Athena SWAN Silver department award application

Name of university: University College London
Department: Institute of Neurology

Date of application: April 2015 (upgrade)
Date of university Bronze and/or Silver Athena SWAN award: Bronze award 2006, 2009, 2012
Date of departmental Bronze award: April 2013

Contact for application: Alex Leff
Email: a.leff@ucl.ac.uk
Telephone: 0207 679 1129
Departmental website address: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/ion

Athena SWAN Silver Department awards recognise that in addition to university-wide policies the department is working to promote gender equality and to address challenges particular to the discipline.

It is essential that the contact person for the application is based in the department.

Sections to be included

At the end of each section state the number of words used. Click here for additional guidance on completing the template.

List of abbreviations:

AS Athena SWAN
E&D Equalities and Diversity
FT Full-time
HoD Head of Department
IoN Institute of Neurology
PT Part-time
SAT Self Assessment Team
STEMM Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics and Medicine
UCL University College London
SWAN category definitions used in this application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWAN Categories</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer/Principal Teaching Fellow/Principal Research Associate/Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lecturer/Senior Research Associate/Senior Research Fellow/Teaching Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Research Associate/Postdoctoral Research Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Letter of endorsement from the head of department: maximum 500 words (487)**

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.
From the Office of Prof. Michael G Hanna, Director, Institute of Neurology

Telephone: 44 (0)20 3448 4028  
Fax: 44 (0)20 7278 5069  
E-mail: N.Naeem@ucl.ac.uk

Athena SWAN Manager  
Equality Challenge Unit 7th floor  
Queens House 55/56  
Lincoln’s Inn Fields  
London, WC2A 3LJ

16th March 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

Athena SWAN Application Letter of Endorsement

As Director of the UCL Institute of Neurology, I am writing to strongly endorse the Institute’s application for an Athena SWAN Silver award. I have four daughters all planning to do science at University and I fully recognise and support the importance of achieving gender equity of opportunity.

I have been a member of the SAT since our initiative began in 2012. The early value of the Athena SWAN process highlighted areas that we needed to improve on (see: Previous Action Plan section). Many of our initiatives are working well. I am especially proud of the career mentoring scheme for female academics, which commenced in 2013 and which has proved highly popular with mentees (leading to a 34% increase in those stating that they now have a clear action plan to achieve their career objectives). This and other initiatives appear to have had an impact on our biannual staff survey: 88% of both female and male respondents in 2015 agree that work is allocated on a fair basis irrespective of gender. I recognise the administrative workload associated with the Athena SWAN process and have made sure that monies are available to fund a part-time Athena SWAN support officer (Katy) at the IoN.

We still have more improvements to make. We don’t have enough senior women and those we do have can become overburdened as a consequence of female representation issues at all levels. There are clear areas for improvement and these form the core of our Action Plan - which I believe is realistic, achievable, measurable and meaningful.

The current culture in the Institute is inclusive. Teamwork is highly valued, individual strengths are recognized and celebrated, and there is a commitment to advancing the careers of everyone, regardless of gender or role. We aim to provide a friendly environment where both women and men feel able to take the time they need for flexible working. In 2014 we established a dedicated private maternity
room in the Institute of Neurology to enable perinatal colleagues to have an on-site dedicated quiet place to rest as needed. It is also equipped with a fridge to enable milk expression and storage.

There is a strong female representation in the current promotions process with six women having been put forward for senior lecturer, reader or chair positions. This is the result of the process we have put in place over last 4 years to increase the number of women promoted to senior positions and is very encouraging for our future balance of women and men at the most senior levels of the Institute.

Athena SWAN continues to be a regular item on the Institute’s Executive Committee, our most senior committee, which meets monthly. This provides a robust conduit for information flow to our eight research groups and will allow contributions from all stakeholders to inform strategy.

This application has my strongest support.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Professor Michael G Hanna
Director, UCL Institute of Neurology
The self-assessment process: maximum 1000 words (994 inc. table)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>SAT role</th>
<th>Work-life balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helen Devine</td>
<td>Post-Doc SWAN2</td>
<td>AS mentoring sub-committee</td>
<td>FT: Currently on maternity leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Green-smith</td>
<td>Professor and research group leader SWAN6</td>
<td>AS mentoring sub-committee; mentor lead for senior female academics</td>
<td>FT: three children (only one school age now). Continues to work flexibly when needed, e.g. attending school events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hanna</td>
<td>Professor and Head of Department (IoN Director) SWAN6</td>
<td>Has ring-fenced departmental funding for AS initiatives. Lead on changes to the IoN Executive Committee. Heavily involved in staff recruitment and promotion</td>
<td>FT: four children, girls aged 11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Leff</td>
<td>Reader SWAN5</td>
<td>Chair, coordinator of AS initiatives, especially AS maternity room</td>
<td>FT: four school-age children; partner is a PT academic radiologist at Imperial College. Works flexibly when required (e.g. school drop-offs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manja Lehmann</td>
<td>Research Fellow SWAN2</td>
<td>Post-doc initiatives. Left SAT (Easter 2015) to industry post</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Pestell</td>
<td>IoN Athena SWAN Support Officer</td>
<td>Data collection, survey development, administrative assistance for SAT</td>
<td>FT (0.5): took maternity leave after last AS application; son under two. Shares childcare with husband and works flexible hours to fit around this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene Plun-Favreau</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer SWAN4</td>
<td>Lead for the AS mentoring programme</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirs Kinnunen</td>
<td>Research Fellow SWAN2</td>
<td>Lead for Athena SWAN outreach (taking over from Manja 2015)</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Warner</td>
<td>Professor and research group leader SWAN6</td>
<td>Lead for case studies</td>
<td>FT: three school-age children. Shares childcare with partner who is a FT paediatrician, works flexibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Wild</td>
<td>Senior Clinical Researcher SWAN3</td>
<td>Graphe data for application and helped devise survey</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selina Wray</td>
<td>Senior Research Associate SWAN3</td>
<td>Mentor lead for Molecular Neuroscience research group</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SAT has 10 members, 4 male and 6 female. The SAT team meets bi-monthly, usually on a Tuesday, and has been in place since June 2012. We aim to have as many of the SAT team present as possible for each meeting, but especially Mike Hanna (HoD) as he has been instrumental in enabling many of the initiatives we have successfully implemented. Katy Pestell (Athena SWAN support officer) prepares the agenda, takes minutes and has an active role in directing Athena SWAN initiatives and policies.

Prompted by the previous assessment panel’s comments about role rotation, we now alternate male and female chairs (Prof Reilly has left the SAT; Dr Alex Leff has taken on her role as chair). One of the PhD students has left and to offset the seniority of the panel and provide a better balance we have replaced these two women with three new female members who are more junior: Selina, SWAN 3; Helen, SWAN 2 and Manja/Kirsi, SWAN 2.

In response to panel feedback which welcomed us having an administrative lead, we have now formalized the role of Athena SWAN support officer, with the IoN paying for 0.2FTE for this post. Katy now meets with the chair (Alex) informally between 2-3 times per month to review progress on our initiatives.

We have consulted with individuals both inside and outside the University to help shape our plans: Alex has been on several externally organised Athena SWAN days (e.g. one organized by Dr Jan Bogg in September 2013; internal half-days organized by the UCL Athena SWAN Adviser Harriet Jones). We have also taken part in a Faculty-level, “peer challenge” system whereby SAT members from different departments within the Faculty meet to provide feedback on each other’s applications and action plans.

Lastly, we have sought advice on our initiatives (e.g. maternity mentors) and this application from Athena SWAN teams outside UCL (e.g. Imperial College London).

Biannual departmental questionnaire

An important part of monitoring responses to our initiatives is to survey the views of the department as a whole, in an anonymised way. Given the size of the department (see below, 418 academics and 191 support staff) an electronic questionnaire was deemed to be the most effective. We carried out an initial survey in 2012 (which helped prompt many of the initiatives outlined in this application) and we repeated the exercise in 2014 to see if there had been any changes. The questionnaire consists of 39 questions which we have conserved over time. Staff are asked to say what their role and gender is so we can classify into clinical/non-clinical/professional services staff and, of course, female: male. The response rate was 57% (115 females, 114 males), which was similar to 2012. Here we present only STEMM staff responses and not professional services staff responses, but will include these next time as we hope to identify the effects of our action plan.

While some of our initiatives do seem to have had a positive effect, some response percentages have stayed remarkably stable, which: a) gives us confidence that any improvements seen are not due to random fluctuation; b) encourages us to work harder and come up with new initiatives in the future. For example, we have had a positive effect on
informing our departmental members on UCL’s gender equality policies (12% improvement for females and 2% for males):

On the other hand, while the vast majority of staff report that they are treated according to their merits irrespective of their gender, there remains a wide gap (18%) between females and males. So it is absolutely critical that we do more over the coming years to improve this (E.g.: Actions 2.2-2.6.; 4.1-4.4).

We plan to continue sending out the questionnaire every two years (Action 3.1).

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 4-6 times per year with the main focus on how our initiatives are faring and adapting our actions as needed to continue to make progress. We will change the composition of the SAT later this year to bring in new members with fresh ideas and provide experience at working on a departmental committee.

Athena SWAN is now a standing item on the department’s main decision making body (IoN Executive Committee) and the SAT chair attends to provide updates.

