Table of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Ear Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>Self Assessment Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAQ</td>
<td>Self Assessment Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDR</td>
<td>Post Doctoral Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT</td>
<td>Post Graduate Taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGR</td>
<td>Post Graduate Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Under-graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The self-assessment process – 996 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;

Institute Director, Professor McAlpine initiated the Athena SWAN application process. In May 2011, Dr Bizley took on the position of Academic Lead and formed a Self-Assessment Team (SAT) from volunteers within the Institute, having first attended meetings for SWAN leads within the Faculty of Brain Sciences and in the School of Life and Medical Sciences (SLMS). Currently, the SAT comprises 8 female (one on maternity leave) and 3 male members.

**SAT members:**

**May 2011-present:**
- Dr Jennifer Bizley, Research Fellow
- Dr Maria Chait, Reader in Auditory Cognitive Neuroscience
- Dr Bridgitte Harley, Lecturer in Audiology
- Dr Dan Jagger, Senior Lecturer in Auditory Cell Physiology
- Prof David McAlpine, Director, Professor of Auditory Neuroscience
- Dr Debi Vickers, Senior Lecturer in Audiology
- Dr Ifat Yasin, Senior Lecturer in Audiology

**September 2013 – present:**
- Dr Jimena Ballestero, Post-doctoral research fellow
- Dr Cherilee Rutherford, Lecturer in Audiology
- Mr Matthew Topping, PhD student
- Ms Katherine Wood, PhD student

**May 2011 – July 2013:**
- Mr David Greenberg, PhD student
- Dr Rosie Lovett, Post-doctoral researcher
Dr Jimena Ballestero joined the SAT in Sept 2013. She joined the EI in 2012 moving from Argentina. She has taken a lead on developing our staff Welcome packs.

Dr Jennifer Bizley joined the Institute in April 2010 as a Royal Society Fellow. As the departmental lead, she formed the SAT, chaired meetings, led the design and implementation of the SAQ, co-organised the careers day and drafted the application.

Dr Maria Chait is a Reader at the EI. She has two children and has taken maternity leave since joining the Institute in 2007. She has played a key role in the analysis performed by the SAT, the development of the mentoring program and the careers day.

Mr David Greenberg was a PhD student and now post-doc in the Institute and helped develop and implement the student SAQ.

Dr Bridgitte Harley is a lecturer in Audiology. She is currently on maternity leave, but will return in December 2013.

Dr Dan Jagger joined the EI as a Royal Society Research Fellow at its inception and is now a Senior Lecturer. He was key to developing the Action Plan, and to the organisation of the careers day.

Dr Rosemary Lovett was instrumental in contributing her perspective as an early career researcher. She worked at the EI between 2010-13, (currently at NICE).

Prof David McAlpine is the Director of the EI. He has been instrumental in championing the cause of gender equality and led the development of the Action Plan.

Dr Cherilee Rutherford is a lecturer in clinical audiology at the EI. She took a 9 month maternity leave following the birth of her second child, in 2011, and subsequently worked part time (4 days a week) for a period of a few months.

Dr Deborah Vickers is a Senior Lecturer in Audiology. She has been a member of the Institute since 2006 and has a young daughter. She contributes the perspective of the teaching staff.

Mr Matthew Topping is a 1st year PhD student. He inputs the perspective of research students, particularly those aspiring to academic careers.

Ms Katherine Wood is a third year PhD student. Katherine has helped collate data and prepare graphs for the application.

Dr Ifat Yasin is a Senior Lecturer in Audiology. As a member of UCL’s 50:50 committee, Ifat has played a key role in shaping gender policies both within and beyond the Institute.

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

The SAT has met approximately monthly during term time from its inception in May 2012. Over the summer of 2012, the SAT developed two Self Assessment Questionnaire (SAQs), oriented towards either students or staff. As a small Institute, the SAT was aware that targeting smaller sub-groups with tailor-made questionnaires risked compromising anonymity which, in turn, could have engendered a reluctance to participate. We encouraged administrative staff to complete the questionnaire as it was recognized that they could make a valuable contribution to an assessment of the atmosphere and ethos of the Institute. In September 2012, the SAT launched both SAQs as on-line ‘Google docs’. Participation in the SAQ was high, with 76% of staff (40/52 academic staff and 5 administrators, Fig.1) and 69% of students (17/25) responding. We considered a variety of statistical data relating to staff and student composition, turn-over etc. and applied statistical analysis where appropriate.
The SAQ data were presented to the SAT in December 2012, and discussions were focussed on interpreting the data and developing measures for the Action Plan (AP). The AP was initiated in January 2013 by Prof McAlpine, together with Drs Jagger, Bizley and Lovett, and later drafted by Prof McAlpine and Dr Jagger, with SAT members undertaking to implement specific actions. The AP is available to all EI members on the new ‘resources’ website, which has both raised awareness of actions and generated suggestions for new ones. An integral part of the AP is to repeat the SAQ biennially to track progress over time. In preparation for this application we ran a mini-questionnaire in October to gauge impact on a number of specific points (outlined in the application).

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 termly to oversee the development and implementation of the AP. Each section of the AP has measurable goals to be implemented according to a clear timetable. A member of the SAT has been nominated to complete each action point, with another named individual responsible for monitoring and evaluating the progress made. The Director will play a key role in the more strategic actions and the Institute manager assumes responsibility for actions that require Institute-wide monitoring. We will ensure continuity of the SAT by annual reviews of its composition (AP:4.6), reported on the new Athena SWAN section of our website (www.ucl.ear/athenaswan, AP:4.3). The AP itself will be reviewed annually by the SAT, and the result of this will be reported back to the Institute’s strategy team. The HoD sits on both the SAT and the strategy team thus ensuring the AP is embedded with the Institute’s short and long term strategy.
3. A picture of the department – 2000 words

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

The Ear Institute is part of the Faculty of Brain Sciences, within the School of Life and Medical Sciences (Fig.2). Created in 2005, it brought together, on a single site, scientists and their research groups from across UCL, from fields as diverse as human genetics, biophysics, and systems neuroscience. Since that time, world-leading academics have been joined by some of the world’s best young researchers to create a genuinely collaborative research environment, ensuring that the Ear Institute is geared to deliver on its mission of ‘Understanding Hearing - Fighting Deafness’. Co-location with the Royal National Throat Nose and Ear Hospital has provided opportunities for developing translational research programmes, strengthened through key senior appointments of academic-clinicians. The School of Audiology, which constituted the teaching arm of the Institute of Laryngology and Otology, was merged into the Ear Institute in 2006 to form the current instantiation of the EI. The Institute now has 31 Academic staff and 13 post-docs.

The Institute delivers MSc programmes in Audiology, Audiovestibular Medicine and ENT Medicine, as well as Master-classes that form the central core of Advanced Audiology, an MSc programme that can be undertaken part-time. The department currently has 116 students (37 UG, 58 PGT and 25 PGR).

