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30th April 2014  

Dear Athena SWAN Panel members,

I am writing to you with my unstinting support for our application for an Athena SWAN Silver Award.

Our SAT has been working to weave Athena SWAN principles into the fabric of our thinking and continues to implement and monitor the effect of practical steps to improve the prospects of female scientists. I see this initiative as demonstrating awareness about leadership, creating the best working environment, and creating a female-targeted development programme. The extent of our progress has encouraged us to apply for a Silver Award.

ICS was created in August 2011 as part of the new Faculty of Population Health Sciences. The Institute coalesces basic and clinical scientists engaged in research, teaching and clinical training in the cardiovascular sciences, heralding from different departments across UCL and partner hospitals, each with differing cultures and working environments. From the start of my tenure in November 2011, I felt the highest priority was to develop the right culture, starting with the Institute’s leadership. The senior management team was overwhelmingly male and it was of the utmost importance to create better gender balance, realising that this could not happen overnight.

Many initiatives already implemented are detailed in the application, but I would like to highlight a few here:

- A staff survey to identify gender-specific work related problems has led to a number of actions.
- We are assimilating female, mid-career scientists into management activity and leadership.
- Athena SWAN principles are embedded into our senior succession planning efforts; the upcoming retirements of several Professors is creating opportunity to appoint or promote women.
- Career breaks for pregnancy, early childcare and the return to work period have been identified as key factor in career progression if not properly supported. A well-attended forum was organised to identify specific, actionable problems and take steps to address them.
- Several new initiatives focus on career progression including: a career advice surgery; a workshop for women PhDs and Postdocs (who we particularly want to assist in progression), to inform and support those who are applying for Fellowships; and a career afternoon aimed at MSc and PhD students. These include involvement of UCL support staff with detailed knowledge of eligibility and application processes as well as UCL women scientists who have previously successfully negotiated career pinch points.
With these and other measures, we have implemented a supportive, transparent and flexible working environment, recognising that much has still to be done. We have set ourselves some key targets and timelines to achieve our Athena SWAN aims over the coming months and years, as outlined in our Action Plan.

We place enormous importance in supporting our hugely talented female staff, and in helping them to maximise their career potential while maintaining a healthy work-life balance for themselves and their families; and on a personal level I see Athena SWAN as integral to our development as an Institute.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Aroon Hingorani
Director, Institute of Cardiovascular Science

Section 1: 482 words
2. The self-assessment process

Describe the self-assessment process. This should include:

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

SAT members have a range of experience in terms of working patterns and work-life balance. Some have long-standing experience of balancing teaching and administration with research or clinical duties; others are establishing their academic and/or clinical profile.

Roles within the SAT varied from providing leadership and direction, developing ideas, collecting and assessing data, reviewing this application and being ambassadors for the project.

Table 1: SAT membership and personal comment on work–life balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT Member</th>
<th>Work-life balance: comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aroon Hingorani (AH) Institute Director</td>
<td>‘My wife is a Consultant Ophthalmologist and we share the care of our two children. I do the school run in the mornings which means I often get in late, so I am fully aware of the need for flexible working’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippa Talmud (PJT) Professor of Cardiovascular Genetics SAT chair?</td>
<td>‘I had my three children as a postdoc and worked part-time for some of this period. I have 4 step-children, two of whom are severely disabled, and 4 grandchildren who I am very involved with. I couldn’t have done this and progressed scientifically without a supportive partner’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia Schievano (SS) Senior Lecturer, RAEng/EPSRC Research Fellow</td>
<td>‘I have 2 young children, both at a local nursery, and I have benefited from flexible working for childcare, which I share with my partner who is a UCL Professor and a Consultant Radiologist’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Galloway (SG) Institute manager</td>
<td>‘I ensure that the Institute has an open minded approach to work-life balance’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasia Z. Kalea (AZK) Research Associate</td>
<td>‘I have a young son and I recently returned from maternity leave and slowly but successfully managed to get back on my career track. That was made possible because of a supportive environment at work that encourages me to succeed and offers me much needed flexibility in my working hours’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Teresa Tome Esteban (MT) Consultant Cardiologist, Honorary Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>‘I am mother of two young children. Juggling work, childcare and career aspirations is a daily challenge. I am fully confident of a brighter future for women working within an Institute like ICS.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Walker (AW)</td>
<td>I have elderly parents who live some distance away and flexible working is helpful when I need to help arrange things with them’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riyaz Patel (RP)</td>
<td>‘As a working parent, I fully appreciate the strains of balancing work, career aspirations and family life, especially for clinical-academics. I have found a great deal of support from ICS to help manage this balance, especially when dealing with simple things like the school run or appointments’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) An account of the self-assessment process: details of the self-assessment team meetings, including any consultation with staff or individuals outside of the university, and how these have fed into the submission.

Learning about Athena SWAN

The Director invited all Institute staff to participate in the SAT and we began with a small and focussed team of senior and mid-career academic and administrative staff. We later expanded the SAT to ensure a more representative mix and a wider range of roles and viewpoints. The SAT first met in June 2012 and every one to two months thereafter to collect and evaluate data, review current practices, support relevant changes and create the action plan. From February 2014 the SAT met weekly to complete this application.

SAT members attended UCL-wide Athena SWAN events; we met with colleagues across UCL and regularly with the UCL Athena SWAN adviser. We discussed and reviewed successful applications within and outside UCL. Professor Talmud met with senior female scientists from outside UCL at the ‘Science and Shopping’ network to discuss the position of women in science and how this related to our application.

There is particular interest in this group about women delaying putting themselves forward for promotion. Professor Talmud has been involved in setting up and running the ‘UCL Women’ network for women in science, and has fed information and insights from this forum into the Institute’s SAT process.

Consultation with all staff

We identified the lack of women in grades higher than post-doc as a major inequality and we sought more information about this. In March 2013, we adapted the Quick CAT questionnaire to understand the views of the Institute’s scientists about the ICS work environment. A strong presentation letter and reminders to Centre heads to encourage responses resulted in 52 replies (24-female, 20-male, 8-unspecified), 48% of our staff.

The survey showed that staff feel they are treated on their merits regardless of gender, identified no differences in workload, promotion rates and support, and no reported problems related to offensive behaviour. Women were slightly more positive about the work environment than men, but some from the mid-career group did not feel that there is parity in pay or that work-related social activities are equally welcoming to both genders.
I believe that in the Institute men and women are paid an equal amount for doing the same work or work of equal value.

Work-related social activities such as staff parties, team building or networking events are likely to be welcoming to both women and men (e.g. venues, activities and times are appropriate to both men and women).

We have initiated a focus group for women in the department to discuss maternity leave and return to work. We have had two meetings so far, both attended by ten women. Details of this are given under section 4. The third meeting is planned for June 2014 to discuss the funding of maternity leave and returning to work.
Developing an action plan

The SAT used the data to formulate our application and action plan. Tasks were distributed amongst SAT members to efficiently progress the project. These points were sent round to the senior staff for discussion and a specific meeting was set up to initiate the implementation of action points we wanted in place prior to the submission deadline. The action plan is available on our website to all ICS staff.

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.

We will maintain dialogues with other UCL SATs to share best practice, and work closely with the newly appointed Faculty SWAN lead (Action Point 1.1). We will appoint a student representative to the SAT and the Chair will rotate for each renewal, alternating between genders (Action Point 1.2). We will continue to encourage others in ICS to join the SAT (Action Point 1.2).

The SAT will implement and monitor action points, reporting progress to the Institute SMG and compiling an annual progress report (Action Point 1.6). We will ensure that Athena SWAN principles are maintained across all ICS activities with a gender balance on all decision making committees (Action Point 1.5).

Section 2: 992 words
3. A picture of the department: maximum 2000 words

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

Introduction

ICS was formed on 1st August 2011 in the new Faculty of Population Health Sciences within the UCL School of Life and Medical Sciences. The Institute brought together basic clinical scientists from different faculties and departments across UCL and partner hospitals. Many, but not all clinical academics are cardiologists.