We have found our biannual departmental survey to be particularly useful in capturing change and highlighting areas we need to work on (above) so will keep this a regular, biannual event.

3. A picture of the department: maximum 2000 words (1467)
   a) Provide a pen-picture of the department to set the context for the application, outlining in particular any significant and relevant features.

The Institute of Neurology (IoN) was established in 1950, merged with UCL in 1997, and is a key component of the Faculty of Brain Sciences at UCL. The IoN has eight large research groups, which encompass clinical and basic research within each theme. In parallel, there are six divisions representing professional affiliations. The IoN has a significant postgraduate teaching and training portfolio, with over 350 graduate students. The Institute employs over 600 staff, occupies some 12,000 sq. m of laboratory, lecture room and office space, and has a current annual turnover of £53m.

The IoN is considered a department by UCL, but, as mentioned above, itself has eight academic research groups, each with its own head. Seven of the research groups are based at one site in Queen Square and the eighth at the Royal Free Campus. Although we do teach clinical neurology to UCL medical students, we are primarily a postgraduate department and currently have 354 postgraduate students (141 on taught courses and 213 on research courses).

In the presentation of our data we use the standardised UCL SWAN categories as defined below. Where possible we will provide data for the last five years.

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

We do not run 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.
We provide teaching for UCL medical students, but are not involved in their recruitment or selection; the Medical School (a department of UCL Faculty of Medical Sciences) controls this. Below we provide UCL medical school data (green) compared with the UK average figures for clinical medicine (purple).

**Undergraduate students enrolling in clinical medicine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**: UCL has a gender balance that is slightly closer to 50:50 than the national average.

### 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 IoN taught courses cover a range of topics and include MSc, MRES and Dual Masters students. The vast majority are full time (FT) rather than part time (PT):

- MSc Advanced Neuroimaging: FT and PT
- Dual Masters in Brain and Mind Sciences: FT
- MSc Clinical Neurology: FT
- Postgraduate Diploma in Clinical Neurology: FT
- MSc Clinical Neuroscience: FT
- MSc Neurology for Clinical Trainees: PT
- UCL Diploma in Clinical Neurology via Distance Learning: PT
- MRes Translational Neurology: FT
- MSc/PG Dip/PGCert/MRes Stroke Medicine: FT
- MSc/PG Dip/PGCert/MRes Neuromuscular Disease: FT
- MRes Brain Sciences: FT
Below we provide IoN data (green) summed across all the courses listed above, compared with the UK HESA figures for biological sciences for 2012/13 (purple).

**Postgraduate students completing taught courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** Our F:M balance is consistent with the UK HESA data. 86% of females and 62% of males are full-time (as opposed to part-time), averaged over five years’ data. Our completion rates are high for both females and males. For years 2009-2012 inclusive the completion rates are 98%F : 91%M, the last year for which all students have now completed; for 2009-2014 inclusive the completion rates are lower at 87%F : 80%M because some students are registered part-time and others defer, so some are still completing.

A maternity policy is in place for all postgraduates.

**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.

This includes students registered for an MPhil/PhD, PhD or MD. The majority of clinical students are registered part-time (because of professional commitments), while the majority of non-clinical students are registered full-time. Below we provide IoN data (green) compared with the UK HESA figures for biological sciences for 2012/13 (purple).
Comment: Our F:M balance is consistent with the UK HESA data. 55% of females and 43% of males are full-time (as opposed to part-time), averaged over five years’ data.

(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.

Below we provide IoN data for applications, offers and acceptances for both taught courses (left) and postgraduate research courses (right)
Comment: Across both taught and research courses we have very similar F:M ratios for applications offers and acceptances. If anything, there used to be a slight bias against female students in the process which has now gone for postgraduate taught candidates and has been reversed for postgraduate research candidates, which is good as females were previously underrepresented.

(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.

Below we provide IoN data for taught course outcomes, by gender. Distinction is the highest achievable outcome followed by Merit and then Pass.
Comment: Despite most years showing that women are doing as well as men in the upper bracket (distinctions, always more than 50% are female); women do appear to be over-represented in the pass bracket. We have discussed this with the Education Unit at the IoN and, in case this represents different levels of supervision, have decided to ask the students to log the number of supervisory meetings they have with their supervisors for the research projects (Action 4.1). We will address any gender imbalances that arise.

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

Below is our data for all staff (clinical and non-clinical) combined, by SWAN grade, by year. Comments appear below the graphs that follow (same data split by clinical/non-clinical).
Female:male ratio of academic (non-clinical) and clinical staff—According to the latest version of the Athena SWAN handbook, "Departments with clinical and non-clinical staff should separate these two groups when presenting staff data." So we have split the same data into two groups.
Comment: Firstly, an important point to make on SWAN 1 level staff. These are non-clinical Research Assistants who are qualified to first degree or masters level. Some might also be studying part time for a PhD, but many are not. Thus, many post-holders are not necessarily on a research track (unlike SWAN 2-6).

Given this, the key transition points, for both non-clinical and clinical staff are from SWAN 2 → 3 and (particularly for academic as opposed to clinical staff) SWAN 5 → 6 (see graph below). In response to the panel’s previous comments where only improvements at Reader level were noted, we are pleased to be able to report an increase in the number of female clinical professors from two (2012, last application) to six (2014). The number of readers in this group has proportionately decreased due to these promotions. However, the situation is less good on the academic side where the disparity between M:F at SWAN 6 is not due to a failure of promotion, but rather an increase in the numbers of appointments of external (male) candidates, which is concerning (10 new appointments since 2012). We are addressing this, in part, with our senior mentoring programme (see below p.24) and our initiatives on making promotion and pay progression a key part of the appraisal process (p.29-30). At SWAN 4 (senior lecture) there has been a year-on-year increase in female appointments for the last three years across both clinical and academic staff.
This data is the same as that shown in combined Staff Data section (vii) above, but as a line graph for three years (2010, 2012 and 2014). Red arrows show the two main transition points that we are targeting with many of our Athena SWAN initiatives.

Comment: Females are somewhat over-represented in the most junior grade (SWAN 1) and are most equally represented at SWAN 2 (49%), which has by far the greatest numbers of employees. Our long term goal is to achieve this ratio across the more senior SWAN grades (3-6).

There are two sharp drop-off points beyond SWAN 1 which have not yet changed over time. The first drop-off is between SWAN 2 and 3 while the other at the most senior level, from SWAN 5 to 6. This latter drop-off is particularly problematic for non-clinical academics [see chart (viii) above].
We have instigated a range of initiatives to deal with this problem, the details of which are found in the next section, but in summary:

**SWAN 2 → SWAN 3**

**Actions in place**

1. IoN Athena SWAN mentoring programme (p.24-27).
3. Encourage female academics to apply for accelerated pay progression (p29-30).

**Actions planned**

1. Expand current IoN mentoring scheme so SWAN 2s can be mentors (Action 1.1).
2. Introduce and annual “careers day” for PhD students and post-docs (Action 1.4).
3. Encourage participation in outreach activities to boost CV and gain a better understanding of public engagement (Actions 3.3-3.7).
4. Encourage SWAN 2s and 3s to join and take part in activities run by the Neuroscience Career Network (Action 4.2).

**SWAN 5 → SWAN 6**

**Actions in place**

1. Named mentor for senior female academics (p.24-25).
2. Encourage female academics to apply for promotion and/or accelerated pay progression (p.29-30).

**Actions planned**

1. Modify IoN appraisal process (Action 1.3A and B).
Comment: For every time point there are fewer redundancies than resignations, which we view as a good thing. Turnover is relatively low with the resignations in particular mirroring the gender split across SWAN grades (table in vii, above); so we do not think there is a strong gender effect here. At more junior grades, contracts are often funding-limited, usually 2-3 years for a project grant and 5 years for a programme grant. End of Contract meetings are held approximately 4 months before the provisional termination date and possibilities for extension explored, although it is common for post-docs to seek a wide range of experience and they often wish to move elsewhere. Turnover of senior SWAN grades is exceptionally low (both SWAN 6s (male) retired), suggesting that, once established at the IoN, senior academics are fulfilled in their roles.
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.

5 year data, by SWAN grade, for: application, interview and appointment rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SWAN Grade 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>SWAN Grade 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications</strong></td>
<td>287 138</td>
<td>35 13</td>
<td>406 403</td>
<td>81 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
<td>35 13</td>
<td>9 2</td>
<td>32 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments</strong></td>
<td>9 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications</strong></td>
<td>533 216</td>
<td>37 12</td>
<td>287 318</td>
<td>59 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
<td>37 12</td>
<td>9 1</td>
<td>59 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments</strong></td>
<td>9 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications</strong></td>
<td>951 276</td>
<td>40 11</td>
<td>350 380</td>
<td>80 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
<td>40 11</td>
<td>14 3</td>
<td>80 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments</strong></td>
<td>14 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications</strong></td>
<td>420 168</td>
<td>48 12</td>
<td>356 313</td>
<td>80 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
<td>48 12</td>
<td>13 4</td>
<td>80 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments</strong></td>
<td>13 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications</strong></td>
<td>937 403</td>
<td>50 8</td>
<td>332 357</td>
<td>64 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
<td>50 8</td>
<td>17 3</td>
<td>64 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments</strong></td>
<td>17 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Comment: By volume, SWAN 2 is clearly the main grade and here the process seems very equal across the genders and over time. SWAN grade 3 is the only grade where, perhaps in some years, the proportion of females being offered interviews is less than one would expect from the ratio of applicants. We are addressing this by making sure that those who shortlist and interview are properly trained on fair recruitment and Equality and Diversity (see p.30 for current procedure and Action 2.2 for future plans). We always plan to have a minimum of one woman/25% female ratio on every appointments panel and will be formally monitoring this now (p.23 and Action 2.5).