As a result of continued growth, in 2013 the Institute organized itself along the lines of four Research Units, each led by an academic member of staff. Heads of Research Units serve on the Strategy Team and act in the capacity of line managers to academic members of staff within their Unit.
Figure 2 The EI is comprised (since 2013) of four research units and sits within the Faculty of Brain Sciences.

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.

We do not offer any access or foundation courses, and have no plans to do so.

(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.

**Note: UCL data monitoring runs October-October and the 2012-2013 staff and student data are therefore unavailable at the time of application.**

The Ear Institute no longer offers undergraduate degree programmes - our BSc Audiology degree was terminated following Department of Health changes to training in Audiology. From 2007-2012 the number of female undergraduates was consistently around 80% of the undergraduate intake (80.9% ±0.01%, mean ±SD), in line with national averages (HESA, others in medicine and dentistry (2011/2012)). While national data specifically for audiologists are unavailable, the British Society of Audiology (BSA) noted that programmes tend to be female dominated and other programmes estimate themselves to be ~75% female (e.g. Aston University). To better benchmark our data, we requested information from the BSA concerning membership composition, which reveals a similar proportion of females, for both full and student members (2184 full members, 76.3% female; 284 student members, 79.9% female).
We have no plans to reinstate our UG course and instead are assisting Middlesex University in establishing a BSc in Audiology.

(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.

The Ear Institute currently offers four MSc programmes. The proportion of female students over the previous 3 years averaged 67%, slightly above the national average (HESA, others in medicine and dentistry (2011/2012), Fig.4).
Our MSc in Audiological Sciences programme has been running successfully for a number of years as a 1-year programme with an additional 1-year placement for those wishing to register and practice in the UK. From 2014, a 2-year programme will operate. As a vocational course, it has traditionally recruited females due to the family-friendly working hours. Analysis of current recruitment highlights small numbers of mature and male applicants and recruitment will therefore focus on these populations (AP:1.1). We plan to target working technicians without formal education (typically mature women), offer bursaries to help mature working professionals who cannot afford the fees for two years and offer bursaries for single mothers to support childcare. We are developing an e-learning module to be offered as a free taster to the MSc, and a summer school to include taster placements with the goal of enabling mature students who might not have a strong academic background to enter this vocational course. To support our recruitment plan we have applied to a HEFCE fund to stimulate progression into taught postgraduate education, "particularly among under-represented groups", via the Head of Policy & Partnerships, Vice Provost of Education Office (AP1.1). Our bid was selected as the UCL’s application for this scheme and was submitted 16th September 2013. If successful it will run from Jan 2014 to Aug 2015 (AP:1.1).

(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.

In contrast to its PGT courses, which reflect its heritage as a largely-clinical department (as the Institute of Laryngology and Otology), the EI’s PGR programmes are largely geared towards basic sciences in the ‘STEM’ subjects and draw students from neuroscience, physical sciences, cell biologists, experimental psychologists and geneticists, in addition to audiologists and clinicians. The number of PhD students has increased as the Institute has developed, but the proportion of female students is consistently in line with national averages for similar fields (Fig.5, HESA 2011/12, ‘others in medicine and dentistry’, Subjects allied to medicine, 59% female, Biology 60% female), averaging 64% female over the previous three years.
Figure 5

(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.

We analysed the proportion of applications, offers and acceptances over the last three years. Annual totals are very small, especially for male UG applicants, and PhD student positions, making meaningful comparisons difficult. Since we saw no evidence of any changes across the three years we pooled the data across this period for further analysis (Fig.6).
We observe very little difference in the gender ratios of applicants to offers across our degree programmes; at the UG level, it appears that a slightly higher number of female applicants receive offers, which may be a result of the higher achievement levels of female applicants at secondary level or simply that the quality of applicants is more variable when only a small sample of (male) students is considered. For PGT courses there is negligible difference between the proportions of females applying and receiving offers. For PGR there appears to be a smaller proportion of female applicants receiving offers. We only had data available from 25 of a total of 63 studentships over the last 3 years and interpreting differences on such a small number of studentships is problematic. Those that we do not have data on likely include studentships not advertised by us in open competition – i.e. we have a number of students on four-year programmes run by other departments (e.g. the Wellcome Trust Neuroscience Programme or COMPLEX Computational Biology programme) who choose the EI to complete their PhD projects, as well as some students for whom funding was sought or who self-fund. Our AP includes improved monitoring of PhD applications (AP:1.3) so that we can better identify whether there is an imbalance that we need to address. As with staff recruitment, all PhD interviews include a female on the interview panel, and all staff interviewing have completed recruitment training (standard practice in the EI for several years, AP:3.6,4.5).

(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.

With only one (discontinued) UG course only a small number of degrees are completed annually– a total of 16 (12 female) in both 2010 and 2011 and 25 (21 female) in 2012. We pooled data over three years to give more meaningful numbers. 68% of female students obtained a 2.1 or higher, in comparison to 75% of male students. 15% of females obtained a 1st, compared to 8% of male students.

Over the past 3 years, from a total of 119 students, 6 (2 female) students dropped out of MSc courses, 5 failed (1 female), and 6 (2 female) failed but were awarded a post-graduate diploma. Completion rates were therefore higher for our female students – which may be a consequence of our male students usually being overseas students who are more likely to have language difficulties. We examined PhD completion rates, 16/20 students (7 women) completed within 4 years full-time or 7 years part-time. 4/20 (2 female) took longer, no students dropped out or failed.

**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
The Ear Institute was founded in 2005 by 9 (2 female) Investigators. The Institute now comprises 31 (18 female) members of academic staff and Principle Investigators (PIs).

We benchmarked our data to the national averages for Anatomy and Physiology as our research, unlike our teaching, is predominantly in this area. Our proportion of female professors is inline with the national average of 17% (2011-12 HESA data for Anatomy and Physiology) as are our proportion of female staff performing research only (52% female compared to our 57%), while our ‘research and teaching’ proportions are above the national average (40% female, compared to our value of 58% across lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Reader and Professor grades).
We have identified an under-representation of women at the professorial level. However, as a young Institute it is clear that the number of females has been increasing from the junior levels upwards over the last 5 years (see Fig.8 and 9) and we are optimistic that we will achieve a significant improvement at Professorial level over the next 5 years. The 2013 figures will demonstrate the appointment of another female professor (Prof Schilder), the promotion of another female Senior Lecturer to Reader, and we anticipate the promotion of a female Reader to Professor this coming year. Looking forwards, there are a number of talented females within the department currently at Senior Lecturer or Reader level who are likely to be supported in promotion to professor level over the next 5 years (AP:3.3, also 3.1-3.5, Case Studies). We have a number of action plan points in place to ensure the development of our female staff, already showing their impact in the increased numbers of female Senior Lecturers and Readers. Our strategy of nurturing talent to ensure staff reach their full potential is seen in the promotion of three staff (two female) to Reader in the last three years (Case Studies). In addition, we have implemented a number of changes to attract more female applicants to senior positions, which are discussed in detail below (4b(i), AP:3.4). From Figure 9, the EI has increased the number of women at all levels – but particularly in the Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Reader categories (2012-13 promotions add another female Reader). This reflects the age and growth of the EI - over time people are being promoted upwards through the career structure. It demonstrates the impact of our focus on nurturing talent and facilitating professional development and promotion (e.g. see Case Studies, AP:3.1-5, discussed in the ‘Other’ section, training in recruitment and diversity (4b(i)))).

