5: Vidoes by students on studying at UCL.

Postgraduate taught degrees
The number of students applying to our postgraduate taught degrees has steadily climbed, but the gender balance has remained virtually unchanged at about 50:50 for applications, offers and acceptances. There does not appear to be any evidence of bias in the process as the proportion of women being offered a place is reflective of the pool of applicants.

### Postgraduate research degrees

![Figure 7: Recruitment data for postgraduate research degrees (PhD)](image)

The gender balance for applicants, offers and acceptances varies from year to year. Overall we attract 44% female applicants, the gender balance of offers is 46% female, and about 40% of those who accept a PhD are female. This year we obtained near gender parity in applications, offers and acceptances, which we attribute to the new doctoral training partnerships at UCL (http://london-nerc-dtp.org). For this we renewed our efforts to advertise the quality research done in our department with special attention to a gender balanced presence, a strong involvement of the female staff in presentations to DTP students and involvement of our PhD students during social and research events. The SAT will meet annually with the Postgraduate Tutor to ensure that this is not a one off.

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

### Undergraduate degrees
In most years, the ratio of female students obtaining a first class degree is about the same as male candidates. The one year which stands out is 2012/2013, but this was an anomalous year with exceptionally low student numbers (a result of increasing the required grades to what we recognise was an unrealistically high level) and there were only two female students that year. Since numbers have grown again, we see no statistical difference between male and female results. We believe this is a result of consistent expectations across the board and of being a generally inclusive department, rather than any gender specific actions.

Postgraduate taught degree (MSc)

Taught postgraduate numbers in most years are small and so the ratio of female to male students obtaining different degree classes varies widely year to year. Some years male students do better on average, and some years female students do better. We are content...
with the data and as with the undergraduates, we believe this is the result of taking a consistent approach to teaching and marking, and not to any specific actions.

Staff data

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

![ACADEMIC STAFF](image)

*Figure 10: Proportion of male and female permanent academic staff over the last five years.*

There has been a slight increase in the number of female members of permanent academic staff from 6 to 8 over the last five years, but the percentage of female staff has remained stubbornly unchanged at around 25%. This is disappointing and a major concern to us. It also came as a surprise since we made a concerted effort to improve the gender balance of our staff, and indeed 45% of the 13 permanent staff hired in the last five years are female (Section 4(b)). However, we have analysed the data and know why the balance did not increase more substantially; this is discussed in section 3(viii), and we do not believe there is a trend of female staff leaving more readily than males. As a small department with low turnover, we know exactly why people leave, but as we grow in numbers of female staff we will consider formal exit interviews.

Currently we have a hiring freeze and we are unable to replace staff so changes in the departmental gender balance in the future is likely to be slow. Nevertheless the experience of attracting and recruiting high-quality female candidates (45% in the last five years) gives us confidence that we will increase the ratio of female academics when allowed to hire again. Our target is for the Department to have 40% female academics in the next five years. This is a sensible while ambitious target, and is well above the HESA (2015) national average of all staff of 33% females in Earth Sciences.
On a positive note, the seniority of our female staff has increased considerably. In 2011 only one professor and one reader were female. The rest were lecturer or senior-lecturer. Moreover, our female professor (promoted in 2009) was the first female professor in Earth Sciences at UCL ever. Due to promotion and recruitment, we now have four female professors in the Department and two readers. The current low number of Grade 3/4 female staff reflects the fact that UCL did a lot of hiring just before the REF and there have been no new permanent staff since 2013.

Section 4(ii) below discusses our approach to cases for promotion which we feel has been particularly successful for female staff. This view is supported in our two case studies.

The percentage of female postdocs is also low, ranging from 40% to 25%. This seems to be due to the fact that the subject matter of many of the grants funded in the department attract candidates from physics and chemistry. Nevertheless, we are not complacent, and our action plan requires all interview and selection panels to have at least one member of
female academic staff on them, and where possible two (Action 3.2). We expect the increased visibility of our senior female staff to encourage female candidates to consider the department as a place where they can imagine themselves working, as well the efforts of the Athena SWAN SAT to provide a female-friendly and family-supporting work environment. We have set ourselves a target of 45% female postdocs in the next three years, also well above the HESA (2015) average for Earth and Environmental Sciences of 33%.

![2015-16 Pipeline](image)

**Figure 13: Percentage of male and females at different stages of career in 2015/16.**

Figure 13 shows that the gender balance starts to fall at postdoc level. This is discussed in detail in Section 4(b) together with the actions to improve it.

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

Turnover is dominated by an average of 5 postdoctoral researchers coming to the end of their contract each year. The gender balance of leavers reflects the gender balance of the postdoctoral cohort itself.

Permanent academic staff turnover is low. In the last five years, two male professors have taken partial retirement, and two left for alternative academic positions. In the same time one female lecturer left for a management role in the university, one left for a position in the USA, and one sadly died. We do not feel there is anything of concern in those figures.

(1968 words)

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

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

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

Figure 14: Academic staff recruitment data

![Academic Staff Recruitment Data](image)

In the last five years we made offers to 13 applicants, 45% of whom are female. This is a significantly higher proportion than who applied or who were interviewed. We attribute this success to a concerted effort of personally contacting and inviting highly qualified female candidates to apply. We also had two female professors sit on the selection and review panels. There is currently a hiring freeze in our Department, but when this is lifted we will continue the drive to recruit female candidates. We are confident of maintaining this success and of appointing ~50% female candidates in the future.