Although the numbers are small, at SWAN grades 4-6 the main problem seems to be less female applicants, especially for the more senior (professorial) posts. We are addressing this by making the IoN a more attractive place for women to work and promoting this extensively (see organisation and culture section in current Action Plan on p.51-53).
Senior promotions (SWAN grades 4-6) go through the IoN Executive Committee for local approval before being passed onto the UCL Academic Promotions Committee, which reviews cases once per year. In the last 5 years, all those put forward by the IoN Executive Committee have been successful at the UCL committee. Below we provide 5 year data for Female:Male success rates at these three grades (SWAN 4 = senior lecturer; SWAN 5 = reader; SWAN 6 = professor).

(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.
**Comment:** The numbers are very low. There does not seem to be a problem with F:M ratios in terms of who gets promoted via this internal route, at least not for the most senior of promotions (e.g.: 4:5 F:M ratio at SWAN 6 over the last 5 years; equal proportions at SWAN 4), rather the problem lies in attracting women to apply for the more senior (externally advertised) posts. At SWAN 5 there is an imbalance (3:7) and we are addressing this by encouraging more female academics (particularly non-clinical academics) to apply for internal promotion (see Career development section p.28-30).

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
UCL has robust recruitment and equal opportunities policies in place to ensure fair selection and recruitment of academic staff. At the IoN we make sure that these policies are followed: 1) Job descriptions and adverts for all posts are reviewed by HR to ensure ‘gender neutral’ vocabulary and that person specifications do not discourage applications from either sex; 2) UCL’s Equal Opportunities policy is cited in all job descriptions; 3) shortlisting is conducted by at least two panel members; 4) make sure that interview panels contain at least 25% women for SWAN 3-6 jobs (see Action 2.5); 5) positive action can be used in a tie-break situation (although this has yet to occur in our department as far as we are aware); 6) interview panel members must first complete the UCL Recruitment training – this includes information on the Equality Act, and unconscious bias (we have been promoting this and increasing the number of IoN academics who are compliant now by 12% since 2012); 7) positive action statements are added to job adverts – those at higher grades specifically welcome female applicants. At the IoN we add the bronze Athena SWAN logo to all our job adverts to attract female applicants.

**Departmental Athena SWAN website**

We have produced a departmental Athena SWAN website that highlights all our achievements and future plans, which we update. We hope that this goes some way towards attracting female applicant to the IoN, as well as publicising our activities to current staff and students.
IoN Athena SWAN mentoring programme
This has been the most detailed and extensive of all our initiatives. We hope it will address the two main areas of poor transition: **SWAN 2 → SWAN 3** and **SWAN 5 → SWAN 6**.

Given the attritional data pattern across SWAN grades in section 3 (graph (viii)), we decided to set up a new mentoring scheme for all **non-clinical female academics SWAN 2 and above** (because these seemed to be the most vulnerable group; we have plans to expand to clinical academics in the future). We wanted to be ambitious and so set up a sub-committee to develop it, composed of:

- Dr Helene Plun-Favreau (SWAN 4, non-clinical) Lead
- Dr Alex Leff (SWAN 5, clinical)
- Prof Linda Greensmith (SWAN 6, non-clinical)
- Dr Helen Devine (SWAN 2, clinical)

We also identified a mentoring lead for each of the eight research groups.

**Identifying those eligible to be mentees and mentors**
Mentoring leads were asked to identify mentees in their research group. **56 mentees** signed up for the first cycle of the scheme and **25 mentors** (males or females, clinical or non-clinical - to increase the number of potential mentors, SWAN 3 and above) volunteered.

**Training the mentors: external expert**
While UCL has its own in-house and online mentor training and database (uMentor), we think it does not provide a deep enough training for the role. We train our mentors both in generic mentoring skills and in the specific departmental processes involved in salary and academic progression at the IoN. The Director agreed a renewable budget for an external expert (Fiona Eldridge) to run mentor training workshops. Two ‘in-house’ experts explain local rules on salary progression and academic advancement.

**Supporting the mentees and mentors**
Helene Plun-Favreau ran one formal and several informal group and individual meetings with mentees, so they could share their experiences of the scheme and air any concerns or questions. She also organised a similar meeting for mentors (October 2014). This feedback has influenced our future plans for the scheme.

**More senior SWAN grades (5 and 6)**
Given the lack of promotion at SWAN 6, particularly on the non-clinical side (see p.15); we decided that a senior female academic, Professor Linda Greensmith, would personally mentor the more senior female academics. Two female Readers (SWAN 5) are currently being mentored.
**How did we evaluate the scheme?**

Mentees (56) were sent a pre- and post-evaluation questionnaire (June/Dec 2014). There were three shared questions across both time points which enabled us to carry out a statistical analysis on these (using a related-samples Wilcoxon signed rank test). There were three additional questions that only appeared in the post-evaluation questionnaire. Each question had five options: Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree. We coded these on an ordinal scale from 1-5. The response rate was 76% for the pre-evaluation questionnaire and 75% for the post-evaluation questionnaire. We believe these encouraging results from the evaluation evidence the ongoing impact of this initiative.

**Results from the pre and post-evaluation questionnaire**

1. Mentees reported understanding the departmental academic promotion process better after having at least one mentoring session $Z = 3.79, p < .001$, 

![I understand the processes of academic promotion at the IoN](chart.png)
2. Mentees reported understanding salary progression better after having at least one mentoring session $Z = 2.50$, $p = .013$.

![Graph showing understanding of salary progression]

3. Mentees reported having a clear career action plan after having at least one mentoring session $Z = 2.92$, $p = .004$.

![Graph showing clear career action plan]

Also, in their post-evaluation questionnaire, mentees reported that they were: (i) more likely to apply for promotion; (ii) had incorporated feedback from their mentors; and, (iii) felt motivated by the mentoring process.
Future plans
The scheme seems to have positively affected the whole of the department, with our survey recording an 18% increase in women agreeing that the department offers them useful mentoring opportunities. Importantly, this hasn’t come at a cost to the men (see graph below).
We plan to expand the scheme to female, non-clinical PhD students (Action 1.1). This means that more junior grades can become mentors as well, which should help boost their experience of enabling others.

IoN Postdocs
Part of the IoN mentoring scheme was to hold feedback session for mentees. At one of these a group of nine IoN postdocs (six females and three males from five different research groups) got together to form the IoN postdoc committee. They now organise monthly seminar sessions that allow postdocs and others to keep abreast of recent scientific developments at IoN, meet with others outside of their research group and encourages mutual support. The first meeting took place in October 2014 and was a great success with over 100 scientists attending. The postdoc committee secured funding from the IoN to finance refreshments for the networking events after the seminars.

We have devised a raft of initiatives to help encourage PhD and post-doctoral students to continue within academia. Full details are in the action plan section but our list includes: involvement in more outreach activities (Action 3.3); register as an academic expert with the UCL media office (Action 3.4); encourage female academics to sign up to the ‘inspirational women in science’ list at UCL (Action 3.5); take part in activities run by the Neuroscience Career Network at UCL (Action 4.2); recruit more women as MSc module convenors (Action 4.3; making sure that credit for taking part in this educational activity is reflected in appraisal/promotion).

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?
Like many UCL departments, the IoN has its own internal procedure for those seeking senior promotions (SWAN 4-6), run by the IoN Executive. Research group heads identify suitable candidates who fill in the standardized promotions form. These are considered against UCL promotion criteria with the IoN group head making the case for promotion at the Executive meeting. Suitable candidates’ forms are submitted to the UCL Senior Promotions Committee. Feedback and support is given where necessary to improve any future application.

Individuals are supported in preparing for promotion through the appraisals system and ongoing advice and support from their manager. Clinical academics have had a yearly appraisal for many years (which goes beyond UCL’s two-yearly requirement); and, to even this up, we have just moved to annual appraisals in 2015 for non-clinical staff.

Additional ‘slip’ for UCL appraisal (promotion and pay progression)
UCL use a standard appraisal form. Although past performance and future plans are covered, there is no specific mention of either pay progression or promotion. Prompted by comments from our mentees, we have recently created an additional department-specific sheet, to be used in all appraisals, adding these two elements. This is obviously not a gender specific initiative, but given the evidence that females are less likely to discuss pay awards [Women Don’t Ask: The High Cost of Avoiding Negotiation. Babcock, L, New York (2007)], it is likely to have a more positive impact on women and we hope this will redress the balance somewhat. We will assess the effect of this intervention (Action 1.3A).

Trying to change UCL appraisal form
We have gone ahead with our local initiative and will also lobby central HR to consider changing the appraisal form for all UCL academics (Action 1.3B).

Accelerated spine point audit
All pay grades have automatic progression that occurs yearly; however, UCL has a mechanism for awarding an accelerated spine point progression (effectively allowing an employee to move up two spine points in a year). The application process is straightforward and, unlike senior academic promotion, can be requested at any time. The academic line manager has to support the application which is passed to the Director for local approval. Faculty board make a final decision, providing feedback where the application is turned down. We wanted to see if there was any gender bias in successful applications.

