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

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

The letter is an opportunity for the head of department to confirm their support for the application and to endorse and commend any women and STEMM activities that have made a significant contribution to the achievement of the departmental mission.
Dear Athena SWAN Panel,

As the new Director of the UCL Division of Biosciences and an active member of our Athena SWAN Self-Assessment Team, I am proud to submit this revised application for a Bronze Award. I was pleased to endorse the Division’s previous application (submitted in November 2013, before my arrival) but had not participated in its preparation. Having been fully engaged in this application, I believe we have made considerable improvements in Divisional policy in the past year to better align with Athena SWAN principles, but also that we had a strong start at the outset.

The Division of Biosciences is the largest at UCL, comprising four Research Departments, each with an academic Head (HoRD). I oversee both the academic enterprise and the administration of the Division, with the help of the Divisional Manager. From UCL’s perspective I am considered a Department Head, so we deem it appropriate to apply as a Division for this award. Furthermore, our collected data indicated that differences in practices and outcome between the Research Departments were not statistically significant.

In my 27 years on the faculty of the University of California San Francisco and during my career as a female scientist, I served as mentoring facilitator for my UCSF department and participated in many events and panels addressing issues facing women in science. Notably, I organized a seminar on these issues during a sabbatical fellowship at King’s College, Cambridge (2006). At that event I met Prof Nancy Lane and was impressed to learn of the Athena SWAN Charter and its important standing in UK academia. So it is with great enthusiasm that during my first year at UCL, in consultation with my management board (the four HoRDs and the Divisional Manager), as well as the Divisional Athena SWAN SAT, I have established uniform fair hiring, promotion and mentoring practices across Research Departments. In brief, we have

1) Developed and implemented a compulsory Divisional mentoring programme for postdocs, Research Fellows, Teaching Fellows and Lecturers.

2) Ensured gender diversity of the three promotions committees (technical, junior academic and Professorial) in each Research Department, making committee composition public and avoiding domination by a single group.

3) Ensured gender diversity of academic search committees and instituted procedures to solicit applications from women and minorities to diversify the candidate pool.

4) Established a Divisional lecture series, 50% delivered by women, and a Divisional Lecture honouring women in science for 2015-16.

5) Provided feedback to the Dean of the Faculty of Life Sciences on Divisional SAT issues.
I believe these changes satisfactorily address the shortfalls noted in our 2013 application, and that we are moving forward in the spirit of the Athena SWAN Charter, intending to work towards a Silver Award, should we succeed with the present application.

Thank you for consideration of this resubmission.

Sincerely,

Frances M. Brodsky, D.Phil.

Professor and Director of the Division of Biosciences
2. The self-assessment process: maximum 1000 words

We have been given permission to extend the word count by 500 words, i.e. to 1500 words because of the size of our Division and SAT.

Describe the self-assessment process. This should include:

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

Our team comprises 10 males and 13 females, including 7 Professors, 2 Readers, 1 Senior Lecturer, 2 Lecturers, 1 Teaching Fellow, 1 Research Fellow, 2 postdocs, 3 PhD students, the Divisional Manager, 3 support staff. This large SAT ensures that the views of academics in different subject areas and at different career stages, as well as of support services, are represented. SAT decisions are relayed to the Heads of Research Departments (HoRDs) and to the Faculty Dean by the Divisional Director (Frances Brodsky, also SAT member), and to the pan-UCL 50:50 group (working for gender equality at the UCL level and chaired by the Provost). Our SAT co-chair sits on UCL Council and raises gender-related issues there, including Athena SWAN related recommendations, ensuring that Divisional gender equality is pursued at the highest level of UCL’s administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and position</th>
<th>Experiences and SAT role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Snezana Djordjevic, Structural and Molecular Biology (SMB), SAT co-Chair</td>
<td>Joined UCL in 2000. She combines teaching, research and industrial collaborations, and served on UCL’s Committee for Equal Opportunities for 6 years. Has two children in a dual career family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Attwell Jodrell Professor of Physiology, FRS, Neuroscience, Pharmacology and Physiology (NPP), SAT co-Chair</td>
<td>Joined UCL in 1981. Has one child in a dual career family, and a research group of 12, with 7 women. Sits on UCL Council (which oversees management policies) where he is a strong advocate for Athena SWAN issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Frances Brodsky, Director of Division, SMB</td>
<td>Joined UCL in 2014, from University of California San Francisco (Professor since 1994) with history of training women in science. In a dual career relationship, no biological children, many scientific offspring. She instituted the Divisional Mentoring and post-doctoral support schemes, appointing a “Postdoc Czar” and committing Divisional resources to these and other AS activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Amanda Cain Senior Teaching Fellow, SMB</td>
<td>Joined UCL in 1994. Completed a part-time PhD while a teaching assistant. Has two children, works 4 days/week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Christodoulou Professor of NMR Spectroscopy, SMB</td>
<td>Joined UCL in 2007; Wellcome Trust New Investigator. Has one child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Orengo Professor of Bioinformatics, SMB</td>
<td>Joined UCL in 1991. On strategy boards of several institutes. Has a stepson. Member of the Mentoring Subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Konstantinos</td>
<td>Joined UCL in 2010. Member of Mentoring Subcommittee and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalassinos</td>
<td>Lecturer, SMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Hazel Smith</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer and Faculty Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Anjali Goswami</td>
<td>Reader, Genetics, Evolution and Environment (GEE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giandomenico Iannetti</td>
<td>Professor of Neuroscience, NPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Martin Stocker</td>
<td>Reader in Molecular and Cellular Neuroscience, NPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Arantza Barrios</td>
<td>Post-doc, Cell and Developmental Biology (CDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jason Rihel</td>
<td>Senior Research Fellow, CDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Patricia Salinas</td>
<td>NPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Christophe Dessimoz</td>
<td>Lecturer in Bioinformatics, GEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Angelo Tedoldi</td>
<td>PhD student, NPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Pascale Gerbault</td>
<td>PhD student, GEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Lewis Brayshaw</td>
<td>PhD student, CDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Maximina Jun</td>
<td>Senior Research Associate, SMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Elizabeth Caine</td>
<td>Biosciences Divisional Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Rachel Tribe</td>
<td>Divisional Staffing Manager, Biosciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role and Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Susmita Datta</td>
<td>Institute Manager, UCL Genetics Institute, GEE. Has two young daughters, and works full-time - UCL's flexible working policy enables her to work from home one day a week as well as adjust her schedule to collect her children. Involved in statistical processing of the data for application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chris Langridge</td>
<td>Centre Administrator, CBER, GEE. Joined UCL in 2008; joined the Division as Administrator at the Centre for Biodiversity and Environment Research in 2013. Created and analysed the ‘Opinio’ web-based staff survey. Recently took paternity leave for his 3rd child.</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.