We are also pleased to note that the gender ratio of applicants and interviewees is the same. This is reassuring and shows that we are effectively eliminating any bias during the selection from the pool of applicants.

Of the 13 offers made, three were at professorial grade. Two of these were female. The others are all at lecturer grade.
The gender balance of research staff has room for improvement. Over the past five years, only 34% of the postdocs are female. However we are pleased that this is about the same as the gender balance of the applicants (31%) and interviewees (33%), suggesting our recruitment process is equitable and women are not being disadvantaged through the process. As mentioned earlier, we attribute this to the subject matter of the grants which tend to attract candidates with physics PhDs. Nevertheless, we aim to improve on this by i) monitoring all interview panels to ensure they have female representation, ii) ensure panels have interview training and have taken part in an unconscious bias awareness course iii) personally encourage potential female postdocs to apply, and iv) taking positive action in a tie-break situation (a policy which has been approved by UCL Council but to our knowledge is yet to be used – we hope to be pioneers in this area) (Actions 3.1 and 3.2).

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

Application for promotion is a two-part process. First, there should be an initial enquiry to the HoD, who then consults with the Management Committee for suitability. Second, if approval is given, the formal application is made to the University. It the management committee feels that the candidate is not ready for promotion at that time, the candidate is given feedback as to why that is. He/She then has the choice of putting forward an application without Departmental support, or to wait. During the last five years, nobody has taken that route. Of those put forwarded by the Department, 100% have been successful.

During the last five years there have been 8 successful promotions in UCL Earth Sciences. These were four applications for professor, one by a female candidate, and four for reader,
two of whom were female. All were successful. In the same time period, the Management Committee turned down two requests for departmental support for promotion; these were both male. The support and encouragement of the HoD in the promotion process has been specifically highlighted in both of our case studies.

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

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

We have described our process in the previous sections and our approach to recruiting was particularly successful in the last round of pre-REF hiring and resulted in appointing ~50% female permanent staff. In addition, Earth Sciences adheres to UCL’s recruitment and selection policy which is designed to ensure equal opportunities; this is monitored and enforced rigorously by the Departmental HR officer. This includes advertising with statements encouraging female applicants and female representation on panels. We also expect panel members to have completed the UCL Fair Recruitment training, which includes conversations on the Equality Act 2010, UCL policy and bias. In addition, we personally contact potential female candidates and encourage them to apply. The same procedures are required when recruiting research staff, although the panels are often smaller. Nevertheless, these panels must adhere to our policy and that of the University, and this is monitored by our departmental HR officer and audited by the SAT.

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

In common with many STEM departments, “leaks” start to occur during PhD and continue on through postdoctoral researchers, to permanent jobs and through to professorial grades. We have, therefore, put actions in to support all these areas.

• In a survey, PhD students and postdocs highlighted the need for career development talks. We have, therefore, initiated a series of career talks by leading academics. The first of these was given by Prof. Bridget Wade who described her career path and hosted a question and answer session. Although we did not formally collect feedback on the success of this, it was well attended (at least 30 attendees of which 60% female) and verbally we received positive feedback. We are organising a second and Prof. Jane Francis (Head of the British Antarctic Survey) has agreed to do this. This will be an annual event.

• Another recurring theme is support for grant writing. The department provides one-on-one help to all staff when writing a proposal, but as well, the new Environmental Domain Facilitator organised a workshop led by two members of the department on how to write a successful NERC proposal. Formal feedback from this was taken and found to be very positive, e.g.: “Thank you for a useful workshop and
information”. “For me what was particularly helpful was hearing from the senior academics who had been chairs for panels. Often it seems a case of picking up bits and bobs of information from around the place, so it was really useful to have then three of them together giving advice and hear it from the horses mouth so to speak. It was useful to see where they were in agreement and where there were differences.” This event will be held annually from now on.

- The Department has now set up a formal mentoring scheme, and all academic staff hired within the last five years have been offered a mentor. However, we also offer the opportunity to chose the gender of their mentor, either male or female, if they wish. So far take up is low (only two have taken it up), but this will now be offered to all new staff (Action 4.7). We have discussed how to avoid the risk of overburdening female academics but feel the numbers of new staff is generally small and so this will not be a problem initially. Nevertheless, we will monitor this going forward. But as well as this more formal arrangement, the department has agreed a small budget for “women’s lunches”, an informal forum to discuss the issues associated with being a female academic, provide networking opportunities, and the group will also make suggestions to the SAT for additional actions.

- At an Athena SWAN SAT meeting, all permanent female members of staff with children identified managing child-care while at conferences, research trips or on fieldwork as being a major issue in their work-life balance and access to promotion. This led to (i) the setting up of a departmental budget for childcare while away on departmental business (fieldtrips and away days), and (ii) encouraging staff to use and apply for a childcare budget as part of their travel costs in grants. Two members of staff (one female and one male) took advantage of the departmental budget and one (female) charged childcare costs to a grant before finance stopped paying them after realizing that this was not part of UCL policy. We challenged this, arguing that these are parents’ expenses, not those of family members, and indeed they are allowed by RCUK. This went up to Senior Management who agreed with us and changed the policy. However, in doing so UCL imposed a cap of only £200 a year for any member of staff, with the intention of creating equity across the institution for staff not on grant funding. We are not satisfied that this is the fairest way of managing expenses and, on the whole, not supportive of gender equality so have taken this up with UCL’s 50:50 gender equality group with a view to having the cap removed. We consider it an important part of the SAT’s role to have a positive influence on how UCL-wide policy works in practice on the ground and will continue to do this with other issues via our Faculty SWAN Lead.