Below we show the gender balance for successful Accelerated Spine point applications at the IoN, collapsed over the last five years and across SWAN grades 1-5.
Comment: Even given the M>F ratios in the higher SWAN categories, there is a clear gender bias for this mode of salary advancement. We have addressed this by: 1) making salary progress a clear learning point in our mentoring programme; 2) making salary progression something that must be addressed at each IoN appraisal (above); 3) trying to alter the University-wide appraisal form (Action 1.3B); 4) continuing to collect this data to assess the impact of our initiative (Action 3.2).

(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 IoN Personnel team ensure that all new staff follow UCL policies including compulsory induction. New staff have to complete two reviews with their line manager before their appointment can be confirmed (at 3 and 8 months).

We strongly encourage all staff to complete UCL’s online Equality and Diversity training, which is a compulsory part of induction and should be completed in the first 6 weeks. As noted by the previous panel, in 2012 the IoN completion rate was disappointingly low: 29%.

Improving E&D training completion rate
We have improved our compliance rate from 29% in 2012 to 41% in 2015 by retroactively chasing up non-compliers. We will move to a proactive plan so we can continue to improve this figure, aiming for at least 80% completion by 2018 (Action 2.2).
All postgraduate students have a personal tutor, and all PhD students have at least two supervisors. The IoN Education Unit provides administrative, pastoral and generic academic support to over 170 IoN research students. The Unit is also responsible for Continuing Professional Development activities run by the IoN. The Unit promotes best practice in the design and delivery of teaching and research supervision on site, in line with UCL policies and procedures.

Students are free to contact tutors at any time to discuss problems. Prompted by student feedback and our slight M>F bias in distinctions (p.13), we are planning on monitoring the quantity and quality of student/supervisor sessions next year (Action 4.1).

We are also going to introduce an annual “careers day” for PhD students (and postdocs), which will build on existing career development programmes to provide targeted support on how to develop an academic career (Action 1.4).

**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 composition of the four main committees of the IoN is shown above. The **Executive** committee is by far and away the most influential. Composition of the committee is *ex-officio* and includes the heads of the eight research groups (appointed by the HoD), six clinical divisions and a few others from associated clinical or academic groups (e.g.: clinical director of the National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery; director of the Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience). We have increased the number of women serving on the committee by appointing deputies (see next section).

**The Clinical Trials** committee and **Athena SWAN** committees are in good shape regarding gender balance but the **Education** committee is rather male biased. This is in part due to the change in Education Unit manager from female to male last year. We have taken the view that trying to get more academic females onto the Education committee may be counter-productive as it will increase their administrative burden (‘committee overload’). Instead we have concentrated first on improving representation on the Executive committee.

(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.
UCL only uses fixed-term contracts in particular circumstances (contracts of less than 9 months), such as for maternity cover. All other contracts are open-ended, limited only by funding end dates. This means that all staff can benefit from the same opportunities regardless of their funding source. All researchers are on open ended, (grant-funded) contracts; currently 165 F : 155 M (52% female).

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?

**Male:Female imbalance of the IoN Executive Committee**

Most positions are **ex-officio**. We have had long discussions at the SAT and with the Executive as to how best to improve this. Our current solution is that each committee member appoints two deputies, (either male and female or two females), who can represent them at meetings they cannot attend. Deputies are also encouraged to attend as an observer first, to become familiar with the workings of the committee and thus take an active role (**Action 2.1**).

So far we have had four meetings with the new system in place and the female/male ratios have improved from 3/18 (**14%**) to: 5/12 (**30%**, December), 4/10 (**29%**, February) and 5/9 (**36%**, March). In time, we expect new members to be drawn from these deputies.

(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.

All staff are expected to contribute to all aspects of departmental work including: academic, teaching, administrative and pastoral care. The UCL promotional criteria recognizes this. Within the IoN there are a large number of administrative and pastoral roles and these are rotated. Each member of staff is given the opportunity at their appraisal to discuss their workload and adjust if necessary.

In our 2014 survey 84% of female academics and 93% of males agreed that “At the IoN, work is allocated on a clear and fair basis irrespective of gender” Stable (1% increase) from 2012.

(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 but one of the IoN meetings have been moved to fit in with our core hours of 10-4. The IoN Executive committee meeting remains scheduled for 5.30pm monthly with dates known a year
in advance and, following a detailed discussion at the Executive, the decision was that this time should continue to maximise attendance given clinical responsibilities; however, the issue will continue to be revisited yearly and as new members join (Action 2.1).

The IoN has regular social gatherings. These are popular but by their nature some happen out of core hours. Sufficient notice is always given to try to allow people to make arrangements to attend. The IoN survey showed that 91% of women and 97% of men agree that our work-related social activities were equally welcoming to both women and men (an increase of 7% and 4% respectively on 2012).

(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

This is an area in which we have been pleased to see improvements. Several of the initiatives discussed above have wider implications than just serving to help individual female academics; they also demonstrate that there has been a change in departmental culture. The three best examples are the maternity room (p.38), the maternity mentors (p.38-39) and the Athena SWAN mentoring scheme (p.24-27). The first two of these, in particular, only directly affect a few women each year at the IoN; however, knowledge of them is high (70% of women surveyed in 2014 knew about the maternity room). This clearly has had an effect on culture with one female academic emailing, “Nice to see something truly concrete in this domain!”

We also have improved on providing information to departmental members. 11% more women and 18% more men feel informed about gender issues than 2 years ago, although there is still more work to be done on this (Action 4.4).

(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.
IoN encourages outreach activities which aim to inspire the next generation of neuroscientists/clinical academics. Several of our staff take part in a variety of UCL run programmes including the Visiting Research Student programme. Many local schools have work experience programmes and IoN clinical academics take these students on an *ad hoc* basis. In fact most of our outreach activities are *ad hoc* and thus difficult to quantify. We are addressing this by now having a SAT member take responsibility for logging these – both in terms of the target audience and those taking part in outreach activities ((Action 3.3)). Here are some recent examples:

- Several female IoN academics acted as mentors at the Women of the World International Day mentoring event at the London Eye in October 2014. ~180 schoolgirls aged between 11 and 18 were speed-mentored.
- Selina Wray (SAT member) is helping to curate a session that will talk about Women and Dementia for this year’s Women of the World festival at London’s South Bank. She has also spoken to A-level students as part of the ‘I Know I can’ project.
- Kirsi Kinnunen (SAT member) is setting up an IoN hosted Ada Lovelace Day. This is to celebrate the achievements of women in STEMM. The plan is to invite girls from a local school -at the stage when they are deciding which A-levels to take- to visit a research lab at the IoN. There will be tours of our labs followed by a Q&A session (Action 3.6).

Although there is a ~10% gap still between men and women at the IoN, both think that we are improving in terms of how much we value using women as well as men as visible role models.

![My Department uses women as well as men as visible role models](image)

We will address this by encouraging our academics to register as experts with the UCL media office, to ensure more women have an active role in interactions with the media (Action 3.4). We will encourage women to sign up to the UCL ‘inspirational women in science’ list; a list that is distributed to schools as part of the UCL outreach brochure (Action 3.5).
Below are the IoN female and male parental leave and return rates for the last 5 years:

**Parental leave return rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>5/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** The IoN actively supports academics whilst they are developing their careers and families. The number of female academics taking maternity leave is 7-10 per year and, bar an unusual year 2010/11, return rates are high (85-90%: 2013-14 data not complete as two are still on leave).

(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.

Our paternity leave figures and comments are included in the previous section. Interestingly, in the last two years, considerably more men have been taking paternity leave (up from one p.a. to five p.a.), which we view as a positive change and one that may go a small way to counter the stereotype that women are always the ‘primary carers’ for children. UCL offers 4 weeks full pay paternity leave, which is double the national requirement. We will continue to support this in our action planning by having an IoN paternity/adoption mentor (Action 1.2), and better dissemination of information about maternity and paternity support including the new provision of shared parental leave (Action 3.9). No individuals took adoption or parental leave in the last 5 years.

(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
The IoN does not hold records on either formal or informal applications for flexible working as this is the accepted working culture (see below).

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.

Flexible working arrangements are all handled, informally, at the IoN research group level. All group leads are encouraged to allow flexible working arrangements. These are commonly required as many staff have young children in nurseries near their homes. The informality of this arrangement potentially compromises transparency. To counter this, we are planning on adding a section to our Athena SWAN website that solely deals with flexible working arrangements (**Action 3.9**).  

Things have improved since 2012, where our survey suggested that there was quite a large gender gap relating to flexible working; however, the 2014 results show that equal numbers of women and men at IoN now feel supported in this regard.

![](image)

However, we accept that this informal approach has drawbacks. For instance, changes in leadership could mean that local policy might change and it would be hard for employees to demonstrate that they already had an agreement in place. We are therefore going to add the topic of flexible working into our local appraisal form so that this is discussed and documented on a yearly basis with each IoN employee’s line manager (**Action 2.6**).
We have four main initiatives that address this, the first two are already up-and-running and are very successful: the maternity room and maternity mentors; the third, a paternity/adoption mentor, will start this year \((\text{Action 1.2})\); the fourth - a planned crèche in the new IoN building - is several years away \((\text{Action 2.3})\).