In 2013, the Faculty Dean (Mary Collins) and Divisional Director (Neil Millar) initiated an application for an Athena SWAN Bronze Award. A diverse team from the academic and management staff was recruited to the SAT, and initially surveyed all staff to assess working practices, views of work/life balance and culture in the Division. The responses (a respectable 31% of the Division; 47 men, 74 women and 40 undisclosed) provided a framework to develop an Action Plan to implement practice consistent with Athena SWAN considerations and initiate specific changes to address problems identified. While the resulting 2013 application was not successful, much was learned from this exercise. With the arrival of new leadership, it was possible to implement a number of recommendations from our first application. Spearheaded by our new Director (Frances Brodsky) and with enthusiastic support from our new Faculty Dean (Geraint Rees), we restructured the SAT membership and engaged the Heads of Research Departments to formulate this resubmission.

Taking into consideration the feedback from the Athena SWAN Panel and consistent with our original Action Points we have now:

- Allotted more meetings and resources to discussing Athena SWAN issues
- Engaged postdocs and PhD students with this application through consultations
- Ensured that workload was spread across all SAT members by forming sub-groups for particular issues (e.g. childcare; barriers to female career advancement; mentoring) and then discussing the sub-group recommendations with the entire SAT
- Defined better the core issues that need addressing in the Action Plan
- Introduced a compulsory mentoring scheme to promote career advancement for women
- Altered employee induction processes to emphasise family-friendly initiatives
- Ensured balanced gender representation of promotion review committees, publicizing the membership of these committees
- Increased the transparency of decision-making processes that affect career structure
- Analysed separately data from the 4 Research Departments making up the Division
- Recruited as application co-lead a senior academic committed to gender issues, who sits on UCL Council and can thus influence UCL policy at the highest level (Prof David Attwell)
Since April 2014 (when we received our feedback) the SAT has met five times, and there have been additional 10 meetings of SAT subcommittees. Developments were publicized on our dedicated website: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/biosciences/Athena_SWAN. We consulted regularly with UCL Athena SWAN policy adviser Harriet Jones and Professor Annette Dolphin (Faculty Athena SWAN Lead). In addition we exchanged experience with colleagues involved in the Athena SWAN process in other UCL departments and other institutions (Birkbeck, Sussex).

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.

There is great enthusiasm for the developments catalysed by the Athena SWAN process. The SAT will meet bi-monthly to monitor the implementation and consequences of the policies set out in the Action Plan for this Bronze application, and work towards the Silver level. A further survey will be done in 2016 to assess progress in cultural change. Action Plan outcomes will be assessed by monitoring the following (see Plan for greater detail):

- Gender distribution of
  - PhD students applying for fellowships
  - Postdocs applying for fellowships and permanent academic positions
  - Divisional promotions
  - Committees deciding on promotion, recruitment and other Divisional activities
  - Purely teaching appointments
  - Invited seminar speakers
- Fraction of
  - Staff participating in the new mentoring scheme
  - Staff trained in equality/diversity issues
  - New parents taking maternity/paternity leave
  - Departmental meetings scheduled in core working hours
  - Compulsory career appraisals executed and their inclusion of mentoring issues
- Number of flexible working arrangements requested and instituted
- Institutional provision of nursery places and childcare in summer holidays

(1500 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.