- A postgraduate/postdoctoral research seminar series has been set up on Fridays to allow all our young researchers the opportunity to give an informal 50 minute seminar on their research in the summer term. This is organised by one female and one male student, however, the first year did not produce equal numbers of male and female speakers, perhaps because it is up to researchers to volunteer. The programme is only in its second year and we continue to monitor it for gender balance, and perhaps take an active role in ensuring all postgraduates and postdocs give at least one talk during their time here.

- All postdocs and PhD students are actively encouraged and invited to meet and network with visiting scientists. This is important for their future career.
Significant progress has been made so far, however, we have a number of actions planned to continue improving the support for the career development of our staff and students (see action plan).

**Career development**

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

(i) **Promotion and career development** – comment on the appraisal and career development process, and promotion criteria and whether these take into consideration responsibilities for teaching, research, administration, pastoral work and outreach work; is quality of work emphasised over quantity of work?

Professors are appraised annually, all others are appraised bi-annually and proceed in accordance with UCL’s criteria. Consideration is given for teaching, research and enabling (which includes administration, pastoral and outreach work) in appraisals and promotion. Staff are expected to contribute to all three. Quality is emphasised over quantity.

Appraisals provide the opportunity to discuss promotion, pay, and general career development and at a discussion of the SAT, this appears to be working for both men and women. However, as we are not a large department, the current HoD has encouraged staff to discuss all aspects of their career with him informally at any time, and many staff take that route as well. This ensures that staff are provided with a consistent view, but we also believe a more informal route outside of the appraisal is appreciated, particularly by female members of staff (see case studies). Indeed nearly all female staff have been successfully promoted in the last few years. We expect our new mentoring programme to provide yet another alternative view on career development. Monitoring the way the Department provides advice on career development via these three routes will be part of the future staff survey (Action 5.1).

Postdocs are appraised by their academic supervisor bi-annually in the same way. We are currently having a discussion as to whether this might be better done by someone who is not their direct supervisor.

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

The Earth Sciences Department warmly welcomes new members of staff. They are personally introduced to current members of staff, shown around the department and given help getting started. They are encouraged to eat lunch in the Academic Common room, which is adjacent to us and used by many members of the Earth Sciences staff. All new staff do the on-line equality training, and female members of staff are informed of the UCL Women’s group, and all Earth Science activities. They are also strongly encouraged
to come to our twice termly “Meet the Staff” evenings (see later). New members of staff have personally commented on how well they have integrated and been supported from the outset.

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

PhD students are treated in a similar way to postdoctoral researchers and have the benefit of career talks, grant writing workshops, the opportunity to give a research talk, as well as mock interviews when appropriate (see section 4(b) above).

Earth Sciences has not allocated mentors to postgraduate students, but this is currently being implemented (organised initially by Dr Philip Pogge von Stradmann, Action 2.3) and a choice of mentor gender will be given. Recognition for this job will be given in appraisals in the normal way, and will be part of the workload model.

We have a small budget for a social evening for postgraduates to get together and discuss issues of being a female postgraduate. The first of which was held last year, but the turnout was less than we expected and we are looking to improve this. We also have a regular Friday evening social event in our “Rock Room”. This is well attended by all postgraduates and helps to make them feel more connected to the department. This is part of the overall strategy to make the Department feel inclusive to all.

**Organisation and culture**

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

(i) **Male and female representation on committees** – provide a breakdown by committee and explain any differences between male and female representation. Explain how potential members are identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Syllabus</th>
<th>Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>13/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>15/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the size of our Department, movement and rotation between committees is not common. Moreover, committee work is not onerous and most committees only meet termly for two hours. There are exceptions. The Space Committee has had more work than usual due to major building renovations. The Chair is a female professor and it is sensible for her to continue until the work is complete, however this has been recognised in our workload model. Athena SWAN has a much higher percentage of female to male members than the department as a whole, but this is understandable given its remit. The other committees have broadly the same male to female ratio as the Department as a whole. The Management Committee is major decision–making body in the Department and we comment on that in section b) below.

(ii) Female:male ratio of academic and research staff on fixed-term contracts and open-ended (permanent) contracts – comment on any differences between male and female staff representation on fixed-term contracts and say what is being done to address them.

All academic and research staff are on permanent contracts, with the exception of postdocs and fellows. Movement between a fixed-term and open-ended contract is always via an advertised position. UCL only uses fixed term contracts where someone is employed for less than 9 months (e.g. for maternity cover). All other staff are on ‘open ended’ contracts. However, research staff with limited funding have open ended contracts with a funding end date. The gender balance of staff on these contracts are shown in figure 11 above. All staff therefore have the same access to UCL policies and benefits – for example maternity/parental leave (from the first day of employment) or flexible working. Effort is made to retain research staff, and those whose funding is coming to an end are added to the UCL redeployment register. Postdocs all receive an exit interview where the next steps in their career are discussed. Activities to support our post docs transition to academic roles have been described above.

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

(i) Representation on decision-making committees – comment on evidence of gender equality in the mechanism for selecting representatives. What evidence is there that women are encouraged to sit on a range of influential committees inside and
outside the department? How is the issue of ‘committee overload’ addressed where there are small numbers of female staff?