Academic Pipeline 2009 and 2012

Figure 9 – a comparison of the percentage of female staff in 2010/11 and 2012/13
We further broke our analysis of academic staff by grade into non-clinical and clinical staff:

**Figure 10**

The career development of our clinical and non-clinical staff is considered equally important (e.g. two staff are currently on UCL’s ‘future 50’ mentoring/leadership program, both are female senior lectures; one clinical and one non-clinical). While our clinical staff are small in number, these data demonstrate that 50% of our permanent clinical staff are female. Increasing ENT research is a goal of the EI. One way to achieve this is to ensure that researchers can progress to lecturer and beyond. Therefore, we are in the process of appointing a clinical lecturer and have developed a number of plans to support our teaching staff in their research (AP3.2).
(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**
Over the past 4 years 8 staff members have ceased employment at the EI (see table).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Senior Lecturer; PT, Researcher; FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Professor, FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2 (Researchers; FT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1 (Researcher; FT)</td>
<td>2 (Researchers; FT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Leavers by gender, grade and full time / part time*

Leavers from Researcher posts tend to be post-doctoral researchers or research assistants on funding-limited contracts; we expect a turnover of such individuals and across the four-year period we can see equal number (3) of female and male leavers. One female Professor retired, and the female part-time worker (2009) resigned in order to focus more fully on her private audiology practice. Whilst the data do not indicate a problem specific to the retention of female staff, the Institute has introduced a number of practices to support female (and male) staff in their transition from post-doc to independent researcher as outlined in our Action Plan and below (AP:1.4,2.1,2.3,3.1,3.5).

4. **Supporting and advancing women’s careers – 4989 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 11

The growth of the Institute is reflected in its recruitment (14, 2 and 12 positions filled in 2010-12), the majority at the level of post-doctoral researchers. Pooling across all positions (Fig.11), the proportion of females is roughly equal across applicants, shortlisting and appointment (except in 2011 where only two positions were filled; one male, and one female, despite 80% of applicants being male). An appointment at professorial level has been attempted twice; in one case the position was offered to a female candidate.

Figure 12

We also considered applicants by job grade across the previous three years (Fig.12). Interpreting such small numbers is complex (e.g. there were two professorial appointments, neither were
filled, and only one lecturer appointment made). There is a slight decrease in the proportion of females researchers offered interviews and positions (although slightly more females gained interviews at lecturer level explaining why in Figure 11 there appears to be equal proportions of applicants gaining interviews). At professorial level, a smaller proportion of female applicants were interviewed (but here there were only 4 female applicants). We have introduced measures that we hope will encourage female applicants (AP:3.4,3.6-7,4.3,4.5), some of which have already demonstrated their positive impact in the recruitment of Professor Anne Schilder who joined the Institute in 2013. In addition, we have (from November 2013) required that all Job Descriptions carry the Athena SWAN logo and contain a statement about flexible working and gender equality (AP:3.4,4.3).

EI policy is that interview panels always include at least one female member. In order to participate in an interview panel, EI staff are required to have undertaken recruitment and selection training. This procedure has been in place for several years, although monitoring of interview panels has been problematic – official statistics from UCL proved inaccurate (as people have to nominate panel members to advertise the job and therefore frequently only enter the minimum of two names into the online system). We are working with the Institute manager to ensure interview panel composition is documented and monitored more effectively (AP:3.6,4.5).

(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.

Academic Promotion within UCL depends upon an annual process, whereby staff are nominated by the Head of Department (or themselves). The process requires completing a detailed CV in a standard format such that candidates can demonstrate that they fulfil UCL’s promotions criteria of contributions to Research, Teaching, Knowledge Transfer and Enabling activity. The Institute Director is proactive in preparing and selecting staff for promotion (e.g. Case Study: Maria Chait). Until 2013, the Director was responsible for all appraisals of academic staff within the EI, including reviewing individuals’ suitability for promotion and what their development needs were in order to achieve it. Since 2013, appraisals of all staff other than the new Research Unit heads have been devolved to the Unit heads, this has allowed appraisals to become an annual process (i.e. going beyond UCL’s biennial requirement AP:3.1) allowing for more regular analysis of staff’s goals and their strategic development. Since the EI’s inception in 2005, six academic staff (4 female, 2 male) have been put forward for senior promotion, 3 to Reader (2 female, 1 male) and 3 to Senior Lecturer (2 female, 1 male). All applications have been successful. In addition, one research fellow (male) with a proleptic academic appointment has been promoted to a senior grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>2 (both to Senior Lecturer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>1 (to Reader)</td>
<td>1 (to Senior Lecturer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>1 (to Senior Lecturer)</td>
<td>1 (to Reader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>1 (to Reader)</td>
<td>1 (to Reader)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ear Institute promotions, 2010-2013:
Table 2: Promotions by year.

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

Interview panels at the Ear Institute always include at least one female member and typically comprise three people with 1 or two female members (mean 45% women per panel in the last three years). Interview panel composition did not differ significantly by grade (Professorial posts 2 attempted appointments, mean female proportion = 53%, Researcher posts, 23 appointments proportion of females = 44%). The SAT became aware that we have poor data on interview panels for PhD studentships; we believe that PIs are aware of the requirement to have a balanced gender ratio on interview panels but have implemented actions to ensure that panel composition is monitored (AP:3.6,4.5).

All staff participating in interview panels have attended UCL’s Recruitment Training course and all staff undergo UCL’s compulsory on-line diversity training when they commence employment. We have monitored training within the EI – the majority of Academic Staff (70%) and some (4) senior post-docs have completed Recruitment and Selection training as of July 2013. The remaining Academic Staff have been encouraged to undertake R&S training and we anticipate will have done so by the end of 2013 (AP:3.7). A majority of staff within the EI have taken online Equality and Diversity training, although for many staff members this was prior to the training being revised last year. We are therefore encouraging all staff to retake this training module (AP:3.7) before the end of 2013.

(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.

The Ear Institute has increased the number of female staff over the last three years (see ‘Academic Pipeline’ figure above). From these data and our survey we identified the post-doc to independent researcher and student to researcher as key transition points. At PhD student and post-doctoral level formal support is provided from beyond the Institute by the UCL Early Career Neuroscientist (ECN) Forum which offers talks, seminars and workshops on fellowship applications, interview technique, grant writing and career options. Dr Bizley is a committee member for the ECN and therefore ensures that this network is both supported by, and promoted within, the Ear Institute.
The Ear Institute runs ‘Work In Progress (WIP)’ meetings where Post-doctoral researchers (PDRs) are encouraged to participate. This raises the profile of PDRs within the department and facilitates intra-department networking. While attendance at these meetings is not compulsory, they are usually attended by the majority of Institute staff, including PhD students.