The Division of Biosciences (in the Faculty of Life Sciences) was formed in 2008 by merging 8 biology and pre-clinical departments, with the aim of promoting scientific interactions between groups doing related research, improving delivery of teaching and centralising administrative resources. The Divisional Director, Professor Frances Brodsky, supported by the Divisional Manager and four Heads of Research Departments-HoRDs, oversees the research strategy, administration and finance of the Division. Research is grouped within four Research Departments: Structural and Molecular Biology (SMB); Cell and Developmental Biology (CDB);
Neuroscience, Physiology and Pharmacology (NPP) and Genetics, Evolution and Environment (GEE). Our research community includes over 500 staff and 300 PhD students. The majority of staff are research active, with 88% of male and 92% of female staff entered into the REF2014.

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**

The following diagram shows student numbers, divided into undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research students. All data are presented with female numbers shown in **orange** and male numbers in **mauve**. Raw numbers are on the left, while percentages of female students within the student body are shown on the right along with the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) average for the subject area for 2012-13 (latest HESA 2014 report).

(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.

*Not applicable - no access courses provided*

(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 Division has over 1200 undergraduate (UG) students (all full-time), studying 11 undergraduate degrees, ranging from broad entry degrees such as Biomedical Sciences to specialised degrees such as Biotechnology and Neuroscience. We have consistently high numbers of female students on the undergraduate courses: females make up about 60% of the student body which is close to the 61% overall and 59% (full-time) national average in Biological Sciences (HESA data for 2012-13). This higher percentage of females reflects the gender distribution of the applicants (59% female in 2013-14, see graph below). In the Biochemistry degree programme however numbers fluctuated with 50% of female finalists in 2011-2012 to 42% in 2012-2013 and 55% in 2013-2014. The proportion of females on this degree correlates with the percentage of female applicants for this degree and is comparable to what is seen in other Biochemistry-like degrees (54% HESA data for 2012-2013). We will continue to review and update our promotional material and open day activities to ensure that they are sending a consistent gender-balanced message as described in section (v) below.

(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.

Our postgraduate taught (PGT) courses (5 MSc and 2 MRes programmes in subjects ranging from Experimental Pharmacology and Therapeutics to Biodiversity, Evolution and Conservation) had a female student population of 66% in 2013-14. This is somewhat less than the national average of 68% female students in postgraduate taught courses in Biological Sciences (HESA 2012-13), but higher than the female representation in the application numbers (63% female in 2013-14, see graph below). Clearly, women are interested in these courses and our programmes are not disadvantaging women, but rather admitting qualified female applicants in excess of the application rate.

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

Over the last 3 years, the proportion of female postgraduate research (PGR) students remained at about 60% (60%, 56% and 59% for 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14 respectively), similar to the national average for biological sciences in 2012-13 (60%; data from HESA) and higher than the proportion of applicants who were female (53% in 2012-13, see graph below). A similar proportion of the students are being awarded highly competitive fellowships from the UK Research Councils or charities (e.g. 65% of prestigious Wellcome Trust PhD studentships in 2014 were awarded to females), so the women students are doing as well as the men in obtaining prestigious funding. Accordingly, we do not feel there is an imbalance that needs addressing at this level. In addition, we are pleased to see that there is a similar proportion of female students across the student pipeline from UG to PGR courses.

(v) **Ratio of course applications to offers and acceptances by gender for undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research degrees** – comment on the differences between male and female application and success rates and describe any initiatives taken to address any imbalance and their effect to date. Comment upon any plans for the future.
The graph below shows our entrance data for the first year undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research degrees. Bars on the left show absolute numbers, while on the right we show percentages of the total who were female for applicants (A), offers made (O) and confirmed accepted offers (C).

The graphs show no significant difference in the female percentage of students for applications, offers made, and acceptance figures. In all three student categories, slightly more women than men apply to, and are accepted for, all degrees. Male and female staff are engaged in the recruitment process for all degrees (during open days, demonstrations, meeting with students/parents and interview for research degree students). For the future we aim to maintain this excellent performance by sustaining the online equality & diversity and Organisational Development recruitment training that we provide to those on selection committees.

Undergraduate:
The columns show consistency in all the categories since 2011-12, with slightly more women than men applying to and being accepted for the courses. Previously, students were interviewed during the admission procedure but since 2011 we no longer interview candidates.

Postgraduate taught courses:
There is a slight trend over time for more women to apply to, and be accepted for, these courses. In 2012/2013 even though there was gender parity in the student cohort, the percentage of female students on the course was lower than percentage of female applicants. This was reversed by 2013-14 (a larger percentage of females accepted than applied), but we will continue to closely monitor our applications and recruitment process.

Postgraduate research students:
There are some year to year variations in the fraction of students who are female (with no obvious cause), but no consistent trend.

(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.

Degree results by gender are shown above. The majority (>80%) of students receive a 1st or 2.1 degree classification. Females are more successful than males at getting 1st class degrees (and so get less upper 2nds). Compared to the national average in biological sciences we have a higher proportion of students obtaining first or upper second degrees (the HESA 2014 report, 2012-13 data, states that 73% of UK female students achieved first or upper second class degrees).