**Athena SWAN Maternity Room**

This is a room for pre- or post-partum women to use when they are feeling unwell, need a rest or need to express breast milk. The room has a sink, fridge, water dispenser, small table, four chairs and a long sofa. The room is lockable from the inside and has an “in use” sign on the outside of the door.

The room does not need to be booked. Although developed for IoN employees, anyone with a valid UCL card can use it.

We do not keep records but have had positive feedback from several women e.g.: “This is a major advance”; and, “I just wanted to say thank you for organising the maternity room. I was feeling unwell this morning and having access to a quiet space to rest did me the world of good.”
Maternity mentors
The SAT took the view that this is a particularly important issue as it is one that exclusively affects women and can have a detrimental effect on their academic careers if not handled well. We asked for volunteers who had taken maternity leave themselves in the department. Professor Olga Ciccarelli (SWAN 6) leads for clinical academics and Dr Bernadett Kalmar (SWAN 4) leads for non-clinical academics.

Dr Bernadett Kalmar

I have had two children while working at the Institute of Neurology and thus have experience with issues arising from taking maternity leave, adjustments when returning to work and establishing a healthy work life balance. As one of my children was born extremely prematurely I also had some special circumstances to deal with at the time and was lucky to have the support of my line manager and UCL. I am happy to discuss and advice how to deal with maternity leave. I have had two children while working at the Institute of Neurology and have tried to find a balance between my professional commitments and my family life. I am now a Professor of Neurology. So if you are a mum-to-be and are working at UCL, please feel to get in touch for a chat. I will be able to tell you who to contact if further advice is necessary or particular issues are identified.

Professor Olga Ciccarelli

As well as giving mentoring support in the traditional sense, we realised that the role would also involve a lot of practical advice e.g. maternity pay; keep-in-touch days; return to work issues. So we arranged for Mike Higgins, UCL HR Policy Officer to come to our department in order to brief our maternity mentors on the more technical details.

Comment: We do appear to have had a significant impact on our female academics’ view on how supported they would feel if they took a career break (10% improvement on two years ago).
Paternity/Adoption leave mentor
Dr Michael Lunn (a clinician) took eight weeks adoption leave in 2012. He has kindly agreed to act as a paternity/adoption leave mentor, much like our maternity mentors above (Action 1.2).

IoN Athena SWAN Support Officer
Katy Peste has been providing support to the SAT since 2012; however, this was initially an additional duty added to her already busy job plan as an IoN personnel administrator. Following our successful bronze award, the SAT decided that the administrative burden was going to increase as we implemented our initiatives. After discussion with Katy, we thought that 0.2FTE (one day a week) was representative of the work load. Mike (HoD) supported this and found funds within the IoN budget to pay for Katy’s time. This has made a huge difference to the efficiency of the SAT and our Athena SWAN initiatives in general (particularly the mentoring scheme which took a lot of administrative time to set up and match everybody up). Katy took maternity leave in 2013 to look after her son and returned part-time to her personnel administrator/Athena SWAN support officer roles. Finding the money to fund this post demonstrates the importance with which the department takes the Athena SWAN process at the IoN and is an important recognition for how much time and effort it takes to shape institutional change on gender issues.

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.
**Crèche in new IoN building**

The Director has been leading on this important initiative that will help secure the future of the IoN and allow for even better clinical/academic partnership at Queen Square. The plans for the new building on the current site will mean a 100% increase in floor space. Many new clinical and academic facilities are planned but we also plan to add in space for a crèche. The details of exactly how this would be run (run by UCL or an external franchise) are yet to be agreed, but we think this will provide an important resource that will help attract and retain female academics at the IoN (Action 2.3).

**Causing culture change**

We have used the survey data to make the case that in some areas (but by no means all) we have made progress as a department since our Bronze award in 2013. Below we show that this is not just having an effect on female academics. Both male and female academics indicate an increase of 8% in their agreement that they understand why we are taking action on gender equality, compared with two years ago.

![I understand my Department's reasons for taking action on gender equality.](chart)

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,
Previous (2013) action plan with outcomes

NB: please note, our Bronze award is not due for renewal until November 2016, meaning we are submitting to upgrade a year and a half in advance. For this reason, some actions are still ongoing or have been amended and included within the new 2015 action plan where appropriate

1 Self Assessment process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Persons responsible</th>
<th>Success measures</th>
<th>Outcome 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Advancement of women’s careers in ION due to actions developed from 3 yearly QS survey</td>
<td>Run QS survey 3 yearly and improve survey each time based on experience from previous surveys</td>
<td>Next survey September 2015 with new questions based on experience from 2012 survey (e.g. assess new mentorship scheme)</td>
<td>SAT Chair (Mary Reilly) SAT admin lead (Katy Pestell)</td>
<td>Survey updated and done 3 yearly and used to inform action plan</td>
<td>Achieved early (survey redone after two years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Improved accuracy of central UCL HR data available to SAT team</td>
<td>Review student / staff and interview data provided by UCL HR in January 2014 and then annually to see if new system implemented in November 2012 to improve accuracy of data has worked and modify new system as necessary.</td>
<td>Review new system Jan 2014 and every Jan annually</td>
<td>ION personnel head (Libby Bertram) SAT admin lead (Katy Pestell)</td>
<td>Accurate data available for SAT to review annually. SAT use data to update SWAN action plan annually</td>
<td>Achieved: accuracy improved, data reviewed annually by SAT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Constantly evolving SWAN action plan</td>
<td>Review yearly UCL HR data and three yearly QS survey to review action plan and modify if necessary.</td>
<td>1st Review Jan 2014 and yearly afterwards</td>
<td>ION personnel head (Libby Bertram) SAT admin lead (Katy Pestell) SAT chair (Mary Reilly)</td>
<td>Action plan modified every January by SAT. Modified plan signed off by ION executive every February</td>
<td>Achieved: ongoing in SAT meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2 Student-related

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Persons responsible</th>
<th>Success measures</th>
<th>Outcome 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Continuation of good overall gender balance for taught and research postgraduate courses and for degree completion and classification.</td>
<td>Monitor all student data every January from 2014 and develop action plan to address any gender imbalances identified.</td>
<td>1st student data review Jan 2014 and yearly afterwards</td>
<td>ION head of teaching and learning support (Dan Warr)</td>
<td>Equal or better overall gender balance for SWAN renewal application in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Increased number of female clinical postgraduate research students from 40% to 50% or above by 2016</td>
<td>Introduce seminar series for female junior doctors (FY1 / FY2 /ST1 / ST2 / ST3) to encourage them to consider a career in neurology (especially academic neurology). Offer mentorship to those interested</td>
<td>Yearly from Sep 2014</td>
<td>SAT chair (Mary Reilly)</td>
<td>Increased number of female clinical PhD students by 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Improved female student satisfaction and experience in ION.</td>
<td>Develop a QS student survey to specifically explore the opinions and experiences of all students in ION and to see if there are any gender inequalities</td>
<td>Student survey to be conducted March 2014 and to be amalgamated with QS survey for September 2015 and then administered 3 yearly</td>
<td>SAT team member (Ed Wild) SAT admin lead (Katy Pestell)</td>
<td>2014 survey completed and actions implemented to address any issues identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Staff-related