Staff are located on three sites and in seven buildings. There are nine research groups, each led by a principal investigator. The geographical spread and the origins of its constituent parts present a number of challenges to fostering a common culture amongst staff. The Athena SWAN initiative is therefore a valuable component for our development.

Research

ICS is a world-class centre of excellence in pioneering novel, integrative strategies in preventative and therapeutic cardiovascular medicine. Many of our staff members work in more than one Centre and inter-site collaboration is encouraged. Much of our research is interdisciplinary and we collaborate with a number of UCL departments as well as others within and outside the UK, such as the key collaboration with Yale Cardiovascular Medicine.

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

Student data

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

We do not 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.

The Institute contributes a compulsory pre-clinical teaching module to 330 students on UCL’s medical degree (MBBS) programme but does not have undergraduate students of its own. The figure below shows that the gender distribution in the undergraduate medical school intake is even.
Our MBBS teaching introduces pre-clinical Year 2 students to patients for the first time and we use this as an opportunity to show positive female clinical role models (6 of the 16 tutors are women) and to identify talented female students who may be interested in cardiology.

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 Institute’s MSc in Cardiovascular Science was launched in academic year 2012-13. The course is offered on a full-time basis and we plan to pilot part-time study from academic year 2014-15. The course is suitable for clinical and non-clinical graduates.

To promote and advertise the course we made a promotional video, which appears on the Institute’s web pages. The video outlines what the MSc covers and highlights the nurturing environment that the students can expect and presents strong positive female role models to prospective students.

In its first year all students completed the course, comparing favourably to the national figures of 93% for women and 94% for men (HESA 2011).

We cannot draw any conclusions from the data at this point. Our action plan is to continually monitor and review data year on year and to ensure that gender balance is maintained (Action Point 2.6). Given the small numbers on the course we should be able to anticipate any issues and address them before they become problems.
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.

Data for the three postgraduate research programmes (PhD, MD (Res) and 4 Year BHF PhD) run by the Institute are available from academic years 2011-12, but they are not separated by programme and do not include completion rates or times to submission due to historic data problems.

Working with central UCL colleagues to ensure good quality data is our action point here (Action Point 2.7).

PGR Student Numbers 2011-December 2013

The picture for PGR students shows the proportion of women over the last three years moving from 35% to 41% to 43%. The data does not illuminate the reasons for these figures or the changes but the increase is a welcome development.

The comparison with HESA (2011) data for women in biological sciences (60%) and clinical medicine (58%) is not favourable. Our interview panels are now gender balanced equally, where possible (Action Point 2.3). In a recent interview, in January 2014 for three prestigious BHF 4-year PhD positions the panel consisted of a male and 2 female professors, and all 3 positions were offered to female students.

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.

Postgraduate Taught

In 2012-13, 86% of male and 83% of female applicants were made an offer. 83% of men and 70% of the women who received an offer accepted it, with 100% of those enrolling. In total five men and seven women joined the course in its first year.
Offers are made solely on the basis of the published criteria, in keeping with UCL’s equal opportunities policy. Although there is no formal interview the course leader (who is also a SAT member) does talk to all the applicants to give more details of the course and answer any questions that may arise. Feedback from the course induction day shows that students appreciate this personal contact before arriving at UCL.

In 2013-14 the total number on the course remained static but the proportion reversed, with seven men and five women. Offers were made to 75% of male and 70% of female applicants, with 50% of female and 58% of males made an offer accepting them. 83% of women and 100% of men who accepted the offer enrolled on the course.

Given the small numbers and the newness of the course it is difficult to draw any conclusions about the data other than to note it is broadly equal so far. We have piloted a questionnaire for students who declined to take up the offer to find out the reason for their decision and to identify and address any reason for their choice related to inequality. To date the response rate has been too low to provide robust data. We will monitor the ratio of male: female offers made to scrutinise for potential inequality.
Our PGR opportunities appear on our website. Our four year programme is advertised nationally and in its second year we recruited all female students.

The numbers are small and the time period is short so it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions from the data. However, our snapshot shows men are more likely to be made offers than women and are more likely to accept. As stated above, we aim to have gender balanced recruitment panels for PGR students wherever possible (Action Point 2.3). We will pay close attention to the figures for 2014 to see if this trend continues and will examine our recruitment practice if it does (Action Point 2.7).

**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.

**Post-Graduate Taught**

Award classification in the first year of our MSc in Cardiovascular Science was split evenly by gender (see figure in the previous Section).

**Post-Graduate Research**

Please note the data for 2013-14 is partial as the academic year is only mid-way through.

---

**Students Completing Postgraduate Researchers by Gender 2011-13**

---

---
Over the period, awards were made to six women and eight men but the absence of data prior to 2011 and incomplete completion data make it difficult to draw meaningful conclusions. Ensuring that we collect good quality data and continually monitoring outcomes are therefore our action points here (Action Point 2.7).

3.b 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.

At the time of writing, the Institute has 88 scientists (clinical and non-clinical academic and research staff members): 34 are women (39%).

The tables below show the changes since our formation in August 2011:
Professors

Only two of the Institute’s 13 chair level employees (15.4%) are female. Of the non-clinical Professors, one of the three (33%) is a woman (better than the HESA bioscience average of 16%); amongst clinical staff the solitary woman is 11% of the professoriate (worse than the HESA average of 22% for clinical medicine). This recruitment happened after the annual data collection exercise so is not included in the figures above.

We acknowledge the imbalance and accept that it is a long-term project to create equality at this level (Action Point 1.4).

In the current funding environment we do not foresee many new academic posts being created. However, a cadre of senior Professors are close to retiring and our succession planning strategy gives us the opportunity to start becoming more balanced at this level (Action Points 1.4 and 3.1).

Readers

All four Readers are men, three of whom are clinical consultant academics in Cardiology. It is this level of employment within the Institute which shows the starkest imbalance and changing this is a priority, albeit one with a very long time-line.

Our action plan focuses on supporting women to this level through promotion as we consider it a more likely route than through recruitment. They will be supported by our careers advice clinic (see below).

Senior Lecturers and Principal Research Associates

At this level we have eight staff, two women and six men (25%). This will improve to 33% women when our new clinical Senior Lecturer joins in May. At present there are two clinicians in this category, both male.

Lecturers, Senior Research Associates and Fellows

There are currently 13 people at Senior Research Associate level, five women (38%) and eight men. Four are clinicians, one of whom is female (25%). Women constitute 44% of the non-clinical complement.

The non-clinical figure is slightly below the HESA (2011) average of 50%. Clinically we are some way off the national average of 60% although this is not surprising given the pool for cardiologists from which this group comes.
This grade represents the biggest opportunity for us to recruit and promote to, and as reported below, it is the key transition point above which our numbers begin to display inequality.

**Research Associates and Fellows**

At this level our figures start to display greater equality: there are 18 men and 22 women (55%).

There are 15 clinicians at this grade, four of whom are women (26%). Again this compares poorly to the national figure for clinical general medicine, but, despite this, the SAT is quietly pleased that the figure is so high in the male dominated field of cardiology.

In terms of academic numbers, we have 18 women and seven men (72% women). In this case we exceed the national average in bioscience (50%) and this figure pinpoints exactly where the biggest problem is: the transition from Research Associate/Senior Research Associate to Lecturer. Therefore our action plan focuses on supporting women at this level through career advice, mentoring, promotion and pregnancy/maternity leave (see below).

**Research Assistants**

We have four Research Assistants, one of whom is female (25%). There are no clinicians in this group. These posts are occupied by scientists without PhDs who have the expectation of gaining one. Very few new appointments are made to this grade and progression to Research Associate is expected of those in post.