The main decision making body is the Management Committee, which is comprised of the HOD, three academics and the Department Manager. All the academic representatives on the committee are male. This is very clearly far from an ideal situation and is recognised as such by the SAT and by the Management Committee itself. However, the members of the Management Committee are on the committee because they have the substantive administrative roles in the department (Director of Teaching, Director of Research and Postgraduate Tutor). The SAT considers that the need for representation must be balanced against the risk of burdening female members of staff with administratively heavy roles in order to sit on the Management Group, and thus potentially impacting on their research output. Nor is there a desire to create a token role. The Department is quite small (33 permanent academics, only 8 female) and so we are mindful of committee overload for the sake of it. Nevertheless, major roles in the Department are rotated every three years and so opportunities to take one for career development are regularly open for all staff.

However, it should not be taken that women are not involved in the decision making of the Department since that is not the case. For instance, the Space Committee is chaired by a woman and the current KLB renovations make this an extremely important role for the future of the Department. The Geophysics degree director, Undergraduate Tutor and Natural Sciences stream director are roles held by women. The Director of the Centre for Polar Observation and Modelling (an important NERC funded centre in our Department) is a woman. Moreover, the SAT itself now has responsibility for auditing a number of important Management Committee’s decisions, such as workload, promotions and flexible working to mitigate against any bias in decision making.

All members of staff, men and women are encouraged to sit on influential committees outside the department as appropriate. The Department does not take exceptional action for women on committees outside department, but considers them in the same way as our own committees and as part of workload management (see next section). Any opportunities we are aware of at Faculty or UCL level are circulated to all academic staff.

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

Workload allocation is the responsibility of the HOD in consultation with the Management Committee. Allocation of jobs is guided by a model where research, teaching and enabling adds up to 1 FTE (or less in the case of part time staff). However, this model can lead to a skewed distribution of teaching and administration strongly favouring those with high grant income and so the workload algorithm is now used only as a guide. The Management Committee is instead guided by these other principles: a) all staff teach at least one module; b) junior staff are protected in order to allow them to build up their research; c) there is no gender bias; d) whether a job would be particularly good for a career; e) being bad at a job does not get you out of it. This last point is of relevance here since in our Department, men are by far the worst offenders.
Major roles in the department, such as Recruitment Officer, postgraduate tutor, Director of Research, etc. are now to be considered for rotation every three years. As discussed earlier, all workloads (teaching, enabling, outreach, etc) are considered positively in cases for promotion and in appraisals.

Last year the Athena SWAN SAT asked the HOD to be allowed to annually monitor the workload. This was agreed; currently women in the department have, on average, a slightly lower teaching and administrative workload than men. This is because some women are still quite new to the Department and we particularly protect new staff, rather than the result of direct action to give female staff members lower workloads than men. However, it also shows that our workload allocation model is working and is not overloading women and producing gender bias.

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

During the last two years, the SAT has made a number of important changes to departmental timings. All meetings are now held in school term and in core hours (10am to 4pm). For example, the seminar series was moved from 5pm to 6pm, to 12am to 1pm.

There are two main social events held in the department: the annual party held at the HOD’s house, and a termly “Meet your Staff” event where a member of staff shares some element of their research with the others in a friendly and informal way, (more information about these events in section iv). Given the social nature of these events, about half of them are held in the evening. However, these are all in the diary at least two months in advance so as to allow family arrangements, and of course family members are welcome, and indeed do, attend too. There is also a regular Women’s Lunch event arranged, obviously, at lunchtime but at a suitable date for all. Christmas parties and leavers parties are also held at lunchtimes.

(iv) Culture – demonstrate how the department is female-friendly and inclusive. ‘Culture’ refers to the language, behaviours and other informal interactions that characterise the atmosphere of the department, and includes all staff and students.

The first female professor in our Department was promoted in 2009. We now have four female professors and two readers and it is difficult to overestimate the effect that such a cohort of senior female academics has had on the culture and the female-friendliness of the Department. They are role models for the PhD students and postdocs, and they are attracting ambitious female students and postdocs. Although we cannot claim to have eradicated all inappropriate language in the Department — and indeed some staff occasionally try to shock — there is a consensus around what is and isn’t acceptable, and staff feel confident in challenging others in rare occasions where inappropriate comments are made.

At the very first meeting of the Athena SWAN SAT, it was observed that only 3 of 42 external speakers in the last two years were women. This was a staggeringly poor proportion, despite the fact that one of the co-organisers of the seminar series was herself female. We promptly emailed the current seminar organizer and we have in the two years since had over 50% female speakers, which is a 700% increase. All staff are expected to suggest female speakers each year.
One of the female Professors now organizes an annual all Department staff party at her house in London; before she began this three years ago, the last such party was in mid-1990s. Another female professor arranges a twice termly “Meet your Staff” evenings, which provides a light hearted and friendly introduction to different staff groups, again a totally new and fun way of interacting. And there is now a better staff gender balance at annual student events such as the Christmas party, graduation, etc.

More senior female staff can now regularly attend undergraduate field trips. This both spreads the load more evenly, but also allows students to benefit from seeing a different side to more members of female staff.

In the very recent UCL-wide staff survey, only one person in our department felt that UCL was not committed to equal opportunities. And a large majority indicated a strong sense of belonging to the department. Unfortunately the gender breakdown of this is not available to us.