We detect no significant gender differences in attainment in our postgraduate taught courses with 39% of female students achieving Distinction in 2014, compared to 37% of the males.
Our PhD submission rates range from 80% to 100% depending on the Research Department and year. We detect no gender differences with respect to average time to submission. For students that started their doctorate in 2009/2010, females took on average 3.9 years to submit while males took an average of 4.0 years to submit their thesis.

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.

We present data (next page) for academic staff: research assistants, postdoctoral staff on grants or fellowships, Teaching Fellows, Lecturers (including Senior Research Fellows), Senior Lecturers, Readers and Professors (including Professorial Research Fellows). Single, double and triple stars mark significant differences with p<0.05, p<0.005 and p<0.0005 respectively. We benchmarked our data against the closest category available amongst HESA data downloaded from the Equality Challenge Unit report on 01/01/15.

Out of 414 academic staff, 40.1% are female, slightly lower than the national average of 43.7% in Biosciences (HESA 2014 report). As for other UK universities, gender balance falls off drastically above Senior Lecturer level with only 21% of Readers and 21% of Professors being female; nevertheless the latter is 4% higher than the national Professorial figure for full-time SET academic staff (HESA 2014 report). Overall, 30% of all men are Professors or Readers versus 12% for women. Since a disproportionately small number of women move from the postdoctoral level to Lecturer, and from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, Reader and Professor, decision-making processes have in the past been dominated by male senior figures. We have therefore implemented two new schemes, following discussions with academic staff at all levels (including postdocs) to address issues that might contribute to gender imbalance. First, we are introducing a compulsory mentoring scheme to help female postdocs to make the transition to Fellowship or Lecturer positions, and to help female Lecturers to move further up the academic staff hierarchy. Second, we ensure gender balanced representation on Divisional promotional committees, as well as insisting that roles regularly rotate, so that it is not always the same individuals making recommendations.

Since lack of female progression to Senior Lecturer/Reader/Professor is a major issue, we analysed separately the staff data from the 4 Research Departments forming the division, to establish whether there were local differences. However, we found that there was no significant difference in the representation of women at Reader/Professor level across the four Research Departments.
The ‘scissors diagram’ below illustrates the differences in the rates of career progression through the grades of undergraduate (UG), postgraduate student (PG) and postdoctoral scientist (PD) together with Lecturer (L), Senior Lecturer (SL), Reader (Read), and Professor (Prof). A shift occurred after 2008, so that the inversion of female:male ratio occurred later in the career progression: in 2008-9 the crossover was between postgraduate and postdoctoral levels, but in 2010-11 and 2011-12 it was between the postdoctoral and Lecturer levels. Despite this
encouraging trend, which suggests that we were able to encourage more female PhD students to enter a research career, the crossover point moved back to the postdoctoral level for 2012-13 and 2013-14. This is a major issue to be addressed by our Athena SWAN action plan, which aims to support females through the transition from post-doctoral research to Lecturer or Fellow, and then to Reader and Professor.

In order to address the gender imbalance at higher grades, we must increase the number of female academics at Lecturer level and increase the rate of their career progression. Our recruitment practices are discussed below. We have established that, to increase the proportion of women at senior grades, we need to increase support for women in building up...
their research portfolio, ensure equality in the distribution of administrative and enabling duties, and ensure that workload and promotion criteria are adjusted for those working reduced hours or returning from maternity leave. This will require a significant shift in practices and culture. We will initiate this shift by the action points that are included in all sections of the action plan, addressing key transition points (i.e. Action Points 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 in Appendix 1), as discussed below. Creating this change in working culture should induce a positive feedback effect, where an improvement in career prospects for female staff increases the number of female postdocs choosing an academic career path.

(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.

The highest turnover rates are for post-doctoral and research staff (see graph on next page) in posts funded by external fixed-term funding, as expected. Traditionally, we encourage our PhD students and postdocs to move to other institutions so that they gain expertise and broaden their experience, although a subset of postdocs are retained at UCL in Lecturer posts or upon obtaining a Research Fellowship. Thus, turnover of women is not necessarily a bad thing, it may reflect them progressing to good positions in other universities.

This highlights the fact that we do not have a systematic mechanism for collecting information on subsequent positions taken by our postdocs. To obtain this, we will collect ‘next position’ data by conducting an ‘exit survey’ through an Early Career Programme (see page 21). This will help to evaluate the impact of the support we offer, and identify any further action required (Action Point 2.1).

Turnover is much lower (<10%) for academic posts, which limits the rate at which we can improve the gender balance (even if only women were hired; and in fact 27% of all new hires over the three year period (2011-2014) were female). Slightly more men leave posts compared to women, suggesting that we are good at retaining female employees.

Action Points from this section:

- **Collect information on next employment of our leaving postdocs by conducting an ‘exit survey’**. To be done through the Early Career Programme (Action Point 2.1).
- **Survey early career researchers for their training needs** (Action Point 2.2)
- **Provide compulsory mentoring scheme to help female and male postdocs and Lecturers navigate career progression** (Action Points 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 3.4)
4. Supporting and advancing women’s careers: maximum 5000 words

Key career transition points

a) Provide data for the past three years (where possible with clearly labelled graphical illustrations) on the following with commentary on their significance and how they have affected action planning.
   