What we will do at all levels is identify women who are approaching promotion, but more importantly those women who perhaps feel that they are not ready for promotion and need a ‘nudge’. They will be advised well in advance to meet with the careers advice clinic (see Action Point 4.5), so that they can gather the necessary information to update their CVs and the support necessary for promotion.

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

Voluntary turnover within the Institute has been low: most leavers only do so at the end of funding for their employment. At present this only affects research staff, the vast majority of whom are grant-funded.

Basic data are included; however the precise reason for any voluntary leaver was not recorded.

In 2011-12 we had 12 leavers: three resigned (two of whom were women). Nine of whom left for contract-related reasons (five women).

In 2012-13 we had ten exits: four resignations (one woman); one woman retiring; and five contract-related (two women).

In 2013-14 to date we have had seven leavers: five resignations (one woman) and two contract-related (one of each). The chart shows aggregated data over the period.
The number of men and women leaving involuntarily is identical and men are more likely to resign voluntarily than women. Taking the average of men and women in the Institute over the period (38 and 25, respectively) we see that although voluntary resignations are broadly similar (22% of men, 20% of women), non-voluntary leavers were 22% for men and 32% for women. The reason for this disparity is likely to be that more women than men are employed as research staff on grant funding and therefore are more likely to be made redundant when their funding ends.

Section 3: 1967 words
KEY CAREER TRANSITION POINT

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.

Our recruitment data is incomplete. We know who was appointed but historic data does not properly record applications or shortlisting by gender. The situation is improving but the data is still not robust enough to include. Ensuring complete data is one of our action points (Action Point 2.4).

Research Staff Recruitment

The following three figures show overall recruitment data from 1st August 2013 to 1st February 2014.
Academic Recruitment

With small numbers it is difficult to draw any conclusions in isolation. Looking at all data, we view this as an improvement on our previous position but, at the same time, we consider it only the start of the long-term project to increase the number of women in academic posts within the Institute (Action Point 1.4).
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.

Promotions at UCL are in two categories, senior and research promotions. This section looks at them in turn.

Senior Promotions

This category applies to academic staff and those research staff looking to advance beyond Senior Research Associate. It is a UCL-wide process, beginning at Institute level and decided at organisational level. The process usually starts in September and promotions are effective from 1st October of the following year.

From August 2014 the Institute will write to all eligible staff to invite them to self-assess, detailing the important criteria, and to submit an application for local review. A gender and grade balanced panel of academic staff (including non-Institute academics) reviews all applications against the criteria and decides which cases should be supported. All applicants at this stage receive constructive feedback from the Director.

We acknowledge that promotion processes are not well understood. We will support academics and researchers to understand what is expected of them to reach the promotion level and ensure that they are equipped to do so (Action Points 1.3 and 4.1).

I understand the promotion process and criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For academic staff, the numbers show a disparity between male and female promotions. This is explained by the composition of the academic group eligible for promotion (i.e. below Professor) consisting mainly of men. For most of the period, there was only one woman eligible for academic promotion. In 2012/13, a second became eligible and was successfully promoted. No researchers were put forward for senior promotion during that period.
Research Promotions

Up to this academic year, research promotions were considered on an ad hoc basis. From 2013/14 we have adopted an annual, Faculty-wide process. An Institute panel like the one for senior promotions will review applications, while supported cases will be discussed by a Faculty review committee. This will create consistency and transparency. All promotions will be effective from 1st August.

A major change is that this process considers fairness above cost; that is, decisions will be made without reference to how a promotion will be funded. The precise means of financially supporting successful cases have to be identified, but we commend this as a bold approach to addressing a long-standing and previously intractable inequality.

The UCL promotion procedure is published on the UCL website; ICS provides this information when advertising the annual promotion call by circulating the relevant documents to all staff eligible for promotion. Increasing awareness about the promotion process is a priority action point for the coming year and we will work with research staff to do this. This process will operate in tandem with that outlined in the previous section (Action Points 1.3 and 4.1).

Research Promotions 2011-2013:

A 3:1 ratio is disproportionate given that at this level there is broad parity in numbers.
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

With the exception of staff named on grants and a single request to waive the requirement to advertise (using gender equality as a key plank in the recruitment strategy), all research/academic posts are advertised on the UCL website and include the positive action statement ‘We particularly welcome female applicants and those from ethnic minority backgrounds, as they are under-represented within UCL at these levels’.

All recruitment materials are finalised by the Institute. This helps ensure that they are free from gender (and other) bias and that the person specification is in line with UCL’s expectations for a job at that level. Jobs are typically advertised on our website, the main UCL website and jpbs.ac.uk. Our website has gender balanced images and links to information about Athena SWAN.

Our recruitment packs contain a statement about UCL’s Equal Opportunities policy and the Institute’s commitment to that. We include a section on Athena SWAN in which we state the Athena SWAN principles and our support for them, and reference our work in respect of this application. We also include specific reference to UCL’s family-friendly policies. For academic posts we include a reference to UCL’s sabbatical leave policy for women returning from maternity leave, reiterated in our induction pack.

We have reflected on the outcome of the recent UCL staff attitude survey. Amongst other things, staff benefits are viewed as being neither satisfactory nor well communicated. We will take the opportunity to review our recruitment material and revise as appropriate (Action Point 3.2).

We now ensure that at least 25% of any recruitment panel members are female and we aim to make this at least 50% by July 2014 (Action Point 2.3). For all academic posts recruited to since August 2012, we have exceeded the 25% target.

As we have relatively few women academics the danger is that the load will fall unevenly on them. To avoid this we will co-opt women from other UCL departments and from partner organisations (Action point 2.5).

UCL’s policy is for all staff involved in recruitment to have undergone training, which includes equalities issues. We will encourage all research staff to do this and we are planning to a database at Faculty level to assist recruiting managers to select appropriate panel members (Action Point 2.3). This has the advantage of increasing individual skills and the number of women available to recruit staff. It will also make it easier for us to monitor who is sitting on panels, what the gender balance is, and how fair the workload is.

We piloted Unconscious Bias training for academic staff in 2013. However the feedback was overwhelmingly negative and we are reviewing our options in this area.
ii) Support for staff at key career transition points – having identified key areas of attrition of female staff in the department, comment on any interventions, programmes and activities that support women at the crucial stages, such as personal development training, opportunities for networking, mentoring programmes and leadership training. Identify which have been found to work best at the different career stages.

To address the attrition of female staff at the key transition point from Post-Doctoral Researcher to Lecturer, a programme of career development opportunities and training has been developed within ICS for PhD and Postdocs for whom we realise that their major concern is fellowship applications (Action Points 4.2 and 4.4),

A new programme of individual careers guidance has commenced. In this programme, ICS will first identify and send an annual email reminder to all members of this key transition group so that they can take advantage of the UCL Careers Service (Action Points 4.2 and 4.5).

We will implement a rolling programme of ‘career advice surgeries’ (Action Point 4.5), for postdoctoral staff. This will offer the opportunity to book a more targeted career consultation with a senior member of ICS staff to discuss how to progress.

There are several ‘return to work’ fellowships available after a career break; however, the problem arises after these fellowships have ended as the next round of fellowships have age restrictions or a ‘maximum number of years since completing PhD’. To draw the attention of the British Heart Foundation (BHF), one of our main funding bodies, to this issue, Prof Hingorani has set up a meeting with them (Action Point 4.6). If successful, we will share this approach with other funding bodies and share our experience with other UCL Departments.

We have a ‘Fellowship Day’ planned for 27th May 2014 (Action Point 4.4) to which we have invited application leads from key funding bodies to speak about their requirements for fellowship applications, with instructions to gear this towards women. There will be breakout groups for PhD and Postdocs to meet with successful fellowship applicants to discuss their personal viewpoints on the process. Feedback will be evaluated and used to develop the event for the future.

We also run a regular PhD and postdoc seminar, which is discussed below.

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?