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

There is a high level of outreach participation by both male and female staff. These are aimed both primary and secondary school children. For instance, “Box Office Blunders” where students are shown clips from popular films and invited to find scientific blunders as well factually correct content. We have obtained funding from NERC for a GeoBus to visit school with interesting hands-on activities. Our overall outreach coordinator is female (Prof. Vocadlo), but male and female staff participate in outreach to about the same extent.

Outreach is considered part of enabling at UCL, and as such is fully recognised, and indeed expected, in the workload allocation model mentioned above and appraisals and promotions.
Flexibility and managing career breaks

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

(i) Maternity return rate – comment on whether maternity return rate in the department has improved or deteriorated and any plans for further improvement. If the department is unable to provide a maternity return rate, please explain why.

During the last six years, five female academics took maternity leave. They all returned.

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

During the last six years, five male academics took paternity leave. Four returned. The one that didn’t was a postdoc whose parental leave coincided with the end of his contract.

(iii) Numbers of applications and success rates for flexible working by gender and grade – comment on any disparities. Where the number of women in the department is small applicants may wish to comment on specific examples.
As discussed below, flexible working is generally agreed informally and so there are no official success rates. One person asked for flexible hours formally as part of her hiring agreement and was allowed this.

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

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

Academics/researchers in the Dept. of Earth Sciences enjoy flexible working as part of the positive working culture in the department, and it is a major attraction of the job. Most academics in the department, and UCL more broadly, do not, therefore, have or require formal flexible arrangements. When these are requested, the Department follows the UCL policy and guidelines on flexible working (www.ucl.ac.uk/hr/docs/work_life_balance.php). The Athena SWAN SAT has asked to have oversight of any flexible working arrangements to ensure that these are fair and reasonable, and are audited annually by the SAT. Flexible working arrangement are known to all our staff, as well as UCL-wide as evidenced by the 2013 Staff Survey showing the 90% (92% women) responded positively to the question “my work time can be flexible”. And in 2015, 93% of staff responded positively to the question “As long as I get my work done, I have a choice deciding how I do my work”. As an example of the Department’s openness to flexible working, two of our academics have families living in France and so their teaching and administrative responsibilities are not scheduled on Mondays or Fridays, unless they proactively choose otherwise. All staff with families benefit from the Departmental policy of not arranging meetings during school holidays. One formal arrangement was made (Case study 1) with a newly appointed lecturer during the final year of the HOD; in order to ensure proper continuity, the HOD in waiting was asked to sign-off on these at the same time. Flexible working extends to all staff, and the Departmental Manager prefers to commute in after the rush hours and so her office hours start at 11 am.

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

UCL has comprehensive policies on maternity/paternity/adoption/shared parental leave (www.ucl.ac.uk/hr/docs/parental-leave.php), which includes 18 weeks full pay for maternity leave, four weeks for paternity leave (which we believe is the best in sector), and a one term extra sabbatical from teaching and admin when returning so they can focus on their research. However, it became clear during Athena SWAN meetings that how exactly this was acted upon had significant consequences for new parents before and after leave. The SAT were extremely concerned to discover that maternity leavers felt they were responsible for making their own arrangement to cover their teaching and other administrative duties while on leave. Indeed, this led one female academic to return early from maternity leave in order not to ‘inconvenience’ a colleague who would have to teach for her. For the same reason, parents did not take advantage of UCL’s policy for taking one extra term of sabbatical after maternity leave in order to quickly re-establish their
research. It should be said that this has not been the deliberate intention of the Dept. or HOD but is an unintended consequence of conscientious staff not wishing to inconvenience their colleagues, and not enough communication from the department outlining the opportunities for staff returning from leave. In order to mitigate against this and allow staff to take full advantage of UCL’s parental leave policies, the Earth Science Department has agreed a new policy on top of UCL’s that: a) parents have no responsibility whatsoever in finding their own replacements for their teaching and/or administrative duties while on parental leave or the following sabbatical, and b) the Department will budget for adequate cover rather than automatically expect other staff to provide the replacement. This was announced at the Staff Meeting and the policy sent via email, and has already been taken up by one female academic.

The policy, along with all information on shared parental leave, will be incorporated into our new Athena SWAN web pages later this year (Action 3.1). It will also be part of the new starters pack.

(4390 words)

5. Any other comments: maximum 500 words

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

Our data tells us that we need more support for postdocs. As well the actions described elsewhere in the document, we provide all postdocs expecting fellowship or job interviews a mock interview. This is done in conjunction with our most experienced staff and will often be repeated, even twice or three times. Our experience is that these are highly valued and appreciated by the postdocs. We have recently changed our careers officer and he has met with a member of SAT and with UCL careers centre to see if more can be done to provide information for postgraduates and postdocs on jobs outside of academia. This has led to more information on suitable events being passed on to them. For instance, they were encouraged to sign up for an STFC careers event for PhD students. More needs to be done though.

As discussed before, we have not performed our own staff survey yet. The results for the 2015 UCL wide staff survey have, however, just been released and we have been provided with the results for Earth Sciences. The Department is currently preparing a response to the survey and this is currently being written. Unfortunately, only nine female members of staff responded and so we are not provided with the female breakdown. However, we are provided with male breakdown. This is providing us with evidence for areas to examine in detail in our survey (Action 5.1). For instance, the male response and average response agrees well with the question “the people I work with cooperate to get the work done” (72% of staff responding positively) suggesting that women feel the same as men. However significantly more men than the average agree with the question “I am effectively supported by my colleagues” (average – 59%, male response – 71%), suggesting that women are less inclined to agree with that. Our ongoing analysis of these data will provide fruitful guidance for our own survey.