   (i) Job application and success rates by gender and grade – comment on any differences in recruitment between men and women at any level and say what action is being taken to address this.

The graphs below illustrate that the numbers for applications, interviews and recruitment to postdoctoral positions show equal success rates for both genders. They also show that there are significantly more male applicants at the ‘next’ levels of career progression (Lecturer-Professor) resulting in a proportionally higher number of men being recruited. Of all new hires over the 2011-2014, 27% were female. It was not possible to meaningfully analyse Teaching Fellow applications because of the very small numbers recruited. In this post-REF period, new hiring for academic positions is reduced. However, for a recent Professorial opening, we focused on gender equality in issuing word-of-mouth invitations to apply. We have now invited for interview the most qualified candidates, three women and two men. This successful recruitment strategy is included in our Action Plan (Item 3.4).
(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.

The promotion success rates within the Division are high, as in UCL as a whole. Successful applications are publicly announced; however information on unsuccessful cases is not easily accessible. When applications are unsuccessful, feedback is provided directly to the applicants by the Dean of Life Sciences and the Divisional Director. In consultation with the HoRD, the applicant is advised on how to manage further career progression. The low failure rate implies that promotion is carefully handled at the right career stage.

Promotion is initially handled by a committee within each Research Department, with representation of female and male academics. They consider staff who have indicated that they want to be considered for promotion and they also review all staff identifying those who could potentially be promoted (to avoid disadvantaging those who feel less confident). Candidates are then put forward to the Division Director, with cross-checking for parity across Research Departments by discussion at the Biosciences Management Board. All applicants receive feedback and are given advice on how to present their CV to best advantage. Staff members not recommended for promotion in that year are given feedback on how to improve their activities to meet the criteria for promotion. This is then fed into their annual appraisal. Since 2012, there have been 12 promotions to Professor (3 female, 9 male), 9 to Reader (2 female, 7 male) and 5 to Senior Lecturer (1 female, 4 male). In future we will monitor the gender balance at the application stage and in success rates (Action Point 3.1iii).

The UCL staff survey and our Divisional survey (both in 2013) indicated that the promotion process is not perceived as fair. For the UCL survey, 38% of male respondents, but only 23% of females, from Biosciences considered that the promotion process is conducted fairly. These low percentages seem at odds with a high success rate for those who formally apply for promotion, suggesting that obstacles might have been present at initial stages, before the formal process was initiated, or that the promotion process was not transparent. The view of the SAT is that all staff need mentorship early on – at the post-doc and lectureship level – in order to better manage their workload and career progression. Female staff in particular would benefit from appropriate support at this early stage when many new challenges are faced, including family obligations. The Division is committed to disseminating more information on how and by whom promotions are evaluated. Action Points 3.1-3.6 address these needs.

Action Points:

- Run CV workshops at departmental retreats/divisional staff meetings. (Action Point 3.1i).
- Introduce extra rubric into the appraisal document, entitled: Consideration of Promotion and Career Progression (Action Point 3.1ii).
- Establish a more transparent mechanism for considering staff for promotion by forming departmental promotion committees that consider all potential candidates in the department (Action Point 3.1iii). This was an action point in our previous Athena SWAN application and is now being implemented.
Monitor gender distribution of applications and successful applicants (Action Point 3.1iii)

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

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

It is now UCL policy that all recruitment panels are 25% female. This was an Action Point on our previous Athena SWAN application, which we have now achieved but would like to increase the percentage (Action Point 3.3). We have sufficient female staff to fulfil this without causing a disproportionate demand on their time. All panellists are required to undergo training in recruitment and selection and equality and diversity. We have training track records for all recently appointed staff and are currently encouraging more senior staff to attend briefing sessions for updating on UCL policies and practices, and the Equality Act 2010 (Action Point 3.6).

As a part of UCL’s recruitment policy, job advertisements for senior grade appointments include the following statement: "We particularly welcome female applicants and those from an ethnic minority, as they are under-represented within UCL at these levels”. Advertisements for front-line, administrative & middle management staff state: "We particularly welcome applications from black and minority ethnic candidates as they are under-represented within UCL at this level".

We suggest that the following is included into the job description for new HoRD and senior posts as an essential criterion: "The candidate should demonstrate a knowledge of equality and diversity issues in their subject area, and HE generally, for both staff and students. They should demonstrate their interest, ideas and aptitude to lead on initiatives to address any equality and diversity issues within the department” (Action Point 3.4 below).

For newly advertised posts we will continue to encourage female candidates, identified through word-of-mouth, conferences and publications, to apply for the position, which is how we proceeded for a recent Professorial appointment (see section 4. a (i))

Action Points:

- Include new essential criteria in the job description for new Heads of Department and other senior posts (Action Point 3.4).
- Invite applications from specific female candidates for newly advertised posts (Action Point 3.4)
- Review staff training on recruitment/selection and equality and diversity, and encourage senior staff to get updated on relevant policies and practices (Action Point 3.6).