Support is given to PDRs and PhD students attempting to transition to fellowships or permanent positions via an informal network of more senior researchers within the Ear Institute. For example, Dr Bizley, a previous recipient of the L’Oreal-UNESCO For Women in Science Award, actively promotes this to female post-doctoral fellows within the Institute, and supports applicants in their applications. Similarly, current and previous Research Fellowship holders support applications for such fellowships within the Institute. Should a member of the department be shortlisted for such an award, or for a job interview, multiple opportunities are given to practice talks and the Institute Director organises practice interviews.

Whilst an informal support network is in existence at the Institute, the SAQ revealed that members (particularly post-grads and post-docs) felt that formal careers advice within the department was lacking. We therefore ran a Careers Day in September 2013 (AP:1.4). Organised by Drs Bizley, Jagger and Chait, the day had a range of presentations from how to make a strong job application, fellowship applications and funding opportunities targeted for flexible working. This event was very well attended - including by students who are registered in other departments whose 2nd supervisors are based at the EI. The atmosphere was informal, encouraging questions and discussion, and the final session of the day was a series of PIs giving information about their individual career paths and how life events (such as serious illness, maternity and paternity leave) were balanced with their work. Feedback assessed by a post-course questionnaire was overwhelmingly positive (on a 5 point scale (1= not useful, 5 = extremely useful, every element scored at >=3.9 (mean 4.4)). Comments indicated that not only had it been beneficial from a careers perspective but that many people had found it reassuring to hear the variety of ways in which an academic career can be achieved – often despite major life events. Given the feedback from this event we aim to run it in its current form biennially and run a more focussed workshop on how to make fellowship applications in the alternating years (AP:1.4). This event also provided a venue to raise awareness of a variety of resources available at the EI (such as advice on interviews, or various non-academic careers) and raise general awareness of our Action Plan.

Our SAQ had a section devoted to PDRs in which we asked about their career aspirations and experiences of career development within the Institute. The data collected demonstrated that both male and female PDRs had opportunity to supervise undergraduate and post-graduate research students. 66% of male respondents (total n=9) and 50% of female PDRs (total n=10) said they were considering careers outside of academia. When asked why, a range of answers were given, which included being very enthusiastic about another career option, and uncertainty as to whether they wanted or would obtain a group leader position. However, there was no clear difference in the answers with respect to gender of the respondents. These responses were one motivating factor for running our Careers Day and we expect that when we rerun the SAQ in 2014 we will see a decrease in the number of people who felt that they were uncertain as to whether they would get a group leader position. We were reassured to observe that approximately equal proportions of male and female post-docs had been encouraged to
make fellowship applications (Fig.13). Examination of the questionnaire data revealed that those who reported that they had not been encouraged to make fellowship applications had only recently been awarded their PhD. Our planned fellowship application workshop will provide detailed advice on how to make applications (AP:1.4).

Figure 13

We used our SAQ to assess whether people within the Institute had mentors. To our surprise, while 25% of male respondents answered positively, only a single female indicated that they had a mentor. We therefore questioned those who had responded positively and in almost all cases respondents did not have a formal mentor but rather had someone that they considered as a mentor. This suggests that men are more willing to seek help independently in this manner. Many researchers, of both genders, responded positively to the SAQ question ‘would you like a mentor?’ We are therefore developing a formal mentorship scheme within the Institute (AP:2.1). As predicted from our SAQ, the response to this scheme has been overwhelmingly positive with more than 90% of post-docs requesting mentors. Mentees have been surveyed (e.g. about whether they prefer a male or female mentor), and this information is being consolidated while mentors from more senior academic positions in departments outside of the EI are being recruited. By mid-2014, we hope that all PDRs who wish to have a mentor will do so, and by 2015, our aim is to have expanded this to both PhD students (who might be mentored by junior PIs of different research disciplines within the EI) and through to higher career levels (AP:2.1). The SAT will be involved in monitoring this process and obtaining feedback from mentors and mentees so that the scheme is as effective as possible.

Our SAQ identified a lack of awareness of women-specific grants and personal development opportunities such as Springboard (or Navigator for men). As part of our impact plan we have therefore launched a new section of the Ear Institute website (http://www.ucl.ac.uk/ear/staffresources/athenaswan) providing information about, and links to, such programs (AP:2.3). Springboard and Navigator were also highlighted in the careers day.
that we ran in September 2013 (AP:1.4), and will be included within our newly developed information pack for new staff (AP:4.3).

While we believe that the proportion of female professors will reach parity over the next few years, this is clearly an important transition point. We therefore have a number of schemes in place to ensure that females at Senior Lecturer level can make the transition to Reader and then Professor (3.2-3.4). We believe these are already having an impact as demonstrated by the increase in females at Senior Lecturer and Reader level over the last three years.

5 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?

See also 4a(ii) for promotions.

Our SAQ revealed that some staff were overdue appraisals. From August 2013, the new Research Unit structure means that responsibility for appraisal of most staff have been devolved to research unit heads (AP:3.1). We also assessed post-doctoral appraisal rates. With the exception of a few overdue individuals (4, appraisals currently in process) it was the case that all post-doctoral staff who had been in the EI for more than two years (9) had had an appraisal within the last two years; (the remaining 9 having been in post for <2 years). While the Institute is following UCL’s minimum requirements, the SAT felt that it beneficial to introduce an appraisal for post-docs one year after their start date to assess how new staff were settling in.

Of the 6 senior promotions that have occurred in the last 4 years, four were female (2 to Senior Lecturer and 2 to Reader) indicating that our approach to supporting females is having a positive impact (see also Case Studies).

(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?

All new staff are required to undertake UCL’s equality and diversity training, as noted in 4b(i).

New staff are informed about the various mailing lists which advertise networking and social opportunities both within and beyond the Institute, and are introduced in person to the department at ‘Donut Thursdays’ (AP:4.1). As of August 2013, all new starters receive a welcome pack which is currently being further developed to highlight the potential for flexible
working (AP:4.3), our Athena SWAN activities, and staff development opportunities. The ability
to work flexibly was highlighted by several of the PIs within the ‘work-life balance’ session that
formed part of our recent careers day (AP:1.4) and in our recent poll 80% of people were aware
that they could work flexibly, and 60% of staff did.

Dr Bizley sends regular emails summarising training opportunities around and beyond UCL as
advertised via various UCL women in SET lists and twitter. Our October Poll indicates staff find
this useful.

(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.

All students are encouraged to attend UCL’s training courses, which include career-oriented
sessions run by SLMS in addition to Early Career Neuroscience Forum events (see 4b(ii)). The
careers day (AP:1.4) ran in September 2013 provided more specific support to female students
and PDRs, and our intention to include PGRs on our mentorship program (AP:2.1) will provide
additional formal support mechanisms for female students. Feedback from our recent careers
day indicates that students felt better able to approach PIs after this event to discuss career and
life issues (see 4b(ii)).