All staff are expected to attend three learning events annually and staff are routinely informed of training and learning opportunities. The Institute moved to an annual appraisal cycle in 2013. We see annual appraisal as an essential mechanism to support career development. We aim to uplift our appraisal completion rates to 90-100% (from 80% currently) and we will ensure that line managers are adequately trained to conduct appraisals. Training sessions for appraisers, focusing on the appraisee’s career development, will ensure a better experience for the appraisee. We will implement a feedback system to review the quality of these appraisal discussions (Action Point 4.7).

In the first year of the Institute we asked PIs for their view on employees’ suitability for senior promotion. However from academic year 2012/13 we write directly to all relevant staff and ask them to submit their
CVs for consideration by a gender balanced panel (Action Point 4.1). We direct them to UCL’s promotions criteria, which incorporate consideration for teaching, research and enabling work (including administration, pastoral and outreach work). The criteria allow consideration to be given to equality matters such as maternity and care-giving in respect of output.

It is evident that one key issue for the Institute is a lack of female representation at senior grades. To address this it was decided that the composition of the Promotions Committee should be gender balanced and that consideration should be given to all female staff at Grade 8 level or above to see whether they would be suitable to apply for promotion (Action Points 1.4 and 4.1). Consequently, one female candidate was identified and submitted an application.

All aspects are taken into consideration through the promotion process; nevertheless, as yet no one has been promoted on teaching alone. This might reflect the light teaching load on ICS academics. We are aware that working part-time might impact promotion and we will ensure that special attention is given to this group so that they are not disadvantaged by their work pattern (Action Point 4.1).

To promote awareness of career progression processes at ICS, we have organised an event on 7th July 2014 (Action Point 4.2), to attract female clinicians and non-clinicians and identify their perception of career progression issues. The meeting will cover the promotion process, grading and review/ assessment, followed by a networking break. The second part of the event will focus on individual career guidance via a speed-mentoring interactive session.

**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?

UCL has well-established Induction and Probation procedures which we will tailor so all new starters will have an induction with one of our administrative team within their first month (Action Point 3.3). At this meeting research and academic staff will be provided with guidelines outlining recommended training and career development opportunities, and the promotion procedures.

As part of this process we will develop an ICS Staff Handbook, which will include our flexible working policy and the policy on maternity and paternity leave (Action Points 2.8, 2.9 and 3.3). A requirement, of which UCL is proud, is that all new staff undertake Equality and Diversity training within six weeks of appointment. The Institute will continue to monitor and ensure that this training is completed by all new starters (Action point 3.3). In addition, all relevant career and personal development training organised by UCL for female students or staff (such as the ‘Springboard Programme’, which several ICS women have attended over the past years) will be highlighted in the new Athena SWAN section of our website and in the staff handbook (Action Point 1.6). The new staff handbook will also be circulated to all existing staff.

Personal development opportunities are addressed formally as part of the induction, probation and appraisal process and informally during the year on an ad hoc basis.

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

Female (as well as male) students undertaking the MSc in Cardiovascular Science are allocated a personal tutor with whom they meet regularly throughout the year of study. They have the opportunity to request a female tutor. Professor Philippa Talmud, the course Director, also meets with students regularly and provides informal pastoral care.
In order to provide both MSc and PhD students with a wide range of career options, over the last three years Prof Philippa Talmud and Dr Ann Walker have run very successful career development afternoons. We plan to continue to run these sessions annually. Feedback from the students has been extremely positive. At least 65% of attendees were female. One comment that the students did feedback was that they would specifically like to know if opportunities for MSc graduates existed in the various careers presented. We will now introduce an evaluation and a feedback form which will be collated and analysed, to enable assessment and development of the careers day (Action Point 4.3).

For MSc, PhD and Postdocs alike we appreciate how important role models are. Instead of introducing specific role model sessions, we have included it into our monthly PhD meetings. We have specifically instructed senior scientists, both male and female, to spend 10 minutes of their allocated time (30 minutes) outlining how they got to where they are and how they juggle work-life balance.

We sent out a questionnaire to get feedback on whether the PhDs and postdocs appreciated this. Response was not great but we did this at rather short notice. We had 11 responses, 6 of whom were women. Overall the respondents found this part of the seminar really helpful (10/11); 8/11 felt the role model outline provided helpful information in relation to work-life balance and all agreed that the talks provided useful information about career progression. Overall we feel that balancing a scientific seminar with the personal background of the speaker, makes the seminars more engaging and informative about the chosen career paths senior scientists have taken to get to where they are.

We are sensitive to the fact that some PhD students might take (and indeed have taken) maternity leave during their MD(Res) or PhDs. They are welcomed into our ‘preparation for pregnancy and returning to work’ group (see Section Cover for maternity and adoption leave and support on return).

We appreciate the importance of coaching and mentoring. The Institute is too small to support one-to-one mentoring and we have two plans to take this forward. For PhD and Postdocs we plan to set up a speed mentoring afternoon at our 7th July 2014 meeting (Action Point 4.2). We will encourage students to make use of the new online u-Mentoring scheme set up at UCL. We are in discussion with Organisational Development who set up an ICS specific mentoring scheme.

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 Institute’s committee structure is based on its SMG, which is made up of all our Readers and Professors (currently thirteen men and two women). A teaching committee and promotions sub-committee report to this. In the SMG, the large differences in gender composition are due to the overall composition of the Institute, albeit tempered somewhat by two non-ICS affiliate female SMG members from other Faculties.

As the Institute grows and the agenda for SMGs increases in length, we will set up a second tier management group (Action Point 1.4). The aim of this committee is to engage more women into management decision-making and organisation. This group will be made up of 8 members, including 3 female Senior Lecturers/Researchers, 2 female Postdocs, 2 male Senior Lecturers and Readers, and one male Postdoc nominated by the Director in conjunction with the SAT. Their role will be to organise the monthly PhD meeting and the Institution seminar series, and be involved in new educational ideas such as setting up CPDs.
The promotions subcommittee was boosted by the addition of a female Senior Lecturer from within the Institute and now consists of 2 female and 3 males.

The teaching committee includes staff from a number of other UCL departments who teach on the course. It is open to all ICS staff who contribute to the course. Eleven staff are on the committee, seven of whom are women. The current MSc course leader, graduate tutor and deputy graduate tutor are all women. We are currently reviewing our educational structure and anticipate that more men will be involved once the review is complete.

### 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.

**Contracts and Funding**

UCL only rarely offers fixed-term contracts, and then only for a narrowly defined range of circumstances, the most common being for a specific and time limited project usually less than 9 months. At present there are no ICS staff members who are on fixed-term contracts. This means that staff on contracts that are open-ended with funding end dates have the same benefits as those on open ended contracts. This includes having access to the UCL redeployment register before the end of their funding.

Excluding those on maternity leave whose funding is covered by the Institute, of the Institute’s 88 scientists 24 are wholly or partly HEFCE funded (28%). Eight women are HEFCE funded compared to 16 men.

The remainder are grant funded, on open ended contracts with a funding end date, with a small proportion (also on open ended contracts with a funding end date) funded by either the NHS or private hospitals. This means that 75% of women scientists in the Institute are on soft funding compared to 68% of men.

There is an imbalance in the proportion of women on HEFCE funds which in turn reflects a sense of less job security. This imbalance is due to the number of male compared to female academics, academic roles being the main recipient of HEFCE funding. The funding situation will only change as the proportion of female academics changes: this is already one of our action points (Action Point 1.4).

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

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

The Institute’s governance is largely done via its academic staff group. With relatively few female academics the danger is that in pursuit of equality on committees the burden becomes unfair. This is remediable to some degree by inviting staff from outside the Institute to participate so, for example, academic appointments committees, the teaching committee, and the SMG are supplemented by external staff.

The flat structure of the Institute and few formal committees mean that staff do not have onerous committee duties.
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.