(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.

We have identified two key transition points for female staff: at the point of entering an academic career after postdoctoral training and at the stage between Lecturer/Reader/Professor. We train postdocs so that they are equipped with competitive skills and research portfolios suitable for applying for lectureship-level positions, and have recently run a very well attended consultation with postdocs to assess what additional training should be provided. Currently, such support is provided informally via their academic supervisors and more formally through the provision of training (via the UCL staff development programme and in the future through our newly established Early Career Programme), as well as through presentation and networking opportunities at departmental seminars and research domain meetings.

The SAT agreed that postdocs should have a more formally structured support scheme that would enable their progression to Lecturer level. First, we will organize an ‘Early Career Programme (ECP)’ (Action Point 2.1) through which information on fellowship and funding opportunities, career paths and training (e.g. CV or research proposal writing workshops) will be provided (more details are given in section 5). The ECP will be run by postdocs with support from the SAT. Secondly, postdocs will be included in a compulsory mentoring scheme with access to appropriate role models (Action Points 2.3 and 3.5). Furthermore, from the autumn of 2013, postdocs have been included in annual appraisals, through which they receive formal feedback (Action Point 2.4). These actions should increase the number of female applicants for Lecturer and other academic posts, providing a larger pool of well qualified and competitive female candidates.

Based on statistical data, staff surveys and informal discussions with colleagues and HoRDs, the SAT concluded that an increased level of support is needed to better manage the progression of female staff from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer/Reader/Professor grades. Junior female academics will benefit from the new compulsory mentoring scheme (Action Point 3.5) providing strong support and guidance to assist them through the initial phase of establishing research programmes and acquiring funding. Mentees will be able to choose their mentors, including female mentors if desired, and mentors will be outside their own research group. They also receive regular constructive feedback through annual appraisals, allowing them to plan their career progression accordingly.

In order to support development of the research and teaching portfolios of female Lecturers it is also necessary to ensure a fair workload in all areas. Our approach to this is described in the Workload model section below (page 26).

Action Points:

- Set up ‘Early Career’ Programme (Action Point 2.1).
- Provide tailored additional training for postdocs (Action Points 2.2).
- At staff meetings, encourage PIs to discuss funding opportunities during the appraisal process and to actively support their postdocs in applying for the schemes (Action Point 2.4).
- Set up compulsory mentoring scheme for postdocs and junior academics (Action Points 2.3, 3.5).
- Review workload allocation models and devise a Divisional model (Action Points 4.3).

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?

The appraisal process covers research, teaching, administration, enterprise, and enabling (including pastoral and outreach) duties. Until 2012 appraisals were carried out every two years (which was UCL policy) by either the HoRD or a senior member of staff. From August 2013 all academic staff including postdocs have been appraised annually. It is UCL policy that all appraisers receive training, and are committed to ensuring that all appraisers comply (Action Point 3.6). In addition to UCL Organisational Development courses, our staff can participate in training workshops organized specifically for the School of Life and Medical Sciences (SLMS). These local training sessions will ensure a higher participation rate, with information tailored to the careers of those in the life sciences, rather than academia more generally. Currently the gender balance of those trained in appraising is 36% women, 64% men.

The quality and benefits of the appraisal process are difficult to evaluate. The staff survey suggests that the process is not widely perceived as beneficial and rewarding – in UCL 2013 survey only 55% of female academics in Biosciences answered positively to the question regarding the appraisal received. While all aspects of an individual’s activity (research, teaching, pastoral, enabling, enterprise, outreach) should be appraised, the exchange between the appraiser and appraisee is strongly influenced by the appraiser’s perception of ‘what is important’. By making the appraisals more frequent and training all staff in how to conduct an appraisal the process should become more constructive. In addition, discussion of career progression and promotion opportunities is often initiated by the appraisee, which may disadvantage those who are less confident. In order to formalize the consideration of career progression with respect to promotion criteria, the SAT proposes to change the appraisal form (Action Point 3.1). In addition, we have introduced a compulsory mentoring system that includes discussion of how to approach being appraised (Action Point 3.5). We already participate in a SLMS Future Leaders programme that trains young scientists (33% female) in how to run a successful scientific career, and our Early Career Programme will discuss many aspects of this as well.

Additional details on the promotion process and promotion criteria are considered above in the section *Applications for promotion and success rates by gender and grade*.

**Action Points:**

- **Annual appraisals for all staff including postdocs (Action Point 4.4i).**
- **All appraisers required to attend training (Action Point 4.4ii).**
Amend the UCL appraisal form (Action Point 3.1 (ii))

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

The Divisional Staffing Team has standard procedures for new staff induction covering: safety, useful web links (including the Divisional Staff Handbook covering flexible working policies and processes, and personal & professional development), contact details of administrative staff, annual leave entitlement, how to notify sickness/sick absence, job description and person specification, UCL campus map and how to obtain an e-mail account. This initiates the employment but does not provide support with research development and teaching duties. All new staff receive a Divisional Staff Handbook and are required to undertake online Equality and Diversity training during the probationary period.