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Persons responsible</th>
<th>Success measures</th>
<th>Outcome 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Increased number of women in all SWAN grades 3 to 6 (especially in SWAN 6 and SWAN 3) by time of SWAN renewal application in 2016.</td>
<td>Monitor new mentorship scheme yearly starting Mar 2014 as described below (action plan 5.1) and iteratively improve scheme. Also amend QS survey to be conducted in 2015 to include questions on new mentorship scheme.</td>
<td>Review new mentorship scheme April 2014 and yearly every April</td>
<td>ION personnel head (Libby Bertram) / SAT mentor leads (Linda Greensmith and Tom Warner)</td>
<td>Review of staff data showing increase of women in SWAN 3-6 yearly from 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review staff data yearly as described above from Jan 2014 with specific reference to women in SWAN 3-6 categories and amend action plan yearly if necessary.</td>
<td>Review staff gender data yearly from Jan 2014</td>
<td>ION personnel head (Libby Bertram) / SAT admin lead (Katy Pestell)</td>
<td>Monitor senior promotion data yearly starting Sep 2014 and amend new promotion procedures if necessary in annual updated action. Also amend QS survey to be conducted in 2015 to include questions on new promotion procedures</td>
<td>Institute Director (Dir/Mike Hanna) / SAT chair (Mary Reilly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor senior staff promotion data yearly from Sep 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Key Career Transition Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Persons responsible</th>
<th>Success measures</th>
<th>Outcome 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 All ION interview panels have at least one female member</td>
<td>Ensure all interview panels have a female member by using junior female academic and research staff to avoid overburdening senior females. Monitor all interview panel gender data yearly starting Jan 2014 as described above (action 1.2) and address if non compliant by alerting panel chairs prior to interview</td>
<td>Monitor interview panel gender data yearly from Jan 2014</td>
<td>ION personnel head (Libby Bertram) and SAT admin lead (Katy Pestell)</td>
<td>All interview panels have at least one female member</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Equal numbers of females and males shortlisted and offered posts for SWAN 3, 4 and 5 by time of SWAN renewal application in 2016.</td>
<td>ION personnel will be responsible for monitoring gender balance of all shortlisted lists and let chair of selection panel know if a discrepancy so that it can be investigated early. ION personnel will be responsible for monitoring outcome of all individual interviews will ask chair of interview panel to comment on any inequalities. Review staff interview data yearly as described above from Jan 2014 and amend action plan yearly if necessary.</td>
<td>Monitoring begins May 2013</td>
<td>ION personnel head (Libby Bertram) and SAT admin lead (Katy Pestell)</td>
<td>Improvement in gender balance for shortlisting and offers year on year from Jan 2014</td>
<td>Partially achieved: Comparing 2011-12 data with 2013-14 data (p.20-21) for shortlisting and posts offered across the three grades (= 6 outcome measures) we improved on 4/6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 QS promotion processes perceived to be fair and transparent in QS survey 2015.</td>
<td>Monitor compliance to new departmental promotion guidance by surveying all HoDs yearly from April 2014. Assess impact of the new guidance in QS survey in 2015</td>
<td>HoD monitoring questionnaire to be done Feb 2014 and then yearly.</td>
<td>SAT member (Alex Leff)</td>
<td>Yearly increased compliance with new guidance and UCL policy from Feb 2014. Improved perception of promotion policy in QS survey 2015</td>
<td>Partially achieved: In response to the survey question on “Under-standing the departmental promotion process.” 49% of F (was 41%) and 67% of M (was 67%) agreed. We hope this will improve with our new appraisal process (Action 1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. Career Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Persons responsible</th>
<th>Success measures</th>
<th>Outcome 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5.1** Mentorship scheme successfully embedded in ION | • Monitor all departments yearly from Jan 2014 to ensure new mentorship schemes are being adhered to  
• Encourage all mentees / mentors to attend UCLs mentoring workshop  
• Mentoring team to evaluate scheme by annual mentee / mentors reports from Jan 2014. Scheme to be adapted and improved as necessary by mentoring leads.  
• Adapt the QS survey questions on mentoring to assess the impact of new scheme in 2015. | • Mentoring scheme introduced Jan 2013  
• Monitoring of scheme to begin Jan 2014 and yearly afterwards | ION personnel head (Libby Bertram / SAT mentor leads (Linda Greensmith and Tom Warner)) | • All females being mentored by Jan 2014  
• All staff being mentored by SWAN renewal application 2016  
QS survey showing positive impact of mentoring scheme in 2015 | Partially achieved: as not for all females. This is rolling out over the next period (see Action 1.1). |
| **5.2** Better understanding of the reasons staff leave (fixed and permanent) | Introduce exit interview for all staff leaving with structured documentation | To start June 2013 | HoDs ION personnel lead (Libby Bertram) | All staff leaving have exit interview by 2014. Staff leave either from fixed contracts or for promotion | Not achieved: goal dropped HR lacked capacity to carry this out, and exit surveys (rather than interviews) soon to be in place across UCL with data being provided to departments |
| **5.3** All staff have completed diversity training by QS survey 2015 | ION personnel to monitor completion of diversity training as part of the compulsory job review monitoring which occurs before an appointment is confirmed. The results will be monitored by SAT | • Process to start June 2013  
• Monitoring by SAT yearly from Jan 2014 | ION personnel lead (Libby Bertram) | Year by year increase in number of staff completing diversity training | In progress: up from 29% to 41%. We will continue to promote the training to aim towards 80% by 2018 renewal/upgrade |
### 6. Organisation and culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Persons responsible</th>
<th>Success measures</th>
<th>Outcome 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.1 Institute and departmental meetings happening during core working hours. | • Following initial survey and action taken, monitor all established and new ION and departmental meeting times to ensure they occur during core working hours yearly from April 2014 and amend times if necessary. | • Monitor yearly from Apr 2014  
• 2015 QS survey | ION admin lead (Katy Pestell) and Institute Director (Mike Hanna) | Good compliance yearly to core time meeting guidance. No gender discrimination to meeting membership or attendance due to meeting times | Partially achieved: All cross-departmental meetings occur within Athena SWAN hours (10-4) with the exception of the IoN Executive meeting. See Action 2.1 below. |
| 6.2 Improved gender balance in Institute wide committees | • Introduce / increase post-doctoral and student representation on the education and computing committees to increase access of females to these committees.  
• Aim to increase female membership of the ION executive by actively increasing promotion of females in ION as per action plan 3.1.  
• Monitor gender balance of all 4 committees and new committees yearly from Jan 2014. | • Introduce new membership Sep 2013  
• See action plan 3.1  
• Monitoring yearly from Jan 2014 | SAT member (Helen Plun-Favreau) and ION admin lead (Katy Pestell) | 1. Yearly increase in female representation on all 4 committees  
Experience for female post docs and students on ION committees | Partially achieved: Two of the four committees have improved, including the Exec, although more work needed on this, see Action 2.1 below. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Persons responsible</th>
<th>Success measures</th>
<th>Outcome 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Female staff feel ION values their full range of skills</td>
<td>Introduce questions to QS survey for 2015 to assess whether the new mentoring scheme has increased the percentage of women who feel the full range of skills are valued.</td>
<td>QS survey question 2015</td>
<td>SAT mentoring lead (Linda Greensmith)</td>
<td>Not achieved: goal modified The % responding to this Q (for both males and females) remained unchanged between 2012 and 2014: 68% of F (both times) and 80% of M (was 81%) agreed their skills were valued (in relation to appraisal). Because the Q is linked to appraisal, this might be affecting responses. So track this goal with other Qs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Female staff feel ION is female-friendly and inclusive</td>
<td>2. Monitor the Action plan implementation and success yearly from Jan 2014 and report to the ION executive every Feb to ensure the Athena Swan practises are embedded in ION culture 3. Assess the impact of the action plan by comparing the answers to questions about ION culture in the QS survey in 2015 to the 2012 survey</td>
<td>Yearly monitoring of action plan from Jan 2014 Qs survey 2015</td>
<td>SAT member (Ed Wild)</td>
<td>Not achieved: goal modified The % responding to the Q “I feel that my Department is a great place for women to work in.” remained largely unchanged between 2012 and 2014: 73% → 74% for F and 90% → 92% for M. Given the high % for M it was perhaps unreasonable to expect F responses to overtake these. Plan is to focus more on culture change (see Actions 2.1-2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Equal or more female school children and student electives in ION</td>
<td>Monitor gender balance of school children and students doing placements and electives in ION</td>
<td>Monitoring yearly from Sep 2014</td>
<td>ION Education support (Dan Warr)</td>
<td>Not achieved: goal modified Establish a programme of annual IoN open days aimed at schools (see Action 3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop collaboration with the UCL academy (secondary school run by UCL) for female staff to visit school on a yearly basis to deliver seminars in careers for females in neurosciences. Offer mentorship to any school children identified who are interested in neuroscience</td>
<td>Aim for first seminar in 2014</td>
<td>SAT member (Helen Plun-Favreau)</td>
<td>Increase in applications for undergraduate and postgraduate females in neuroscience</td>
<td>Achieved Increase in applications (and offers) for postgraduate females in neuroscience between 2011-12 and 2013-14 (at both MSc and PhD level, see p.12).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7  Flexibility and managing career breaks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Persons responsible</th>
<th>Success measures</th>
<th>Outcome 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7.1     | Female staff and students happy with ION systems for maternity leave and return to work | Monitor impact of new maternity mentors by questionnaire of all staff who take maternity leave before leave and after return to work and adapt mentor role if necessary. Ensure tenure of maternity mentor role is 2 years maximum. | 1. Maternity mentor appointed Feb 2013  
2. Monitoring to start May 2013 | SAT member (Alex Leff) | Females reporting that they find the new maternity mentoring system helpful. Increased return to work after maternity leave for fixed term staff. | Achieved – informal feedback from maternity mentors (p.39) |
| 7.2     | Accurate data for paternity / adoption leave available by 2015 | ION personnel head to introduce compulsory reporting of all paternity and adoption leave from May 2013. Introduce questions in QS survey 2015 to capture this data (especially if paternity leave is being taken). | Introduce reporting May 2013 | ION personnel head (Libby Bertram) | Accurate data available Paternity and adoption leave taken by all eligible staff | Achieved |