We have recently (Aug. 2013) appointed a female Graduate Tutor (Dr Sally Dawson). This
provides female students with an additional (female) point of support, (and Dr Dawson with
‘Enabling’ activity for her next promotion).

6 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.

The major committee is the Ear Institute Strategy Team, which was reconfigured in July 2013
following the division of the Institute into Research Units, each headed by an individual (two
male, two female). Unit heads were identified with respect to their seniority, relevant scientific
experience and leadership potential (AP:3.1). In addition, the Strategy Team includes the
Institute Manager (female), Director of Studies (female) and Manager for Enterprise and
Business Development (female). The Strategy Team meets on Monday lunchtime twice monthly,
a time decided by mutual agreement to fit with team members’ flexible working arrangements.
There are two other key committees: The administration liaison team meets with members of the department’s finance and admin team monthly (Wednesday lunchtimes). The teaching committee (which includes clinicians and lecturers from beyond the Institute) meets termly and includes all members of staff with any form of teaching role. It is headed by the Director of Studies (female). Membership of committees is identified by necessity (e.g. the teaching committee includes all module organisers, course co-ordinators etc.), or by definition – e.g. every member of academic staff is part of a Research Unit. Research Units meet monthly at times arranged within each unit to fit with part-time and flexible working requirements. All meeting times are within core hours (i.e. 10-16.00). The proportion of females on committees is inline with the rest of the department. Committee membership is reviewed annually and positions rotated.

Our SAQ revealed most members of the department thought the committee membership was fair:

(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.

![Proportion of respondents with a permanent position](image)

Figure 16 – Proportion of respondents who answered ‘yes’ to the question ‘Do you have a permanent position?’

24 (15 female) of staff who responded in the SAQ as not under a permanent contract, as compared to 26 (11 female) staff who do. While neither of these proportions is significantly different from 50% (binomial test p>0.05), transitioning from a fixed term contract to a fellowship or permanent position is an essential career step and one that women in particular may be more likely to miss if inadequately supported. The Institute’s policy of securing funding for career development fellowships (4 during 2007-9) and of considering such Fellowships as tenure-track positions, has brought a number of young scientists (3 male, 1 female) to the Institute and helped them transition to independence (evidenced by Dr Chait, Case Study). The Institute has also supported and attracted individuals to apply for their own Research Fellowships to be held at the EI by providing facilities and proleptic appointments (one male, one female).

We have increased our formal careers support for early career scientists (AP:1.4) and confirmed that this has had a positive impact. We have implemented a range of measures including mentoring (AP:2.1), as discussed in 4b(ii), to provide personal support at key career points.

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?
Female staff are members of a number of committees within UCL including: the 50:50 committee (a committee for gender equality across UCL), the UCL Athena SWAN SAT, the UCL Neuroscience Steering Committee, Faculty level undergraduate and postgraduate teaching committees and STU Senior Management Team. A survey of all PIs within the Ear Institute revealed that women within the department were more likely to be serving on external committees than the male members (5/6 staff serving on external committees were female). This difference is likely to reflect, in part, the dominance of females in the teaching staff and also reflect encouragement from the Institute Director in preparing individuals at Senior Lecturer (67% female) and above for promotion; after this year’s promotion round, at Senior Lecturer and Reader level there is a female dominance within the Institute. We are aware of the risk of overburdening female staff so those with faculty level involvement have a smaller workload within the Institute (Case Study). Four staff (the three non-clinical Research Unit heads (2 female) and Director of Studies (female)) have been put forward for a SLMS scheme designed to provide faculty level experience to staff looking for senior promotions (AP:2.2).

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

The Institute does not have a formal ‘workload model’ as noted above, allocation of roles within and beyond the department is made by the Director in a way that ensures staff are prepared appropriately for promotion. Since we did not have a formal model for workload allocation, we included a number of questions relating to workload within the SAQ.

![Workload allocation, self-reported via SAQ](image)

*Figure 17*
When we analysed these data looking specifically at lecturers and senior lecturers there was a pattern of greater teaching workload for female staff, and a greater number of male staff with a large number of administration roles. Understanding the cause of these differences is complicated; for example, many of the teaching-focussed positions in the EI are filled by women, since our teaching is predominantly audiology, which is female dominated. However, we are currently working towards developing methods for integrating teaching and research within the Institute and encouraging research profiles of clinical and teaching staff (AP3.2). We hope this will result in a more even distribution of admin and teaching workload amongst staff. The questions and analysis from our SAQ about workload allocation have been discussed by the UCL 50:50 committee with the potential view to assessing workload allocation more broadly across UCL. This is an instance where impact of our SAQ reaches beyond the EI.
(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.

All departmental seminars and meetings are held within core working hours (all seminars are at 1:00pm, 6a(i)). The Director has one fortnightly meeting (Priority Setting Meeting) with two of the senior clinical academics (1 female, 1 male) that occurs 8:30am at their request due to clinical commitments. Teaching meetings are arranged on an ad-hoc basis at times within core working hours by mutual consent. Seminars, which include external speakers, work-in-progress meetings, and Institute-wide journal clubs, are held weekly at 1:00pm on a Friday. While we are aware that a Friday lunchtime seminar might cause a problem for practising Jews or Muslims, this is not currently a problem for our department; should it become so we would consider moving the seminars to another day.

When surveyed (in Sept 2012), staff felt that departmental meetings were usually within core working hours:

![Figure 20](image)

**Figure 20**

However, there was some concern over the timing of social events:

![Figure 21](image)

**Figure 21**
Since the SAQ we have experimented with the times of our regular ‘final Friday’ social event (AP:4.2, see 5(iv)), to make them more family-friendly, and introduced an additional monthly social gathering within core hours (11:00am AP:4.1). The impact of moving the time of Final Fridays has been measured in increased attendance (and pizza consumption!). The first donut Thursday of the academic year was well attended by staff and students throughout the Institute. Our October poll indicated that 85% of people find these events a useful networking opportunity within the department.

(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 Institute is extremely inclusive; staff work in largely open-plan environments, with senior academic staff, post-doctoral researchers and PhD students of all research groups seated in the same area. This engenders a cohesive and culturally-aware atmosphere.

The Ear Institute has a flexible working policy, as evidenced in our two case studies (AP:4.3). Several people commented specifically on the benefits of this when responding to our SAQ indicating that people are aware of this practice and use it to their advantage.

A variety of social opportunities exist and provide networking opportunities within the Institute:

- **Final Fridays**: pizza, beer and soft drinks are provided within the atrium on the last Friday of the month. Previously this event took place at 5pm but after some experimentation over the last 18 months this now runs at 4pm (AP:4.2); this time is late enough that people attend rather than stay in the lab, and early enough that those with childcare responsibilities can attend.

- **Donut Days**: the Director has organised ad hoc mid-morning ‘donut days’ throughout the year as a means to introduce new staff and students to the department. AP:4.1 increased the frequency of these to monthly.

- **Christmas lunch**: Previously the Ear Institute has run an evening Christmas event but in 2011 and 2012 this was moved to lunchtime to enable all Institute staff to attend and consequently meant that almost every student and staff-member in the Institute attended (AP:4.2).