In February 90% of our permanent staff attended a workshop on unconscious bias. This was very well received and we will extend this to postdocs next year.
The Department has also signed the UCLU pledge to Zero Tolerance to Sexual Harassment, and some of our students have attended UCLU organised workshops, although we have not been provided with numbers yet. Signing the pledge means we have committed to:

- To never tolerate, condone or ignore sexual harassment of any kind.
- To educate students and staff about sexual harassment and why it’s never ok.
- To support students and staff when they talk about, report or challenge sexual harassment.

Finally our building is undergoing a major refurbishment. As this proceeds, we will look for opportunities to name rooms after female academics.

(465 words)

6. Action plan

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

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

SEE APPENDIX

7. Case study: impacting on individuals: maximum 1000 words

Describe how the department’s SWAN activities have benefitted two individuals working in the department. One of these case studies should be a member of the self assessment team, the other someone else in the department. More information on case studies is available in the guidance.

Case study A: Dr Ana Ferriera (SAT member)

I joined UCL Earth Sciences as a lecturer in September 2013. Previously I was a permanent lecturer in another UK university, where I was scientifically isolated and had a heavy administrative and teaching load. Although I managed to build and lead my own research group and undertake world-class research work, I often had to work very long hours to maintain my research activities, leading to a poor work-life balance. When preparing for the birth of my son in 2012, it became obvious that it was not sustainable to work for such long hours in the future. With no perspectives for new hirings in my area and with the upcoming retirement of a colleague that would have increased my teaching duties, I applied for a new job at UCL. I was interviewed when my son was one-month old, and UCL allowed me to come just for the day for my interview, rather than staying overnight, which enabled me to meet my family’s needs (notably breastfeeding). When negotiating my job, a family-friendly written agreement was set with the Head of School, allowing me: (i) to work from home 2-3 days per week (provided that there were no major clashes with departmental duties), to facilitate my family arrangements, including the fact that my partner, a researcher, might have to work away from London; (ii) to take up a minimum of time-consuming administrative roles in my first years at UCL; (iii) to avoid whenever
possible duties involving long periods away from home, such as leading field courses in my first years at UCL.

Shortly before starting at UCL, my partner took a unique job opportunity in Northern France. Given the lower costs of childcare in France and the family support that we have there, my partner and son moved to France whereas I commute between London and France. While we are trying to find ways to be all together in London, for now this allows us to achieve the best possible work-life balance for the three of us, given our circumstances. This would not have been possible without UCL’s support, both formally and informally, notably through departmental assistance and help from colleagues in accommodating my needs in the department’s activities whenever possible. As a result of UCL’s support and of a well-organised on- and off-site working schedule, my personal and professional development greatly accelerated. Indeed, since joining UCL, I have: (i) achieved very high student feedback scores in my teaching; (ii) almost doubled my list of publications and improved its quality; (iii) built a large new research group (currently with 50% female participation); (iv) secured highly-competitive funding, notably from the National Environmental Research Council. Finally, in 2014-2015 I was encouraged to apply for promotion to Readership, which was successful.

Being part of UCL Earth Sciences and of the department’s Athena SWAN working group made me realize the importance of having a positive, diverse workplace with flexible working practices that meet individual’s needs. I now feel that it is my turn to give back and help other women to have access to similar opportunities.

Case Study B: Prof. Lidunka Vocadlo

I have been in the Department for 27 years. During this time I have had three children and recently the Department’s approach to flexible working has been instrumental to my academic success. With three boys, the youngest of which is five, life can get quite demanding. I cannot think of any other environment where my family-first approach has been accommodated so well and strongly supported by the Heads of Department. Indeed, I became the first female professor this department has ever had - this was down to the recognition by my then Head of Department that my research, teaching and enabling record was as good as many of the existing professors, yet I did not have the confidence to put myself forward. With his support and encouragement, I was able so to do, with success.

The Head of Department supported my suggestion to set up a women’s lunchtime group. This allows me to offer a networking opportunity to all female fellows and long-term postdocs in order to help develop their career paths; this forum provided an excellent means to discuss the issues associated with being a woman in, essentially, a man’s world. There were so many common problems that were shared, and while not necessarily solved, it enabled us at least to not feel so isolated. I would like to think that, certainly in one or two cases, this initiative proved both useful and effective. Since then I have seen the number of active female research staff increase five-fold, significantly changing the dynamic within meetings and corridors for the better. We know we are still in the minority, but having more women around is very welcome. The current Head of Department has been incredibly supportive in my efforts to get childcare costs onto the UCL expenses agenda; we have been moderately successful and I will continue to influence UCL policy in this area. I also find my Head supportive of other initiatives I have made, for example Meet the Staff. Most of the social activity is geared towards larger sectors of the Department (undergraduates, postgraduates and postdocs), but there was little for the permanent staff.
This twice-termly event has proved to be very successful, increasing the engagement of all staff, including the women.