**KEY**
- SAT = Self Assessment Team
- QS = Queen Square
- ION = Institute of Neurology
- HR = Human Resources
- Dir = Director of Institute of Neurology
- HoDs = Heads of research departments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Specific action</th>
<th>What is currently in place?</th>
<th>Success Measures</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Person(s) responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority 1: Addressing key career transition points at the IoN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td><strong>IoN mentoring scheme:</strong> Expand to include PhD academic (non-clinical) females as new mentees and SWAN 2s as new mentors</td>
<td>The mentoring scheme is currently for SWAN 2-6, non-clinical, academics; with mentoring from SWAN 3s and above</td>
<td>1) Mentees survey: we would expect similar gains as in our current mentoring survey (p.25-26), so 20-40%↑ in response to the main three Qs. 2) Biannual departmental survey: A further 10%↑ in response to the Q “My dept. provides me with useful mentoring opportunities” (current rate 69%).</td>
<td>Scoping exercise (April 2015) Additional training sessions (June 2015) First meeting (July-Aug 2015)</td>
<td>IoN Athena SWAN mentoring sub-committee: Helene Plun-Favreau, Linda Greensmith, Katy Pestell, Alex Leff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td><strong>Paternity/adoption mentor:</strong> Given imminent introduction of Shared Parental Leave that should encourage men to take parental leave, we will appoint a paternity mentor in 2015</td>
<td>We currently have two maternity mentors; a scheme which has had a positive impact (p.39)</td>
<td>Mike will: 1) keep a record of the number of people he advises; 2) collect qualitative feedback from the people he advises; 3) We expect the impact will show on relevant sections of our biannual survey.</td>
<td>Train (June 2015) Advertise service availability (July 2015)</td>
<td>Mike Lunn (clinician); Alex Leff (SAT contact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3A</td>
<td><strong>Modify IoN appraisal process:</strong> to encourage female academics to apply for promotion and/or accelerated pay progression: Add in a departmental-specific appraisal form (M and F)</td>
<td>The UCL-wide appraisal form does not specifically mention promotion or pay progression. Appraisals are held annually in IoN (above UCL requirement of biennial appraisals)</td>
<td>The biannual IoN staff survey has several questions about promotion and pay progression. We will expect at least a 5% increase in response to Qs on this every 2 years.</td>
<td>Form is already designed (April 2015) Inform group heads (Exec meeting May 2015)</td>
<td>Katy Pestell; and research group heads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3B</td>
<td><strong>Lobby UCL HR:</strong> to add in these questions to the standard UCL form</td>
<td>Proposals being discussed centrally at UCL, but no drafts have been circulated yet.</td>
<td>A 10% increase in female academics being either successful in promotion and/or being awarded pay increments.</td>
<td>Check usage with group heads (Dec 2015)</td>
<td>Katy to liaise with UCL HR / Harriet Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Specific action</td>
<td>What is currently in place?</td>
<td>Success Measures</td>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td><strong>Introduce an annual “careers day” for PhD students and postdocs:</strong> Build on existing career development programmes to provide targeted support on how to develop an academic career.</td>
<td>There is currently an Early Careers in Neuroscience mailing list which runs quarterly events such as how to get published, how to write grants etc. followed by networking.</td>
<td>1) At least 50 post docs attending the first careers day 2) Positive feedback from attendees (course questionnaire) 3) Suggestions from attendees on how to improve future events.</td>
<td>Yearly: first meeting for February 2016</td>
<td>Selina Wray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority 2: Changing the organisational culture and profile of the IoN

<p>| 2.1 | <strong>Address M:F imbalance on IoN executive committee:</strong> Add a non-professorial member to represent more junior academics (expand the exec with more posts) | Exec members include all the research group HoDs and divisional heads plus a few others (n = 21). | We will aim for a consistent improvement in the ratio of F:M attendees of 33-50% (judged by attendance in the freely available minutes) | 6-monthly reviews | Mike Hanna (HoD) |
| 2.2 | <strong>Address non-compliance with E&amp;D training:</strong> Continue to improve the proportion of those with completed E&amp;D training at IoN, by having a lead responsible for each research group | SAT lead and research group HoDs occasionally email IoN staff and remind them to complete training. 2013 = 29%. 2015 = 41% | Compliance rates are measured by UCL HR. Individual research group leads will be fed-back the % completion rates. Aim for at least 80% completion by 2018 | Yearly checks in January | Katy Pestell; and research group E&amp;D champions |
| 2.3 | <strong>Crèche in new IoN building:</strong> A major rebuild of the main research building (Queen Square House) is being driven by our HoD: Mike Hanna. He has agreed that provision for an IoN crèche will be made in the plans | UCL has some crèche facilities, and the closest one is an 11 minute walk away. It is also heavily oversubscribed | At least 20 nursery places available to IoN staff (pending planning approval). | Yearly checks in September. Planning permission expected by 2018. | Mike Hanna (HoD) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Specific action</th>
<th>What is currently in place?</th>
<th>Success Measures</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Person(s) responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td><strong>Informal networking support group for female professional services staff.</strong> To share ideas, gather information and make new contacts. Also encourage them to join the UCL Astrea network so they can meet women outside the dep.</td>
<td>Nothing local: Staff are currently dispersed at different locations across the IoN site. UCL has the Astrea network for women in professional services, but no IoN staff signed up yet.</td>
<td>1) At least 16 female professional services staff attending informal local meetings (15+ female administrators at the IoN have so far expressed a wish to be a part of the scheme) 2) At least 20 signed up for Astrea. 3) Biannual IoN survey e.g.: ‘my department provides me with useful networking opportunities’ (Q9), Compare responses before and after the establishment of the scheme.</td>
<td>Aim to hold two sessions by end of 2015.</td>
<td>Katy Pestell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td><strong>Closer monitoring of IoN interview panels in SWAN categories 3-6, aiming for 100% to be at least 25% female.</strong> IoN Personnel will alert the recruiting contact to find alternative panel members, if possible, when there is not at least 25% female representation and will suggest alternative members.</td>
<td>IoN Personnel do routinely ask staff to make sure that the gender composition of all interview panels meets the minimum 25% female criteria, but this data is not routinely recorded and evaluated. We will also continue to encourage female members to undertake the UCL interview training to ensure the widest possible pool of interviewers.</td>
<td>As close as possible to 100% of all IoN interview panels at SWAN levels 3-6 to be at least 25% female.</td>
<td>May 2015 onwards</td>
<td>Katy Pestell (with support from local research group administrators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Specific action</td>
<td>What is currently in place?</td>
<td>Success Measures</td>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td><strong>Modify IoN appraisal process: to make sure that flexible working is discussed and documented at each appraisal:</strong> Add this into the departmental-specific appraisal form (for both M and F). See action point 1.3B</td>
<td>Informal arrangements for flexible working that appear to be working well, but formal documentation of these discussions will benefit IoN employees.</td>
<td>The biannual IoN staff survey has a question about flexible working, with 81% of males and females agreeing that “My line manager/supervisor is supportive of requests for flexible working” (see p.37). We will hope that this will by 5% increase in the next survey.</td>
<td>Form is already designed (April 2015)</td>
<td>Katy Pestell; and research group heads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority 3: Information gathering, information delivery and outreach at the IoN