UCL appraisal considers the range of activities carried out by an individual and the discussion centres on the individual’s self-assessment to locally guide and address any shortcomings. Although workload has not been distributed as a result of this as yet, we have an action plan toward this aim (Action Point 2.5).

Teaching is a relatively small part of our activity. On our Masters it is done by those who agreed to offer modules and ICS staff often teach on courses run by other departments. MSc personal tutors are two men and a woman. The Institute graduate tutors are all currently women, with the lead for our MBBS contribution being a man.

These roles will be reviewed regularly and we expect there to be changes in personnel within the next two years. There is no assumption that these are women’s roles and we would like to add more men to the team, so that women alone do not take on the pastoral roles. This is also important in training male academics.

Administrative and managerial responsibility rests with the Director (male) and is devolved to research group leads (all male). This is a reflection of the academic group from whom the leads are drawn. There are about five senior academics on the SMG who will retire in the next two-three years. This will provide opportunities to change the gender balance of the Institute (Action Point 1.4).

For research staff workload is typically related to funding and therefore heavily research based. Teaching or other activities will be undertaken in discussion with line managers and will be limited. Academic staff are more self-directing and workload is allocated in discussion with group leads and the Director.

Responsibility for Athena SWAN sits with the SAT which is gender balanced and which we aim to expand and enhance (Action Point 1.2).

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.

Initially the Institute’s monthly management meeting started at 7.30am in line with the typical starting time of a consultant cardiologist. This was quickly changed to the more reasonable time of 9am. Although still outside the core UCL hours of 10:00-16:00, we consulted with members to ensure that all were able to attend without adversely affecting caring or clinical commitments (they can). The timing of this meeting remains under review (Action Point 6.1).

All ICS staff social events are held within core hours, albeit with part of the social element occasionally falling outside of core hours. These events are typically announced several weeks in advance to allow people to make appropriate arrangements if required. We have had two all-staff events to date with a third following in summer 2014. Events have addressed scientific and business matters and have included discussion groups, poster-board presentations, a quiz and food and drink for more relaxed interactions. At the next staff day in September 2014 a major focus will be Athena SWAN (Action Point 6.2).

The times of individual lab meetings is to be monitored by the SAT; one of our action points is to ensure that group heads hold their regular meetings within core hours and we are monitoring this for compliance (Action Point 6.1).

Social gatherings are either over lunch or where possible start around 4.00pm. One of the issues here is that Institute staff working at the Heart Hospital have clinics that end at 5.00pm: there is a trade-off (Action 6.2).
Where possible Doodle polls are sent out to organise meeting times which allows staff to enter their preferences. The use of Doodle Polls has made meeting organisation much easier and will be encouraged at all levels (Action Point 6.1).

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

The Institute’s genesis means that its culture is evolving from a number of pre-existing ones. In order to understand the culture(s) we asked a number of specific questions within our staff survey. Answers suggest a positive and supportive culture.

For example there are positive responses about the timing of staff meetings (more by women than by men).

**Meetings are completed in core hours to enable those with caring responsibilities to attend (UCL’s Equality Strategy defined core hours as between 10.00 am and 4.00pm)**

And in terms of behavioural norms:

**The Institute makes it clear that unsupportive language and behaviour are not acceptable (e.g. condescending or intimidating language, ridicule, overly familiar behaviour, jokes/banter that stereotype women or men or focus on their appearance)**

Improving on this good start to the culture is one of our general aims and will be kept monitored through UCL and ICS surveys (Action Points 2.1 and 2.2).
At present the Institute’s outreach work is limited but we are aware of UCL’s ‘Inspiring Women Speakers’ list and we have added these details on our website to encourage our very talented women to put themselves forward.

The Cheltenham Science Festival is a perfect outreach event. This year a senior Professor was invited to attend to discuss his research with Festival goers. However he decided to nominate a talented woman scientist to go instead; this creates an opportunity for the individual and gives attendees a positive female role model.

**FLEXIBILITY AND MANAGING CAREER BREAKS**

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

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

We have a 100% return rate for women in scientific posts since the Institute was formed. Since its formation, five scientists in the Institute have taken maternity 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.

UCL offers double the national requirement for paternity leave and provides up to 4 weeks full paid paternity leave, and also supports the provision of additional paternity leave. These provisions will be highlighted in our new staff handbook.

Data on these items are lacking. Although UCL has an on-line application for managing all leave its implementation was optional so use across the Institute is variable. We are in the middle of a project to get all staff to use this.

There is no record of any staff member taking adoption leave or parental leave.

**iii) Numbers of applications and success rates for flexible working by gender and grade** – comment on any disparities. Where the number of women in the department is small applicants may wish to comment on specific examples.

Staff are entitled to request flexible working under a UCL-wide work-life balance policy and accompanying formal process. This is certainly followed for support staff but (at least since August 2011) the Institute is not aware of any formal requests from research and academic staff.

The available data on which to draw conclusions refer only to changes in hours worked. Since 2011 there are nine recorded changes of hours by academic and research staff, eight for women and one for a man. Of those changes three are recorded following maternity leave. The data suggests that these were voluntary changes rather than changes necessary due to funding and the inference is that the changes were made following a request, most likely informally. We don’t have data on the success rate of requests.
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.

Academic and research roles are usually more amenable than support roles to flexible arrangements and a number have been agreed informally. Such agreements tend to be arranged at research group level, with the Institute only being told if an agreement results in a contractual change. For example, an agreement to work from home one day a week will often be discussed, agreed and recorded locally without reference to the UCL process or the Institute.

Flexible working arrangements need not be on-going and indeed many agreements are ad hoc, for example working from home on a manuscript or changing working pattern during school holidays. These are typically not recorded.

Managers on the whole appear to be supportive of requests:

My line manager/supervisor is supportive of requests for flexible working (E.g. requests for part-time working, compressed hours, etc.)

And more women than men are aware of the relevant policies:

The Institute has made it clear to me what its policies are in relation to gender equality (e.g. on discrimination, parental leave, carer’s leave, flexible working)
As part of the on-going project to introduce on-line management of leave, we are working on our data to ensure that the work patterns of all staff are correctly recorded. This will give us a much better understanding of flexible working.

In the coming year we will implement two actions: the first is advising staff of their right to request flexible working (Action Point 2.9). This will be done through the staff handbook and annually during appraisal, during which working arrangements will be a formal item for discussion.

The second is to pilot a ‘just say yes’ approach (Action Point 2.9), under which we will commit to agreeing a trial period for all requests made under the formal UCL process, subject to the understanding that any request made is the starting point in a discussion and that the agreement to trial may be different from the initial request. At the end of the trial period successful arrangements will continue.

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

Maternity leave and return to work can be a challenge for women in their careers and advice and support on these issues is important to maintaining a career trajectory. Although UCL has a good maternity policy, how it is implemented and understood locally was uncertain.

Nor did the SAT have qualitative information on the experience of women who have been, are, or are planning to be on maternity leave. We therefore ran a focus group for relevant staff, which was a real success. We are using the information gathered to inform our action plan.

We invited all the women in ICS and extended that to any of their colleagues from across UCL who might be interested. Fourteen women responded positively and 10 attended.

The group included pregnant women, someone on maternity leave (who came with her baby) and others with young children. One woman, with no children and who was not pregnant, came because she felt too exposed to write to her funding body or to speak to her manager (an NHS clinician) to find out about taking maternity leave during her PhD (Action 5.3).

Each woman had the opportunity to talk about her situation. For many it was a real struggle to juggle full time work and child care. We discussed various practical topics including funding, length of maternity leave, flexible working hours, and also personal things, such as the effects experienced during pregnancy or upon return to work.

Some women had a positive experience thanks to the full support of their manager/supervisor and peers. However, for some there was a feeling of guilt at being pregnant and (for some) the fear of being side-lined in the male-dominated clinical field.