With the support of this Department I now have good research income, a number of postdocs, PhD students and related researchers, whilst maintaining a flourishing family.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Issues/areas for action</th>
<th>Planned actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Accountability (SAT member)</th>
<th>Person responsible</th>
<th>Success criteria and outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1  | Improve gender balance of UG students, and encourage more women to apply for UCL Earth Sciences degrees.                                                                                                                                  | i) UG Recruitment Officer to attend SAT meeting annually to discuss recruitment data and methods.  
ii) Ensure that potential students and parents encounter both male and female staff in person during open days  
iii) Work by female academics to feature in all recruitment talks  
iv) Generate “Women in Earth Sciences” page to departmental UG recruitment website.  
v) Fundamental re-think of advertising and whether it encourages women to apply. Hold focus group from current UGs. | 2016/17. Reviewed annually.  
UCAS days 2016/17 onwards  
2017/18 | Paul Bown                | Pieter Vermeesch (UG Recruitment Officer) and Lidunka Vodadlo (Recruitment Committee)                                                                                 | 50-50 gender balance on applicants, offers and acceptances |
| 1.2  | Few UG students are aware of the Athena SWAN scheme, or of efforts to address gender imbalances.                                                                                                                                          | i) Athena SWAN activities to be publicised via email, student boards, websites and introduction leaflets.  
ii) Annual Athena SWAN UG event – i.e. career talks with Q&A.  
iii) Funds will be set aside for a creative project by UG students (e.g. a short film about sexism in Earth Sciences). | To begin academic year  
Autumn 2016/17  
2017/18 | Anjali Goswmai            | All SAT                                                                                                                                   | 100% UG students aware of aims of Athena SWAN.  
Assessed via the annual UG student survey. |
| 1.3  | Opportunity for women undergraduates to request female personal tutor                                                                                                                                   | Design a way to offer incoming UGs option of m/f tutor and implement. | To be implemented for 2017/18 cohort. | John Brodholt | Wendy Kirk (Undergraduate Tutor) | 100% of female undergraduates able to choose a female personal tutor.  
100% of those who |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Postgraduate recruitment and support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Improve gender balance of PG students, and encourage women to apply for UCL Earth Sciences degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) SAT and PG tutor to meet yearly to discuss recruitment methods. Ensure that 50:50 balance in 2015/16 is maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Ensure female academics are visible in all advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Generate “Women in Earth Sciences” page and tie to departmental PG recruitment website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st quarter of academic year 2016/17 and annually thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carolina Lithgow-Bertelloni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graham Shields (Postgraduate Tutor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50:50 gender balance on all applicants, offers and acceptances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of visits to website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Lack of peer mentoring for PG students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Develop peer mentoring scheme within PG student cohort (i.e. 3rd years mentor new students).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) All PG students offered a peer mentor, with choice of male/female mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016/17 Begin 2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Pogge von Strandmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graham Shields (Postgraduate Tutor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of new intake of PG students have a peer mentor of requested gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction will be monitored by annual PG survey. Also check satisfaction of mentors with respect to workload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Opportunity for women postgraduates to request female staff mentor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish and put in place a mechanism for female students to be offered a female mentor, separate from any academic supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Pogge von Strandmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graham Shields (Postgraduate Tutor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | 100% postgraduates offered female personal tutors. 100% of female personal tutors are satisfied with their
### 2.4 PG students are not aware of the Athena SWAN scheme, or of efforts to address gender imbalances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>tutoring workload. Data collected via annual survey.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| i) Drive to engage PG students in Athena Swan activities by publicising the information on student boards, websites and introduction leaflets, and promoting during career path talks.  
ii) Careers lectures and advice given by internal and external female speakers sponsored by Athena SWAN SAT.  
iii) Annual Athena SWAN social evening with informal discussion on issues facing female academics. Open to all postgraduates (male and female). Invite people from other departments where Athena SWAN is more established. | 2016/17 | Bridget Wade | Bridget Wade and all SAT | 100% of PG students are aware of Athena SWAN actions, as reflected in PG survey after two years.  
Monitor via annual PG survey. |
|   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |