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td><strong>Biannual IoN survey:</strong> Aim to increase response rate from both academics and professional services staff e.g.: by requesting the HoD to send out the link to the survey, by presenting data, actions and improvements at an all staff meeting to raise awareness.</td>
<td>We use the UCL, in-house Opinio tool which means that each person is sent a unique link to the survey (thus, the survey is only completed by those eligible)</td>
<td>Aim to increase the response rate by 5% each time the survey is run.</td>
<td>Next survey planned for Autumn 2016</td>
<td>Katy Pestell &amp; Alex Leff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td><strong>Data streams on staff and students:</strong> Continue to improve on current arrangements i.e.: make sure we are collecting data so we can see if action points like 1.3A and 4.1 are having an effect</td>
<td>Data streams have considerably improved from our last application to this. Katy Pestell liaises with: UCL HR, UCL AS officer, IoN Education Unit and IoN HR.</td>
<td>Aim for parity with males on number of accelerated spine points awarded (see graph on p.30)</td>
<td>Yearly updates: Dec.</td>
<td>Katy Pestell and UCL staff who collect requisite data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Specific action</td>
<td>What is currently in place?</td>
<td>Success Measures</td>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td><strong>Encourage IoN involvement in more Outreach activities</strong>: We have appointed a SAT member to create and maintain a spreadsheet of all outreach activities across the dept. and to make sure the work is fairly shared across males and females.</td>
<td>Only ad hoc at present, with no central records of outreach involvement or ways of managing the work load (examples on p.35)</td>
<td>Spreadsheet of all Outreach activities including: 1) who delivered the activity; 2) intended audience; 3) main aim; 4) number attended (by gender); 5) hours taken to deliver said activity</td>
<td>Standing item on future SAT agenda: bimonthly updates.</td>
<td>Kirsi Kinnunen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td><strong>Register more of our academics as experts with the UCL media office</strong>: Kirsi will encourage IoN academics to join, especially SWAN 2-3 to help build their PPI experience and enhance their CVs (via announcements from group leaders; IoN post-Doc committee)</td>
<td>Only ad hoc at present</td>
<td>1) At least 20 IoN academics signed up with UCL media office by 2018. 2) Kirsi will liaise with UCL media office, keep a spreadsheet of completed events by gender and update the SAT.</td>
<td>Yearly: October</td>
<td>Kirsi Kinnunen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td><strong>Encourage female academics to sign up to the UCL ‘inspirational women in science’ list</strong>: This is promoted as part of the outreach brochure that is sent to all local schools. Members of the list are then asked to attend any events hosted by the school</td>
<td>Only ad hoc at present</td>
<td>1) At least 10 female IoN academics signed up by 2018. 2) IoN staff to have visited at least four schools by 2018</td>
<td>Yearly: October</td>
<td>Kirsi Kinnunen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Specific action</td>
<td>What is currently in place?</td>
<td>Success Measures</td>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td><strong>Organise Annual Ada Lovelace Day event</strong>: Each year, we will target a different aspect of highlighting women’s achievements in science/STEMM. The 2015 event (described on p. 35) is focused on the importance and lasting impact of positive role models. Organising committee meetings monthly between March/April and September</td>
<td>Planning of the first event (Oct 2015) is underway; the first organising committee meeting will take place in March/April, with the committee then meeting regularly until October when the event takes place.</td>
<td>1) At least 50 attendees&lt;br&gt;2) Positive feedback from attendees (course questionnaire)&lt;br&gt;3) Suggestions from attendees on how to improve future events.</td>
<td>Yearly: October (event and monitoring)</td>
<td>Kirsi Kinnunen is leading the first event (2015); different members will take the lead in 2016-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td><strong>Establish a programme of annual IoN open days aimed at schools</strong> (inc. UCL Academy and 6th form colleges, at which IoN’s progress and commitment to the Athena SWAN goals and the pivotal role of women in neuroscience will be showcased.)</td>
<td>No such programme exists at present</td>
<td>1) May need support from the UCL (will require some central funding); so first aim is to secure this (apply for a UCL public engagement Beacon Bursary in 2015)&lt;br&gt;2) At least 50 attendees in the first year it is run</td>
<td>Annual open days beginning in 2016</td>
<td>Ed Wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td><strong>Dedicated section on IoN Athena SWAN website for new starters</strong>: Providing a one-stop-shop for information would empower new staff and local administrators. It would also provide an opportunity to publicise positive UCL-wide policies and procedures.</td>
<td>The IoN has a dedicated Athena SWAN website, which currently includes our main initiatives but nothing yet for new starters</td>
<td>Inclusion new question in next IoN survey: “I am kept informed about UCL policies and procedures which affect me” with responses to improve between 2016 and 2018 surveys.</td>
<td>Aim to have information live on website by December 2015</td>
<td>Sarah Lawson (IoN webmaster) and Katy Pestell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point</td>
<td>Specific action</td>
<td>What is currently in place?</td>
<td>Success Measures</td>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>Person(s) responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td><strong>Dedicated section on IoN Athena SWAN website for staff wishing to take maternity/paternity/adoption leave or formally change to flexible working:</strong> Put all the information related to these issues in a single, easy to access place.</td>
<td>The information on the UCL HR website, although excellent, is also quite dense. The proposal would summarise the main points, providing links to the HR website for more in depth information.</td>
<td>Inclusion new question in next IoN survey: “My line manager/supervisor is supportive of requests for flexible maternity/ paternity/adoption leave”</td>
<td>Aim to have information live on website by December 2015</td>
<td>Sarah Lawson (IoN webmaster) and Katy Pestell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.1          | **Logging student/supervisor supervision for MSc projects:** We have discussed this with the Education Unit at the IoN and will ask students to log the number of supervisory meetings they have with their supervisors for their research projects. Underperforming tutors will be contacted by their academic line manager (head of research group) | No logging of meetings. Informal student feedback has consistently bought this up as an issue with some supervisors.                                                                                     | 1) 50% of MSc students to have signed up by the end of the first academic year  
2) 75% of those registered to have met their supervisor on at least three occasions | System in place and promoted by Oct 2016, reviewed annually [Sept] thereafter                  | Caroline Selai and David Blundred at the IoN Education, with Selina Wray (SAT)                      |
<p>| 4.2          | <strong>Encourage IoN academics to join and take part in activities run by the Neuroscience Career Network (particularly female SWAN 2-3)</strong> We will promote this network to our post docs and PhD students via the IoN post-Doc group and the mentoring scheme (amongst others). | No formal arrangements to promote this network, although Tammaryn Lashley (see case study below) is a committee member.                                                                                   | 1) At least 40 staff signed up to the network mailing list by the end of the next academic year | Yearly review: (Sept)                                                                                  | Selina Wray (SAT) and Tammaryn Lashley (IoN and Neuroscience Career Network)                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Specific action</th>
<th>What is currently in place?</th>
<th>Success Measures</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Person(s) responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>To recruit more women as MSc module convenors: to offer an opportunity for SWAN 2 females to get involved in running/setting up MSc/MRes programmes, and ultimately facilitate their transition to SWAN 3</td>
<td>Currently IoN has 18 module convenors across all MSc/MRes programmes. Four are women (two appointed in 14-15)</td>
<td>We plan to appoint two new female convenors to replace two male convenors for two modules at the end of their term. IoN Education Unit appoints and keeps records of convenors</td>
<td>The two new female convenors recruited by June 2015</td>
<td>Caroline Selai and David Blundred (education unit); Katy Pestell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Create Email distribution list at the IoN for people interested in Athena SWAN-related issues which support and promote women.</td>
<td>No formal mailing list at the IoN exists, although information is currently available via our IoN Athena SWAN website</td>
<td>Higher satisfaction rate in next IoN survey e.g.: “I am kept informed by my Department and/or Institution about gender equality matters that affect me”(Q25)</td>
<td>Distribution list set up by Oct 2015.</td>
<td>Katy Pestell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I joined the Department of Neuropathology at the IoN in 1999 as a research technician to Prof Revesz, investigating the expression of tau isoforms in progressive supranuclear palsy. During this period I began a PhD under the supervision of Prof Revesz, registered part-time as I also continued diagnostic work at Queen Square Brain Bank.

Shortly after starting my PhD, I had my first daughter and took five months maternity leave. On returning to study Prof Revesz and the Department supported me to maintain my work-life balance with flexible hours so I could fit my research around essential child care. This was important as it allowed me to reduce child care costs and continue with my PhD and the diagnostic histology for the brain bank. Towards the end of my PhD I had my second child and took seven months maternity leave, which meant I could spend time at home with both children.

I completed my PhD in 2006 and continued to work; with support from Prof Revesz, was able to work from home one day a week to help with child care commitments. I worked on several post-doctoral grant funded projects ranging from looking at the interaction between Aβ and α-synuclein in Parkinson’s disease to a large clinicopathological study in frontotemporal dementias. During this period I had my third child and took a further nine months maternity leave.

More recently I have been encouraged to progress and apply for my own research fellowship funding. With the support of Profs Hardy and Revesz this application was successful, and I am currently funded by an Alzheimer’s research UK (ARUK) fellowship investigating the role of the nuclear transport system in frontotemporal lobar degenerations. As well as continuing my academic career progression I have also been a member of the Neuroscience Career Network for the last 3 years and have arranged several workshops highlighting how to achieve a
work/life balance within academia and have passed on advice to junior post-docs under the mentoring system at IoN.

In the last 2 years I have benefitted from the mentoring system with a senior academic at the IoN. This has given me the support and confidence to apply for more research funding, including success with equipment grants to fund the purchase of a laser capture microscope, and an ARUK PhD studentship. It has also been instrumental in helping me develop my career and I am now applying for a Senior Fellowship application which helps me to establish myself as an independent researcher.

I have worked at the IoN for the past 15 years, and recognise that having the full support and encouragement from both supervisor and department, along with mentoring advice, has been invaluable to my career progression and family life. Recognition of my talent and potential, and also the need to spend time with my children, has allowed me to develop my scientific career and progress from research technician to being on the verge of my own Senior Fellowship.

Professor Linda Greensmith (SAT member, SWAN 6)

I was recruited to the IoN in 1998 to the Graham Watts Senior Research Fellowship (Lecturer), to establish a set of basic science laboratories investigating the underlying causes of Motor Neurone Disease. At the time of appointment, I was 7 months pregnant with my third child. The IoN Director (HoD) and Research Group Lead were both very understanding and allowed me to defer taking up the position until April 1999, thereby enabling me to take 6 months maternity leave.

From the time of my arrival at IoN, the Research Group Lead and HoD encouraged me to take on key roles: I was appointed as the Departmental Postgraduate Tutor (responsible for 22 PhD students), a post I held for 10 years; a member of the IoN Education Committee; the Academic Head of the Biological Services Facility; and, the only female member of the IoN Science Council, the body that determines IoN Strategy. These roles not only raised my profile but also provided me with important experience of leadership and enabling roles. These are key factors taken into consideration by UCL’s Senior Academic Promotion Committees, and in 2005, I was promoted to Reader. In the same year I was also appointed Deputy Head of the Sobell Department of Motor Neuroscience.
This experience, together with my research output, was recognised by the then HoD (Prof Alan Thompson), when he encouraged me to apply successfully for promotion to a personal chair (2009). I became the first female Head of the Sobell Department of Motor Neuroscience in 2012. To develop my leadership and pastoral skills, Prof Hanna (current HoD) nominated me to attend the first, 12 month UCL Future Leaders Programme. As a result of this programme, I have worked with the HoD to deliver the IoN Strategy Document 2014-2019. I now regularly attend the UCL Faculty of Brain Sciences Executive Committee, where decisions regarding the future strategy of the entire Faculty are taken.

During my time at IoN, I have been supported and encouraged at all stages of my career, which has enabled me to develop and progress from a Lecturer, to a Reader and now a Professor, Head of the Sobell and Deputy Director of IoN. In addition, I feel that the IoN has been understanding of the flexibility that a senior female scientist with 3 young children needs if she is to maintain a healthy work-life balance. For example I have always been able to work flexibly, enabling me to take my children to school and to attend school performances etc.

I have worked under four Directors of the IoN, all of whom have offered me their support and encouragement. I continue to be rewarded for the academic, teaching and enabling work I undertake at IoN. For example, in 2012 I was promoted to Professorial band B and in 2013, as part of the Professorial Appraisal Review, with Prof Mike Hanna as my advocate, I was awarded an increase in salary in recognition of outstanding performance.