Respondents were asked whether they believed there to be gender equality at the EI:
The majority of respondents responded positively. When asked to comment, or suggest improvements, these too were mostly positive, for example “The EI is the most gender balanced place I have worked”. The comments section of our SAQ also highlighted things such as a need for mentorship (see AP:2.1), and suggested ideas such as keeping the issue of gender equality high profile through initiatives such as Athena SWAN. Our SAQ led us to believe that, while people thought that the Ear Institute was a relatively gender-equal place, academia more broadly was not. For example one comment said “The type of character who prosper in research may be rather "male", self-sufficient in working, less reliant on the support or respect of people around them”. It is the sort of attitudes highlighted by the last comment that we must seek to change; there shouldn’t be the belief that research is a male domain or that ‘male characteristics’ are necessary to succeed. We believe that our recent careers day, which included several female PIs at both junior and senior levels, will help change attitudes (something we will assess directly when we re-run our SAQ in 2014). Additional measures, such as 50% of the new Research Unit heads being female, will help provide the visible role models that junior scientists need to believe that research is not a male-dominated discipline.

(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.

Both male and female members of the department contribute to outreach in a variety of settings – from talks to non-specialist audiences, school visits, hosting A-level students, a ‘Noisy World’ exhibition, which several Ear Institute members contributed to at the Royal Society Summer Exhibition in 2011. EI members support A-level work placement students, volunteer at the science museum, and provide expertise for events run by organisations such as the Wellcome Trust. Such activities contribute to ‘knowledge transfer’ activity, one of the four key areas considered for promotion. The EI actively encourages and supports outreach activity, and individuals contributing to outreach activities span all levels of seniority and are supported equally by male and female staff; over the last 3 years, 5 men and 6 women were involved in outreach activities. Five EI females have signed up to UCL’s ‘Inspirational Women’ programme, which aims to provide female scientists as speakers to go into schools.
The SAT identified departmental outreach as being underdeveloped and therefore, in March 2013, the EI hosted an open day for Year 10 and 11 students from local schools. Students gained practical experience in a range of audiological testing procedures. Thirty students (80% female) participated and feedback was overwhelmingly positive and we will therefore repeat this event (ucl.ac.uk/ear/news/130220, AP:1.2).

7 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.

Four women have taken maternity leave in the last three years, one of whom was Dr Chait (see Case Study). Two staff and one student are currently on maternity leave, and the other two have returned to work, in one case full time and in the other part-time. In such a small department it is almost impossible to provide a more detailed analysis as to trends over time.

The Institute follows UCL’s policy of ‘keeping in touch’ days for those on maternity/paternity leave. Additionally, those on leave (for any reason) are kept on a mailing list which updates them on Institute news and happenings to make sure that, if they so wish, they remain up to date and in touch with current events related to Institute life. The Institute is also very supportive of flexible working. Our SAQ highlighted that not everyone in the EI was aware of his or her maternity/paternity leave entitlement and we have therefore made clear links to this on our new Athena SWAN webpage, and also included the information in our new Welcome Pack (AP:4.3). We are also developing a maternity/paternity support network to be formally launched next year to benefit new parents within the Institute (AP:4.4).

(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.

Two male researchers (a senior Lecturer and a postdoctoral fellow) have taken extended paternity leave in the last three years. In both cases the individual’s partners are also academics and their taking paternity leave has enabled two talented female academics to continue in their career pathways. The post-doctoral fellow (Dr Overath) took unpaid leave for 6 months enabling his mathematician wife to advance her career (she has recently secured a Faculty position at Duke University, USA). One male respondent (a senior research associate) took only the statutory short period of paternity leave (UCL offer 4 weeks paid paternity leave), but noted in the SAQ that while he had not officially taken a longer break he had been able to work very flexibly after his daughter was born and continues to do so in order to share childcare with his wife. These instances highlight the Ear Institute as a relatively young department willing to operate flexibly to allow our researchers to obtain work-life balance. No individuals have taken adoption leave.
Generally, staff within the EI were positive concerning the EI being supportive of those with caring responsibilities (as assessed by the SAQ).

![The EI is supportive of new parents and those with caring responsibilities](chart)

Figure 23

We hope that the policies we are implementing to further highlight flexible working (AP:4.3), make social events more accessible AP:4.1-2) and provide innovative solutions to the restrictions posed by child-care requirements on conference travel (AP:3.5) would lead the individuals who responded that they disagreed to respond more positively.

(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.

Since we do not have a formal process for flexible working for full time staff, we have no official data on this. Informally, staff whose experimental demands (for example school children must be tested outside of school hours, some experiments must run continuously for 24 hour periods etc.) require they work unconventional hours are supported in working flexibly - for example Dr Lovett, tested children with Cochlear Implants, and had to work on Saturdays in order to test such children, but took a day off during the week. As well as using flexible working for family caring duties, other examples within the EI include volunteering on a weekday at the science museum (and working longer hours /at the weekend to compensate).

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.

We included a question about flexible working on our short October 2013 poll: 80% were aware they could work flexibly and 60% said they did. New staff will be made aware of flexible working
policies in the newly developed welcome pack (AP: 4.3). Generally, the Institute has an informal approach to flexible working which allows people to be genuinely flexible in their approach to balancing work demands and family needs. However, comments within our 2012 SAQ suggested that not all new staff were made aware of flexible working policies: one respondent commented “I think the environment for women and for both men and women with young children is very good at the EI. However, I think probably new hires at UCL generally would benefit from more explicit encouragement to consider flexible working schedules when appropriate.... I did not yet have the confidence to request permission for a more flexible schedule, even though now I realize it would surely have been allowed.” We have taken this on board and during our Careers Day a number of PIs (male and female) made the point that they worked flexibly arranging their work demands around family commitments to make it clear that flexible working is very much part of daily EI life. Our recent poll suggests an improved awareness of flexible working policies.

(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’s Gender Equality Scheme provides one term of sabbatical leave from teaching commitments for research staff returning from maternity leave, with the aim of enabling them to re-establish their research activity without the additional burden of teaching. UCL encourages “Keeping in touch days” (up to 10 days during the period of maternity leave when staff members can catch up with work if they desire to). It is policy within the Ear Institute that female staff members returning to work after maternity leave are encouraged to adopt flexible working hours, in consultation with line managers. We are setting up a new parents network to provide support to those taking maternity and paternity leave (AP:4.4).

5. **Any other comments: 410 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 SAT assessed the gender balance of the speakers at external seminars over the last four years as 42% female: in 2010 and 2011 we have 50% male and female (6,6 and 4,4 respectively), in 2012 we had 9 male and 5 female, and to date in 2013 we have had 9 male and 5 female speakers. We are continuing to monitor this and aim to average 50% over the next 3 years.

Early in 2012, we surveyed the gender balance of pictures on the EI website. 42% of photos on the website were female and 58% were male. Given the importance of a website in promoting the department to applicants we felt that we should aim for a more equal gender balance. In
October 2013, we reassessed the website and newsletter representation of women and found that 55% of pictures are female. Our AP will monitor the website annually (AP:3.4).