Another issue was whether staff are given enough practical information, for example about facilities for expressing milk, contractual issues, funding information during maternity leave. The consensus is that there is not enough information and it was agreed that a fact sheet would be included in the induction pack (and circulated to all current staff), and also that the maternity policy at UCL would be included on the ICS website (Action Point 5.1).

A second meeting of the group was held in January 2014. It was as successful and an outcome from this meeting was that the next such meeting should be focussed on how grant funding bodies support maternity leave. An appropriate staff member from UCL’s Research Services will be invited to present and answer any questions at the meeting planned for June 2014.
Women felt very positively about having a maternity mentor and this will be looked into, but in the meantime we will pair up the women to act as ‘buddies’ (Action Point 5.2). Sharing information and experiences across the group participants was important and the group will meet bi-monthly.

UCL’s Organisational Development team, who facilitated the focus group, is exploring how to use our approach as a best practice model across the university.

In terms of Institute processes, when a staff member advises her manager that she is pregnant the manager contacts the Institute admin team, who offer to meet with the individual to discuss the maternity options. This includes a discussion of keeping-in-touch days, the possibility of flexible working on return and how to make a request using the formal UCL processes.

Save where a funder specifically agrees to maternity pay, all periods of maternity leave are funded at Institute level. If there is not funding to cover maternity absence then the work is either distributed amongst existing staff or not done (a good example of this is on a personal fellowship).

Section 4: 4980 words
5. Any other comments: (maximum 500 words)

Please comment here on any other elements which are relevant to the application, e.g. other SET-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.

UCL Women

UCL Women is a network for women scientists in STEM at University College London, spearheaded by Professor Talmud and two other colleagues, Professor Uta Frith (Cognitive Neuroscience) and Dr Jenny Rohn (Medicine). It was launched on 16th January 2013, attended by over 100 women (and one man) from all faculties within STEM. The group meets every two months with guest speakers talking on topics ranging from promotion, scientific research, and life: work balance, incorporating into their talk ‘Who Am I and, How Did I get Here’. The idea is to provide role models for junior staff members.

Science is male dominated and we want to support women in that environment and enable them to put themselves forward and instil confidence in them through positive role models. We aim to support women to feel good about themselves and about being at UCL. Subsequent events have included ‘Smart Networking Via Twitter: A How-to Tutorial’; a presentation by Prof Frances Happe on ‘My Mum’s a Scientist’ and a concert of music composed by female musicians. Networking lunchtime meetings also take place.

We recently met the Provost of UCL to put forward our case that UCL Women is not a campaigning body but a networking organisation who are available to mentor junior faculty within UCL but also to outreach to the UCL Academy with young PhD and postdoc women offering to mentor A level students. We did take the opportunity to draw the Provost’s attention to the fact that of the 17 annual UCL Guest Lecturers to date (a high profile event with many Nobel Prize lecturers) all were men. He promised to change this. He will also support an annual event run by UCL Women with a reception followed by a guest speaker.
6. Action plan

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

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

For this Silver Award application, we have identified key areas that we believe will improve the working culture at ICS. The Action Plan summarises on-going actions and planned new actions in these key-areas that are realistic and timely:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point/Issue Identified</th>
<th>Actions already taken</th>
<th>Further actions Planned</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Success measure over next 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 Meet with other SAT committees within FPHS | A faculty coordinator has been appointed to organise collaboration. A Faculty Equality Steering Group has been set up which includes representatives from the FPHS Institutes’ SAT | Make contact with SATs in other FPHS Institutes and set up meetings | • SG to make contact  
• Eleanor Day, Faculty Athena SWAN Lead | September 2014 | Annual FPHS SAT meeting |
| 1.2 Current SAT: gender balance, representation, student member | The original SAT formed of 4 members of staff was enlarged to 8 members, to include each ICS site and different levels of seniority. One new member is a post-doc recently returned from maternity leave | • Invite student representative to the SAT  
• Open the invitation to other targeted ICS members  
• Remind the entire staff of the SAT and encourage anyone interested to join  
• Rotate the SAT Chair for each resubmission | • PJT to invite 2 students  
• SG to email all ICS staff about SAT invitation | May 2014 | Larger SAT (12 members), with gender balance, good representation from different staff groups and different ICS sites and a student member |
| 1.3 Launch of ICS Athena SWAN at the next ICS ‘get together’ staff event and annual update at future meetings to embed principles in the Institute | Athena SWAN information has been uploaded to the ICS website | • ICS staff ‘get together’ event where all ICS employees will be made more aware of the ICS Athena SWAN programme in breakout sessions  
• The promotion criteria will also be part of the agenda | AH, SG and Rikke Osterlund, Institute executive assistant | June 2014 | Understanding and embedding of the Athena SWAN principles within the Institute will be monitored as part of the ICS questionnaire planned for Oct 2014 Improved response rate in survey in relation to |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point/Issue Identified</th>
<th>Actions already taken</th>
<th>Further actions Planned</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Success measure over next 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.4 SMG mainly male dominated | Appointment of a new female Professor in Oct 2013, and recent recruitment of a female Senior Clinical Lecturer. Attempt to recruit an excellent female scientist from the US | • Assess potential retirement plans for the senior Professors and plan a succession strategy to start balancing staff at senior levels  
• Identify early career scientists (4 members of staff are currently eligible to be promoted to Reader, 2 men and 2 women) that could be supported and promoted to replace one day the potential leavers  
• Assess suitability of all female staff at Grade 8 level or above to apply for promotion, and support them through our careers advice clinic  
• Invite female candidates for senior positions to present in the Institute and to meet staff  
• Ensure that women are fully involved in the search committees  
• Set up a second tier management group to engage more women in management decision-making and organisation. This group will | AH, SG | September 2015 | A strategy in place to achieve a more balanced and representative SMG within the next 5 years  
More women involved in management decisions by September 2014 (new decision making group) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point/Issue Identified</th>
<th>Actions already taken</th>
<th>Further actions Planned</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Success measure over next 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organise the PhD meeting and ICS seminar series, and be involved in new educational ideas</td>
<td>SG, SAT</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Decisions of major committees to reflect Athena SWAN principles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.5 Ensure that SAT members sit on all important ICS executive committees | We have improved the gender balance of the Promotion Committee, the Departmental Teaching Committee and the Student Staff Consultative Committee | • Review of the current committees’ gender balance  
• Additional staff members to join the SAT in the next few months to avoid overburden, especially for the female members of the SAT | AH, SG | April 2014: Next progress report to SMG  
January 2015: annual progress report | Agenda and minutes of SMG meetings include Athena SWAN update (every other month)  
Progress identified and reported on annually |
| 1.6 Athena SWAN progress report to SMG | The SAT report was introduced as one of the points in the SMG agenda in December 2013 | • Report of the Athena SWAN progress to SMG bi-monthly  
• Compile an annual progress report to upload on ICS website | AH, SG | | |