### 3 Staff Recruitment

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| i) All current staff expected to actively encourage appropriate female academics to apply for jobs by encouraging appropriate female candidates.  
ii) Departmental web site to contain a high level of female academic content.  
iii) Departmental Athena SWAN web pages to be designed and visible from Departmental home page.  
iv) Information about role of | All actions to begin 2016/17.  
Jan 2017  
Jan 2017 | John Brodholt | All SAT and all Staff. | Increase to 40% number of women applying for permanent academic jobs.  
Increase to 50% number of women applying for postdocs. |
<p>| | | | | |
|   |   |   |   |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>Increase number of female academic staff and postdocs.</th>
<th>Athena SWAN and gender equality in departmental decision making, flexible working, childcare, maternity policy, etc. is provided to potential candidates. To be done via combination of web site and pamphlet.</th>
<th>Summer 2017</th>
<th>John Brodholt and Leisa Clemente</th>
<th>Lars Stixrude (HoD)</th>
<th>45% of postdocs are female by 2019. 40% permanent academic staff are female by 2021. HR database to show that all staff have such training.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Increase female representation on committees without increasing their workload.</td>
<td>As well as 3.1 above: i) Monitor all recruitment panels for postdocs to ensure they meet UCL policy and include at least one female member of academic staff. Departmental manager/HR to identify appropriate person if needed. ii) All recruitment panels for permanent academics to have at least two female members of academic staff. iii) All members of recruitment panels to undergo UCL’s online equality and diversity training and unconscious bias training.</td>
<td>From 2016/17</td>
<td>John Brodholt</td>
<td>Lars Stixrude (Head of Department)</td>
<td>Each committee has female representation. Committee workload balance is proportionate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Childcare costs when staff member away on departmental business (e.g. fieldwork,</td>
<td>i) Department to influence UCL. on capping childcare costs at £200 p.a. when away on work related business.</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>John Brodholt</td>
<td>Lidunka Vocadlo</td>
<td>Limit of £200 is removed. 100% of staff...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.3 | **Female applications for promotion.** | i) Perform annual review of all staff to identify and encourage suitable female staff to apply for promotion.  
ii) Offer mentor to promotion applicants. | 2016/17 | All SAT | Lars Stixrude (HoD) | 100% of staff satisfied with support provided by department for promotion and pay increases. |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4.4 | **Teaching and admin workload biases in staff.** | Admin and teaching workload spread sheets will be provided by HOD and audited annually by Athena Swan SAT. Issues identified to be reported to and acted on by HOD. | Annually | Leisa Clemente | Lars Stixrude (HoD) and SAT | 90% of men and women satisfied with their workload (both type and amount). Monitored via annual survey. |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4.5 | **Enact new Departmental policy on maternity/paternity / shared parental leave.** | i) Ensure all staff know that they are not expected to find own replacements for their teaching/enabling during maternity/paternity leave.  
ii) Ensure replacements for teaching does not fall on existing staff but will be covered by replacement staff at UCL cost.  
iii) Policy is clearly presented on Departmental and Athena SWAN web pages and all new staff are informed. | 2016 and ongoing | Paul Bown | Lesia Clemente (Dept. Manager and HR) | Policy given to 100% of new and potential parents.  
100% of staff satisfied that policy works. Monitored in annual survey. |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4.6 | **Getting back into research after maternity/paternity / shared parental leave.** | Ensure that staff members coming back from maternity/paternity leave can get back up to speed quickly with their work, by:  
i) Assigning a mentor on return, | 2016/17 | Paul Bown | Lars Stixrude (HoD) | 100% return from parental leave.  
100% satisfied by support from |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.7</th>
<th>Mentoring opportunities for all staff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| i) All new staff members will be offered the opportunity to have a staff mentor.  
ii) Mentorship will be recognised in appraisal and promotion case.  
iii) Mentoring workload to be included in Departmental workload model and monitored by SAT. | From 2016/17  
From 2017/18  
From 2017/18 | Ana Ferreira  
Lesia Clemente (Dept. Manager and HR)  
Lar Stixrude (HoD)  
SAT and HoD | HoD  
100% of new staff have a mentor.  
All HoD supporting letters to contain appropriate information.  
100% staff feel mentoring workload to be at an appropriate level. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.8</th>
<th>Assist staff in gaining grant funding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| i) All grant applications will be peer-reviewed within the department before submission.  
ii) Departmental grant success rates to be monitored for differences between genders, and increased support from successful grant writers to be provided when needed. | 2016/17 and ongoing. | John Brodholt  
John Brodholt (Director of Research) | HoD  
Grant success rates for women should be at equal to men's. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.9</th>
<th>Design of a new building allows infrastructure change, easing child-care duties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Incorporate breast-feeding/changing facility into refurbished Kathleen Lonsdale Building. | 2016/17 | Anjali Goswami  
Lidunka Vocadlo (Chair Space Committee) | HoD  
Satisfactory facilities as monitored via annual survey. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.10</th>
<th>Improvement of working environment and culture for women and other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ensure that all staff complete online training in Equality and Diversity. | 2016/17 | Ana Ferreira  
Ana Ferreira | HoD  
100% of staff have undertaken training. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th><strong>Departmental culture</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1</strong> Need to obtain regular data on staff views</td>
<td>Perform staff survey every two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2</strong> New staff unaware of provisions available for flexible working, maternity/paternity / shared parental leave cover, ability to bring children to work, etc.</td>
<td>Write Athena SWAN induction pack for staff which includes information additional to UCL's (<a href="http://www.ucl.ac.uk/hr/qualities/gender/FINALguidance_updatedJun2015.pdf">http://www.ucl.ac.uk/hr/qualities/gender/FINALguidance_updatedJun2015.pdf</a>). Distribute upon arrival, and highlight again during probation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.3</strong> Promoting women in science to UG and PG students and staff.</td>
<td>Monitor and maintain 50:50 gender balance of speakers at departmental events. Staff to be regularly encouraged to suggest appropriate female speakers. Gender balance of speakers to be reported annually to Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.4</strong> Unconscious bias in staff.</td>
<td>i) All new staff to receive on-line unconscious bias training. ii) Make unconscious bias training part of probation. iii) Renewal of unconscious bias training for all current staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.5</strong> Informing staff of Athena SWAN progress and activities.</td>
<td>The Athena SWAN report will be a standing item at all staff meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5.6 No undergraduate or postdoctoral representation on SAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruit UG and postdoc to SAT</td>
<td>By end of 2016</td>
<td>John Brodholt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5.7 Expanding on good practice learnt during SWAN exercise, by informing other departments of lessons learnt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) SAT team will attend UCL wide SAT training and seminars.</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>John Brodholt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) SAT team to present to other departments in the MAPS faculty our experience</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>John Brodholt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>All SAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representatives in place

Appropriate number of events attended. Positive feedback on events we present at.