Our SAQ included questions about work-life balance. Male and female respondents highlighted similar issues – relating to concerns about work-life balance and financial instability resulting from short-term contracts. They are summarised below in a Wordle (which represents words according to their frequency across all of the comments made, generated from our SAQ using www.wordle.net): 
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There are some aspects of academia we, as an Institute, cannot change – for example, one respondent noted that post-PhD time limits for fellowship applications in particular hurts females. Nevertheless, by providing staff with mentors (AP:2.1), offering more in-house careers advice (AP:1.4), and better support and networking opportunities through social events (AP:4.1-4), we believe we can help women make the transition to permanent positions without compromising their family lives.

Despite some of the negative comments in our SAQ about the larger problems of women in academia, when asked the question ‘would you equally encourage a boy or girl into a career in science’, respondents overwhelmingly answered that they would. This suggests that, in departments like the EI, women have positive experiences and that, hopefully, we are on the path to removing people’s stereotypes and assumptions relating to science and gender.
In addition to providing support and advice, we are providing practical support with an innovative childcare bursary scheme. EI staff and students will be able to apply for flexible funding to support childcare costs associated with conference attendance (AP:3.5,4.4). The first round of this scheme will operate in Jan 2014 (timed to coincide with the annual international hearing sciences conference held in the USA).

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.

7. Case study: impacting on individuals: 829 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue and area for action identified</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
<th>Accountability (SAT member)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Success Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Under-representation of certain disadvantaged groups, such as single parents and mature female Audiology technicians without formal education, in post-graduate taught courses.</td>
<td>Prepared bid for HEFCE Postgraduate Support Scheme, to support various initiatives including bursaries to assist with fees and childcare costs, recruitment open days and marketing literature targeting disadvantaged groups, development of e-learning &amp; summer schools.</td>
<td>Bid submitted September 2013, decision due early November 2013. Activities to run from January 2014 to August 2015.</td>
<td>Dr Cherilee Rutherford</td>
<td>Academic leads for the UG and MSc courses, and course administrators.</td>
<td>A more gender-balanced recruitment to postgraduate courses, and subsequent advancement in vocational careers. Broader demographic represented in taught courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Under-developed outreach, particularly to schools attended by disadvantaged groups including females from low socioeconomic backgrounds.</td>
<td>Held a Work Experience Day in Feb 2013 for Year 10-11 students from 3 local schools. Participated in practical measurements of brain activity, hearing aid use, balance tests, etc. Further events to be held.</td>
<td>Biennially from February 2015.</td>
<td>Dr Debi Vickers</td>
<td>Academic leads for the UG and MSc courses, and course administrators.</td>
<td>Attendance to be maintained at ~80% females. Positive feedback in post-event questionnaire, reflecting increased awareness of careers in Audiology in this group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Lack of data on gender balance in PhD Studentship applications.</td>
<td>Initiated rolling audit of applications within last 3 years &amp; going forward.</td>
<td>July 2013 onwards.</td>
<td>Dr Jen Bizley</td>
<td>Institute Manager</td>
<td>Data assessed by SAT annually and any discrepancies followed up by SAT. Maintenance of gender balance matching or exceeding School average. Currently ~65% female.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Lack of awareness of academic career progression models, in both PhD students and postdocs. Unfamiliarity of how</td>
<td>Ran a Careers Workshop with a particular focus on applications, interview preparation &amp; procedure, fellowship schemes, and examples of how EI PIs have reached Lecturer/Reader Fellowship</td>
<td>First Careers Day held in September 2013, to be repeated Sept 2015.</td>
<td>Dr Dan Jagger</td>
<td>Dr Jen Bizley</td>
<td>Feedback will be monitored through post-course questionnaires. Success will be evidenced through positive feedback from participants (as with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
senior staff can attain permanent posts while managing work/life balance.

positions via different pathways. Following positive feedback, this session will be run biennially, with target events (e.g. Fellowship application workshop planned for summer 2014), informed by feedback from post-event questionnaire, will take place in alternate years.

application workshop summer 2014. Application advice & mock interviews to be available as necessary.

Following positive feedback, this session will be run biennially, with target events (e.g. Fellowship application workshop planned for summer 2014), informed by feedback from post-event questionnaire, will take place in alternate years. Application advice & mock interviews to be available as necessary.

our session in Sept 2013). Feedback will also be used to develop further events.

Increased awareness of need for earlier career planning & development, evidenced through appraisals & increased applications for Fellowships/Lectureships.

Success measured by SAQ and increased success in fellowship applications.

### 2. Supporting staff at key transition points in their academic careers

| 2.1 | Need for staff mentoring scheme (and a policy), for post-doctoral researchers. Similarly, PG students to be offered mentors within the Department. | Recruit mentors. A poll among current EI post-doctoral researchers identified an overwhelming enthusiasm for the mentoring program. A meeting was held in the beginning of the academic year to describe plans and obtain individual information (e.g. whether a female or male mentor is desired, what career stage, family experience etc). We are currently in the process of consolidating this information and identifying appropriate mentors. | Oct 2013 - Jan 2014 | Dr Maria Chait | Dr Maria Chait | All postdocs to have a mentor by Nov 2014. Positive feedback from postdocs about mentor scheme in questionnaire and focus groups (Sept 2013). Progress tracked via annual questionnaire, success reflected in responses indicating postdocs feel better supported. All EI members (PhD students, post-docs, PIs) who would like a mentor to be paired by March 2014.