It is up to individual HoRDs to organize a new Lecturer/Reader/Professor’s induction into available resources, funding streams, PhD studentship allocation and probationary requirements. If the new employee is a post-doc or laboratory technician then the level of induction and career development support currently depends on their line-manager. In the Biosciences survey (2013), 33% of respondents gave a score of 5 or 6 (out of 6) when rating their arrival in the Division as satisfactory, but informal discussions suggest that many new staff feel ‘left on their own’ and gather information from ‘word-of-mouth’. Thus, anyone lacking confidence might fail to come across the right information. To improve communication of important family-friendly opportunities and other UCL benefits, we will hold two induction sessions per year for new postdocs (Action Point 4.1). These will cover benefits and research, development opportunities such as the Early Careers Programme and mentoring available in the Division. Additionally, we will ensure that all new members of staff are enrolled in the new mentoring scheme (Action Point 3.5).

HoRDs normally meet all new Lecturers but we will encourage them to meet with other new staff members (postdocs, Teaching Fellows and research technicians), welcome them personally and introduce them to the department. Once a term, the Division Director will name and welcome all new staff in the Division via email and the Biosciences webpage, as well as at the Divisional staff meeting.

Action Points:

- Ensure that new staff are enrolled into the compulsory Divisional mentoring scheme (Action Point 3.5)
- Continue to review and amend welcome packs and procedures and implement twice yearly induction sessions for postdocs (Action Point 4.1).
- Division-wide announcements of new appointments to be made (Action Point 5.7).
(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.

**Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught (PGT) students:**
In addition to Programme Tutor and Year Tutor, all undergraduate and PGT students have an academic assigned as their Personal Tutor. The Personal Tutor follows a student’s academic progress, and looks after their well-being, particularly in time of difficulties. A student normally has the same Tutor throughout their degree, for continuity, but we can change the assigned Tutor (e.g. if a female is preferred). The Tutor gives career advice and assistance in applications for internship programmes and postgraduate studies. All academic staff are Personal Tutors and each Tutor looks after 4-5 students for each year of the degree as part of their standard departmentally-monitored workload. The small student/staff ratio enables us to build supportive relationships with our students and follow them closely through their studies.

**PhD students:**
Each Research Department within the Division has one or more Graduate Tutors for postgraduate taught and postgraduate research programmes. In addition we have a Staff-Student Consultative Committee at the Divisional level. Each student, in addition to a primary supervisor, has a PhD/MRes thesis committee that assesses their progress and well-being. The student has important input into choosing their mentors. The high proportion of female students makes them very important in the life of the Division. For the last two years we have had a Divisional postgraduate research day, organized by student committee with a fair representation of male and female students, and each day was a great success. For that day, to specifically promote career advancement for female students, the SAT prepared a poster presentation focusing on SWAN activities and providing information on postdoctoral fellowships, particularly those aimed at female students such as the Dorothy Hodgkin Fellowship and the L’Oreal Women in Science Award. Many students were not aware of the schemes available, so we plan to make them more visible by advertising them on the Divisional Athena SWAN site, by sending termly email reminders to all students and staff, and by covering these opportunities during post-doc inductions (Action Point 1.1i). We will continue to present a similar poster at the Biosciences postgraduate research day and additionally organize a ‘Life as a Lecturer’ session (Action Point 1.1ii). Since spring 2014, PhD students have been engaged in Athena SWAN activities through their representatives on the SAT.

**Action Points:**
- *Increase information on funding opportunities for female scientists at early career stages or after career breaks (Action Point 1.1i).*
- *Organize a ‘Life as a Lecturer’ session associated with the Divisional postgraduate research day (Action Point 1.1ii).*
- *Identify Athena SWAN student reps (Action Point 1.2).*
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.

All academic staff are members of their Research Department’s Research Committee and its Teaching Committee.

We also have several committees at the Divisional level and the gender balance of all committee members (presented below: currently 44 male and 31 female), who are recruited according to their interests and position, is not significantly different to that of the total pool of academics (40% female).

### MALE AND FEMALE REPRESENTATION ON DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biosciences Management Board</td>
<td>M 8</td>
<td>F 8</td>
<td>M 5</td>
<td>F 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosciences Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>F 8</td>
<td>M 9</td>
<td>F 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosciences Team Managers</td>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>M 5</td>
<td>F 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosciences IT</td>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>F 2</td>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>F 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Management</td>
<td>M 5</td>
<td>F 4</td>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>F 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Staff Students Consultative</td>
<td>M 7</td>
<td>F 6</td>
<td>M 7</td>
<td>F 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosciences PhD Strategy</td>
<td>M 8</td>
<td>F 6</td>
<td>M 8</td>
<td>F 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>M 26</td>
<td>F 21</td>
<td>M 49</td>
<td>F 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Point:**

- *Collect and monitor data from Research Departments on committee membership gender balance (Action Point 4.6).*

(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.