2. Monitoring

| 2.1 UCL Staff Survey  
< 20% ICS staff members responded to the 2011 UCL survey  
60% ICS staff members responded to the 2013 | The 2014 questionnaire was highly advertised through ICS group email; staff were reminded before the deadline and encouraged to take part. Survey results have been analysed and discussed | • Report the results of the UCL survey to the next ‘get together’ staff event to emphasise the importance of participating  
• Stress the importance of this survey at SMG meeting and report results once analysed | SG to report results to the next staff meeting  
AH to address this at SMG | | |
|                             |                      | • SG to report results to the next staff meeting  
• AH to address this at SMG | Report of the results to staff: June 2014  
Report of the results to SMG: June 2014 | | Completion of survey, with an increase of 20% each year. Actions to be addressed by SAT and SMG, progress reviewed annually by SMG |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point/Issue Identified</th>
<th>Actions already taken</th>
<th>Further actions Planned</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Success measure over next 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCL survey</td>
<td>by SAT. Key transition point for gender balance and other issues have been identified</td>
<td>• SAT to develop actions and identify areas of impact each year as a result of staff feedback</td>
<td>• Advertise the survey: at June 2014 staff ‘get together’ and just before and during the time of the next survey completion (2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 ICS Staff Survey</td>
<td>&lt; 50% ICS staff members responded to the questionnaire in 2013</td>
<td>The first survey was designed and delivered in March 2013 to understand the opinion of staff about potential gender issues and identify areas for improvement. Key transition points for gender balance and other issues were identified and plans made for addressing them</td>
<td>• Update the survey according to latest results from the UCL survey in order to assess staff feeling related to specific areas of interest and potential improvement. The ICS survey will be delivered every 18 months. • Stress the importance of this survey at SMG meeting and encourage ICS staff to fill in the survey via email communication. • SAT to develop actions and identify areas of impact as a result of staff feedback. • Key issues from the survey results also communicated to SMG.</td>
<td>SAT to design the new survey, AH to address this at SMG, SG to email all ICS staff</td>
<td>Next survey distributed in January 2015, analysed and discussed by SAT before May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point/Issue Identified</td>
<td>Actions already taken</td>
<td>Further actions Planned</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Success measure over next 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Gender-balance on all shortlisting and interview panels, including for PGR recruitment. This is already in place for academic posts, but not for other positions where arrangements are made locally</td>
<td>Since August 2012, interview panels for all academic posts have already exceeded the interim 25% female target</td>
<td>• Continue to ensure that at least 25% of any recruitment panel is female and aim to make this 50%  • Recruitment panel composition to be requested at advertisement stage  • Staff to sit on a maximum of 4 panels a year.  • Avoid over-burdening by involving women from other UCL departments and partner organisations: creation of a FPHS database  • Review of all gender-balance data regarding recruitment during SAT meetings. Results will guide further changes year by year.</td>
<td>SG, all recruiting managers</td>
<td>• October 2014  • Database in place: January 2015</td>
<td>100% of interview panels with at least 25% female representation  No women to sit on more than 4 panels a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Job applications/results Incomplete data until mid-2013</td>
<td>Recruitment of a new HR member of staff in March 2013 that enhanced our monitoring of new job applications. Administration was done external to ICS before and data are incomplete</td>
<td>Collection of robust data for future appointments</td>
<td>Institute Admin</td>
<td>Starting from June 2014</td>
<td>Accurate data, analysed annually by SAT. Actions in place where required as a result of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Committee work load of female academics</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitor the committee workload by gender and check the distribution amongst senior academic staff</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td>Fair distribution of committee workload across the Institute. Decrease in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point/Issue Identified</td>
<td>Actions already taken</td>
<td>Further actions Planned</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Success measure over next 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 MSc student course: Lack of information related to the reasons for declining the offer to the course New part-time programme</td>
<td>Gather qualitative data from applicants who decline offers to find out the reason for their decision and to identify and address any potential reason for their choice related to inequality</td>
<td>• Review of these data to plan the next year course. • Pilot a new part-time programme from academic year 2014-15; monitor and review student data also in consideration of the declining reasons.</td>
<td>PJT, Joanna Pajerska, ICS Education Administrator</td>
<td>Starting from next academic year – 2014-15</td>
<td>• Information related to reasons for not acceptance. Actions in place in response to feedback • Appropriate gender balance for the new intakes and monitor results between female: male part-time: full-time students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Postgraduate research programme student outcomes. Information is currently provided centrally by UCL, but it is not as good as it could be.</td>
<td>MD(Res) and PhD programme students came from different Institutions at the time of ICS formation, which made it difficult to monitor consistently this group.</td>
<td>• Collect good quality data and outcomes from prospective students registered for these programmes: record of reports and outcomes from annual individual meetings, MPhil/PhD upgrade time and pass/fail rate, PhD final outcome and time to award • Work with UCL’s Student Services to ensure good data quality</td>
<td>• SG to gather current student information • Joanna Pajerska to collect prospective data</td>
<td>Retrospective data: June 2014 Prospective data: starting from next academic year – 2014-15</td>
<td>• Information on female:male outcomes from current students. • Information for prospective students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Paternity leave. Currently not monitored.</td>
<td>UCL has recently introduced a formal procedure to request and</td>
<td>• Spread information about paternity leave through ICS mailing list.</td>
<td>Institute Administration</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>All instances of paternity leave monitored and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point/Issue Identified</td>
<td>Actions already taken</td>
<td>Further actions Planned</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Success measure over next 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Monitor paternity leave. 2 men in the Institute have recently applied | - Require formal requests to be filed in order to ensure these data are monitored in future.  
- Add information about paternity leave to all Job Descriptions and Induction Pack  
- Promote 4 weeks paternity leave, and additional paternity leave to staff | Institute Administration | Starting from September 2014 | Men and women report through ICS staff survey that they work flexibly, with satisfactory results, or >80% understand how to request flexible working |
| 2.9 Flexible working | - Add information to job description, staff handbook and to staff appraisal documents  
- Pilot a ‘just say yes’ approach: trial period for all requests made under the formal UCL process. At the end of the trial period, successful arrangements will continue | Institute Administration | Starting from September 2014 | Increase the number of women applying for senior positions to rectify the imbalance at professorial and reader level |

### 3. RECRUITMENT

#### 3.1 Increase numbers of women externally recruited to senior research grades

- This has been commenced by the appointment of a female Professor, a female Lecturer promoted to Senior Lecturer in the next year, and more recently a female clinical consultant cardiologist to a Senior Lecturer post
- Make an active effort to head hunt outstanding female applicants to attain gender balance  
- State clearly in all adverts the gender neutrality of the recruitment and interview process

<p>| Academic Appointments Committee, SMG | Next 2-3 years | Increase the number of women applying for senior positions to rectify the imbalance at professorial and reader level |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point/Issue Identified</th>
<th>Actions already taken</th>
<th>Further actions Planned</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Success measure over next 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Transparent recruitment process</td>
<td>• Job descriptions are now finalised at Institute level to ensure that they contain an appropriate equality statement and information about the Institute’s commitment to Athena SWAN; to ensure that they are free from gender (and other) impartiality; and to ensure that the person specification is in line with UCL’s expectations for a job at that level. • Senior management at ICS have done Unconscious Bias training.</td>
<td>• Introduction of an ICS pack for job advertisement, shortlisting and interview panels to be circulated to all staff. • Review of recruitment material to outline staff benefits and maternity leave policy, which will be added to all job descriptions and ICS pack • Increase the number of staff members who undergo Unconscious Bias training and keep a register of this (using a different facilitator or the new training being developed by UCL)</td>
<td>Institute Administration</td>
<td>Starting in the new academic year 2014-15</td>
<td>No bias evident in annual analysis of recruitment data (% female applicants reflect % female in applicant pool) Increase in number of women applying for jobs at ICS due to improved communication of benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Point/Issue Identified</td>
<td>Actions already taken</td>
<td>Further actions Planned</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Success measure over next 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.3 Induction of new staff members | Staff inductions are already performed, but vary by site | • Induction of all new starters with one of our administrator team within their first month to inform them about UCL and ICS guidelines, outlining recommended training opportunities, career development and promotion procedures.  
• All new staff to undertake Equality and Diversity training within six weeks of appointment. The Institute will continue to monitor and ensure that this training is completed and staff members who have a probation period cannot be confirmed in post until this training has been done  
• Develop an ICS Staff Handbook | Institute Administration | • Standardised inductions from October  
• ICS Staff Handbook ready in September 2014 | • 100% of staff inductions carried out for new appointments  
• ICS Staff Handbook to be circulated to all existing staff, as well as new staff  
• All new starters have completed online E&D training |