Provide mentorship training. Advice to be sought from Academic Careers Office – ACO - | August 2014 | Dr Maria Chait | Institute Director to request training programme from |
(Professor Geraint Rees, who runs Future 50 mentoring scheme).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair mentors with mentees (Due to the small size of the institute mentors will be recruited from other departments).</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Dr Maria Chait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review mentor scheme – design a short questionnaires for mentors and mentees and run a focus group with female mentees.</td>
<td>April 2015 (annually thereafter)</td>
<td>Dr Maria Chait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to feedback from mentors and mentees, making any improvements necessary.</td>
<td>July – Aug 2015</td>
<td>Dr Maria Chait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin rolling out mentoring to all staff and PG students who would like a mentor.</td>
<td>Dec 2015</td>
<td>Dr Maria Chait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate mentor scheme into induction.</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Dr Maria Chait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Need for greater interaction of academic staff with key Faculty-, School- and UCL-wide groups and committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propose female members of staff for leadership programmes offered by UCL at School level. Improve gender balance by ensuring all new Heads of Research Units (2 female, 2 male) are invited to attend Faculty Heads of Research Departments meetings. Nominate a female deputy to attend Faculty Executive.</td>
<td>On-going: all current and new Readers have faculty level opportunities, Research Unit Heads (2/4 female) and Director of Studies (female) participating in SLMS ‘Future Leaders’ scheme.</td>
<td>Institute Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Need to encourage female staff to take control of personal & career development. Need to increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New staff alerted to the UCL Human Resources led Springboard Women’s Development Programme. Details included on new website</td>
<td>February 2013 onwards.</td>
<td>Dr Jen Bizley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016. All new staff to be offered a mentor as part of induction.
<p>| 3.1 | Need for more frequent academic appraisals, and to formalise guidelines for postdoc appraisals. | Annual appraisals for Academic staff to be undertaken by new Heads of Research Units (2 female, 2 male), increasing frequency beyond UCL’s bi-annual requirement. | Commenced Aug 2013. | Institute Director | Institute Manager | All post docs to have an appraisal one year after starting. All academic staff to have an annual appraisal. Appraisal rates will be monitored directly by the Institute Director for Academic staff and by the Institute Manager via information provided by the faculty office, and SAT for post-docs. Improved satisfaction as measured by improved future SAQ results. |
| 3.2 | Need to encourage research profiles for clinical-teaching staff (currently are predominantly female) and encourage clinical staff to pursue research careers. | Ensure all new Research Units provide each member of the unit with a portfolio of research and teaching activities. | Sept 2013, institute wide questionnaire of PIs and research group leaders to establish contributions to research, teaching, outreach and enablement activities. March 2014 for roll-out. | Institute Director | Heads of Research Units | A developing portfolio of research profiles for clinical staff, evidenced by their inclusion on grant applications as collaborators. An increased number of interactions with commercial partnerships in the clinical arena, facilitated or led by clinical |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>Lack of sufficient female EI staff at Professorial level.</th>
<th>Ensure increased awareness of available positions to specific female candidates via UK and International Hearing sciences email lists and similar networks, &amp; social networking sites. Direct contact where possible to suitable female academics. Ensure appropriate gender balance when drawing shortlists.</th>
<th>September 2012 onwards.</th>
<th>Institute Director</th>
<th>Institute Director</th>
<th>Increased numbers of female staff at professorial level (projected 50% within 5 years, 45% within 3 years).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Need to raise awareness of the Institute’s encouragement of female career development.</td>
<td>Add Athena SWAN logo to job &amp; studentship advertisements. Add statements describing the mentorship scheme and career nurturing initiatives.</td>
<td>In place Sept 2013</td>
<td>Dr Jenny Bizley</td>
<td>Institute Manager</td>
<td>Information present where required (i.e. on website: URL). All job adverts/studentships include Athena SWAN logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Improve ability of female staff to balance family commitments with academic career progression.</td>
<td>Initiate new fund for assisting with childcare costs while attending conferences. Target sponsorship from current commercial partners.</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>Research Unit Heads</td>
<td>Institute Director</td>
<td>Increased female conference attendance and increased session chairing, making staff more “visible”. Funds are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Need to monitor recruitment &amp; selection training for interview panels, ensuring gender equality awareness.</td>
<td>All staff instructed to attend UCL-led courses before being accepted to sit on recruitment panels. Essential in order to use UCL recruitment software (ROME). Introduce new measures to ensure that officially recorded interview panels are accurate so that composition can be effectively monitored.</td>
<td>January 2010 onwards.</td>
<td>Institute Director</td>
<td>Institute Manager</td>
<td>Increased awareness of gender equality issues. Increased number of staff available for panels. Official UCL records to better match EI ones. Ensure that all interview panels do have one female member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Need to be aware of Equality Act 2010, and equality &amp; diversity issues.</td>
<td>All new staff to attend UCL-led courses before sitting on recruitment panels.</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
<td>Institute Director</td>
<td>Institute Manager</td>
<td>Increased awareness of gender equality issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Culture, communication and departmental organisation

<p>| 4.1  | Infrequent opportunity to network &amp; socialise during work hours. | Department to provide morning-tea (“Donut Thursday”) for all staff in the EI atrium, increased from sporadic basis to monthly. | Commenced October 2013. | Dr Dan Jagger | Institute Manager | Increased opportunities for networking and socialising within the department. Positive feedback recorded in Oct 2013 questionnaire, |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>4.2</strong> Under representation of those with childcare commitments at in-house after work social events (commencing at 5pm).</th>
<th>&quot;Final Friday&quot; monthly social now commences at 4pm to encourage greater attendance.</th>
<th>From January 2013.</th>
<th>Dr Dan Jagger</th>
<th>Institute Manager</th>
<th>Increased opportunities for networking and socialising within the department. Increased attendance by those with childcare commitments. Success measured by October 2013 poll and requirement for more pizza! Almost the whole Institute has attended the Christmas gathering over the last two years compared to a smaller fraction previously.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christmas event changed from the evening to lunchtime</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.3</strong> Need for improved access to information on career opportunities, promotion, flexible working, and childcare.</td>
<td>Created new Athena-SWAN section of the Institute website, regularly updated. Welcome page is public-accessible, personal data only available via password-protected intranet. Include case-studies on staff members who have improved their work/family balance at the EI. Includes links to relevant gender equality blogs &amp; news. Develop an enhanced welcome pack for all new starters which specifically details procedures for maternity/paternity leave, flexible working, social</td>
<td>Website launched October 2013 and continuing to evolve in response to feedback from the Institute. Website updated as required or at least monthly to provide links to new and topical news items. Welcome pack is being developed and is scheduled to be launched Jan 2014 at which point it will</td>
<td>Dr Jenny Bizley</td>
<td>Institute Manager</td>
<td>High visitor web footfall and increased information awareness, measured by improved SAQ results in 2014. X hits since launched. Footfall monitored termly in order to track on-going usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Need for improved support &amp; advice for new parents on integrating family life with career progression.</td>
<td>Cohort of volunteer new parents outlined on the new website, available for discussion &amp; advice on childcare issues, development of work/life balance with young family.</td>
<td>September 2014.</td>
<td>Dr Jimena Ballestero</td>
<td>Institute Manager</td>
<td>Development of a novel support network for new parents. Increased awareness by new/prospective parents of relevant issues. Uptake and benefit to be assessed via SAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Improve gender balance on interview panels for studentships and staff positions.</td>
<td>Provide guidelines for principle investigators on panel composition. Collect data on gender balance of all panels. Encourage female staff to attend UCL training courses on interview techniques.</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
<td>Dr Jenny Bizley</td>
<td>Institute Manager</td>
<td>Interview panels currently averaging ~50% female. Maintain numbers of female staff on interview panels, ensuring gender balance. Increased number of interview-trained personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Maintain continuity in committee memberships &amp; to ensure gender balance.</td>
<td>Annual review of SAT membership to ensure committee is active &amp; relevant. Current list added to SWAN website. Other committees (H&amp;S, Dept. Teaching Committee, Exam Board, Staff/Student Liaison Committee) to be audited annually.</td>
<td>SAT reviewed September 2013, new PG &amp; PD members welcomed. EI-wide committee audit to be carried out from January 2014.</td>
<td>Dr Jenny Bizley</td>
<td>Institute Manager</td>
<td>Audit of website listed current SAT membership shows members are active and current EI employees. Committees to continually have appropriate gender balance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>