### 4. PROMOTION, MENTORING, CAREER DEVELOPMENT

| 4.1 Limited awareness amongst early career staff, but also at more senior levels, of the requirements for promotion | Employees’ PIs were alerted for their view on the individual’s suitability for promotion in the last round, and information was provided about the assessment criteria | • Circulate relevant documents directly to all staff eligible for promotion.  
• Advertise the UCL promotion workshops  
• Organise a workshop dedicated to UCL promotion criteria as part of the next ICS ‘get together’ staff event. | AH, SG, Rikke Osterlund | Starting August 2014 | • Increase number of women applying for promotion and being successful.  
• Improved feedback on promotions in the next ICS staff survey – increased awareness of the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point/Issue Identified</th>
<th>Actions already taken</th>
<th>Further actions Planned</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Success measure over next 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.2  | Career progression process information | • Event for a focus group of female clinicians and non-clinicians to identify issues with career progression.  
• Speed mentoring activity | PJT | 7th July, 2014, annual thereafter | Through positive evaluation of events at the time of delivery |
| 4.3  | Career development afternoons for MSc and PhD students | Successful annual presentation of the wide range of career options | Introduce an evaluation and feedback form which will be collated and analysed to enable assessment and development of the careers day | PJT, AW | Jan 2015 | Positive feedback from these meetings. Content adapted in response to feedback where necessary |
| 4.4  | PhD and Postdocs career development support | A programme has been set up within ICS, in particular towards fellowship applications | • ‘Fellowship day’ planned for 27th May 2014 with key funding bodies.  
• Set up mock interviews before the interview itself to give applicants feedback and improve their chances of a | PJT, AH, SMG | • May 2014 and annually: ‘Fellowship day’.  
• Starting with the next | • Improvement in staff satisfaction regarding career development reported by this key transition group in the next ICS staff |

- Invite research staff to take part in the internal review process
- Adapt the appraisal process to ensure that it specifically addresses promotions
- Assess the impact of part-time working on promotion and action that special attention is given to this group so that they are not jeopardised by their work pattern

- Improvement in staff satisfaction regarding career development reported by this key transition group in the next ICS staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point/Issue Identified</th>
<th>Actions already taken</th>
<th>Further actions Planned</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Success measure over next 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>successful application</td>
<td>fellowship applications within ICS: mock interviews (responsive mode)</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Improvement in staff satisfaction regarding career development reported by this key transition group in the next ICS staff survey (October 2014) by 20%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Set up a buddy mentoring scheme for PhDs and Postdocs in ICS, to improve the support given to PhDs and Postdocs who have different needs, by establishing separate PhD and Postdoc small mentoring groups led by senior staff members with opportunity for individual mentoring if required</td>
<td>SG, SMG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Individual career development support</td>
<td>• Advertise UCL Careers Service and the one-to-one appointment with a Careers Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation of the UCL policy to offer a rolling programme of ‘career advice surgeries’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create a fund to financially support career development opportunities such as Teaching and Learning in Higher and Professional Education certificate, external training course, etc., with 50-50 split between female and male applicants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Point/Issue Identified</strong></td>
<td><strong>Actions already taken</strong></td>
<td><strong>Further actions Planned</strong></td>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Timescale</strong></td>
<td><strong>Success measure over next 3 years</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.6 Lack of funding sources for women who have taken career breaks and following one round of return to work fellowship (key career transition point) | Meeting organised with BHF to outline this issue and discuss the removal of the age limitation on their intermediate fellowships, or the opening of a new scheme specifically for this group of female researchers | AH | • Meeting in April 2014  
• BHF change in the next 2 years | BHF change in their fellowships scheme regulations or improve communication of policy |
| 4.7 Assessment of the appraisal process | ICS has moved to an annual appraisal cycle rather than the UCL-required two-year cycle as we see appraisal as an essential mechanism to support individual career development, and pivotal in changing the % women representation in senior positions as well as in all grades of career progression. | • Monitor appraisals to ensure that they are done regularly with review of career development and potential promotion assessment, using existing UCL tools and quality checking before Director sign-off  
• Ensure that both the appraise and appraiser are trained to optimise the promotion process  
• Advertise training courses for appraiser and appraisee by email to all ICS staff | • All senior staff (appraiser update pack)  
• All staff through pre-appraisal pack guidance. | September 2014 onwards | Improve the quality of the appraisal process with cultural change and transparency of opportunities. Improve promotion rate of women. 90% appraisal completion rate each year Increased satisfaction with the appraisal process in the ICS staff survey |

### 5. PREGNANCY, MATERNITY LEAVE AND RETURN TO WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Action Point</strong></th>
<th><strong>Actions already taken</strong></th>
<th><strong>Further actions Planned</strong></th>
<th><strong>Responsibility</strong></th>
<th><strong>Timescale</strong></th>
<th><strong>Success measure over next 3 years</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1 Improve information about pregnancy, maternity leave and return to work issues which are not well disseminated in UCL. When a staff member advises her manager | A forum has been set up to understand the issues experienced by ICS women during pregnancy and on returning to work | PJT to set up bi-monthly meeting  
PJT, SS, Rikke Osterlund and Elaine McDonald to disseminate information | • April 2014 next meeting  
• September 2014: information pack | Improve information available to women thinking of becoming pregnant and informing details to those already pregnant or on maternity leave. But |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point/Issue Identified</th>
<th>Actions already taken</th>
<th>Further actions Planned</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Success measure over next 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| that she is pregnant, the manager contacts the Institute admin team, who offer to meet with the individual to discuss the maternity options. However, women cannot easily access practical information especially during planning of pregnancy or before communicating the pregnancy to the line manager. | facilities available at UCL e.g. for expressing milk, contractual issues, funding information during maternity leave especially for those researchers sponsored by grants, etc. in the induction pack.  
- Include UCL maternity policy on the ICS website and in the new Induction Pack.  
- Send the information pack to all existing staff. | | | | more importantly to support women in these situations  
Positive feedback from the bi-monthly meetings, and from the ICS survey. |
| 5.2 Set up small buddy mentoring groups led by senior staff in relation to pregnancy and maternity. | Buddy mentoring groups work well for women planning for pregnancy, pregnant, and returning to work after maternity leave to support each other and deal with mutual issues. | PJT | April 2014 | Help support women through this period of pregnancy, maternity leave and return to work so they do not feel isolated.  
Positive feedback via the ICS survey |
<p>| 5.3 Barriers for clinical staff in specific male dominated environments | Female clinical role models have been introduced into MBBS teaching | Work with the relevant NHS Trusts to help with these issues, by introducing role models in teaching, Continuing Professional Development, seminars and conferences | PJT and SS | January 2015 | Female staff are better equipped to develop in a clinical as well as an academic setting |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point/Issue Identified</th>
<th>Actions already taken</th>
<th>Further actions Planned</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Success measure over next 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Time of work meetings</td>
<td>• Monthly SMG used to meet at 7.30am, a common time for clinical cardiology but unusual for academics. This was moved to 9.00am to help accommodate the needs of staff with childcare responsibilities. • Meetings organised centrally for specific committees now go through a Doodle poll</td>
<td>• Review of SMG time to be moved to core hours for some meetings, when compatible with clinical commitments • Heads of laboratories to reschedule their Centre meetings in core working times from 10am to 4.00pm. • Empower staff to choose optimal meeting times through the use of web tools such as Doodle poll at local level</td>
<td>Whole SAT</td>
<td>Starting from May 2014</td>
<td>• Women report improved satisfaction regarding time of work meetings in ICS staff survey • All centre meetings held during core hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Time of social gatherings</td>
<td>ICS ‘get together’ staff events in 2012 and 2013 were held during the afternoon</td>
<td>Work with the different NHS Trust sites to ensure that clinical duties are organised to allow staff to participate in these events. Encourage social meetings such as Christmas Parties to be organised at lunch time or start around 4.00pm. When not possible, the meetings need to be organised well in advance to enable parents/carers to plan for childcare and support</td>
<td>SMG</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Positive feedback via the ICS survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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