Technically, UCL only uses fixed-term contracts for short-term contracts such as maternity cover. Researchers are in principle on open-ended contracts limited only by the supervisor’s ability to raise funding. When funding comes to an end, managers hold a consultation meeting with the affected staff member to discuss the funding situation and explore possibilities for extension or redeployment. If further funding is not available researchers are provided with a minimum of 3 months’ notice and placed on the UCL redeployment register, which allows them advance notice...
of any posts advertised across UCL. The vast majority of our funding-limited staff are post-doctoral research associates/fellows (gender data provided above, page 13, 56% are female). In addition, we have 14 Research Fellows who are directly paid by external fellowships while hosted by UCL (12 male and 2 female). Although fixed-term, these fellowships are prestigious and provide a competitive advantage to their holders at the time of application for a permanent post. As a part of our overall plan to encourage our female postdocs to increase their prospect of acquiring a permanent academic post, we will be supporting them in applying for these prestigious fellowships (see above: Support for staff at key career transition points).

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

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

UCL requires that at least 25% of the members of interview panels be female, but does not have formal mechanisms regulating the gender composition of other decision-making committees. Nevertheless, we have significant female representation from our Division on key committees, including: (a) at the UCL level, on UCL Council, Finance Committee, and Committee for Equal Opportunities; and (b) at the departmental level, all teaching and research committees. However, some UCL committees have only a few female members, such as the Neuroscience Domain Steering Committee where only 2 out of 13 are women. In 2012, the 50:50 group was established specifically to promote gender equality at UCL and Professor Annette Dolphin from our Division was co-chair for this committee from 2012-14. There are sufficient female academics that there is no committee overload problem.

To promote better gender representation for decision making, we will ensure that every committee has a deputy chair of the opposite gender to the chair (Action Point 4.6 below).

**Action Points:**
- **Collect information on committees’ memberships (Action Point 4.6i).**
- **In cases where imbalance is identified, notify the convening Research Department or Programme.**
- **Appoint deputy chairs to the members of the specific committees such that the deputies are of opposite gender whenever possible. When term of membership expires, deputies could rotate into the role with a new deputy being appointed (Action Point 4.6ii).**

(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.
Currently, all of the Divisional Research Departments quantify teaching workload allocation, but other enabling activities are informally considered. All Research Departments have a target of 40 contact hours per year per person as a minimum requirement and any further load is adjusted based on individual circumstances, including administrative responsibilities, research management and supervision. Individual enabling, consultancy, knowledge transfer, public engagement and outreach activities are discussed during appraisal meetings. During appraisals, adjustments to activities are considered, particularly if a new duty is to be undertaken by the member of staff. The allocation of workload and rotation of responsibilities potentially needs examination, although a preliminary analysis has suggested that women do not have a higher teaching workload than men. We are developing a more comprehensive Biosciences workload allocation model that gives appropriate weighting to teaching and its organisation, grant management, supervision and other administrative duties.

Key administrative positions (for example, Head of Teaching, HoRD, Departmental Graduate Tutor) are appointed for 3-5 years initially and can rotate thereafter.

Action Point:

- **Review current workload models; develop a consistent, transparent and comprehensive workload model (Action Point 4.3).**

(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.

Core hours are 10am-4pm, with a policy of not scheduling meetings outside these hours (Action Point 5.1). Most meetings are between 10am-2pm and, in all four Research Departments, seminar presentations have been moved to a lunch-time slot. Some seminars and social gatherings are held at 4pm as otherwise it is perceived that they would be disruptive to normal research activities. These are organised well in advance to enable staff to make arrangements e.g. for child care. Departmental retreats are held over two days away from London and they cannot be scheduled in the 10am-4pm core working hours. However these retreats are always well attended by staff of both genders and they provide valuable opportunity for social and scientific interaction.

(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.

Our perception, based on communication with HoRDs and discussions within the SAT, is that our culture is inclusive (for staff and students alike), female-friendly and family-friendly. This is not surprising given the high percentage of female workers and parents with children. The Division accommodates the needs of individuals by allowing flexible working hours; we facilitate switching of teaching and other commitments for staff who find conflicts during a particular period of their lives (for childcare, school-parent meetings, family/health care, compassionate leave to travel to another country). We are extremely supportive of those about to embark on parental leave (i.e. maternity, adoption) and on their return, ensuring continuity of communication.
Our departmental culture is informal and we have easy access to the administrative support groups in the Staffing, Finance, Teaching, Operations and PhD Administrator teams, providing a distinct advantage to all staff and student groups.

We aim to provide female role models: last year we named our PGT students’ room the ‘Anne McLaren Room’ in honour of the renowned former director of Mammalian Development Unit at UCL.

We organise regular and inclusive gatherings celebrating openings of research facilities and individual successes such as PhD vivas, entry to the Royal Society and (so far, once only!) a Nobel Prize. Regular coffee meetings are organized by several departments, as are student/postdoc research presentations preceded by small receptions where food and refreshments are provided. We also carry out fund-raising activities for charities supported by all our staff.

Despite all this, our 2013 survey, as well as the UCL staff survey in 2013, suggested that some staff are not content with their working environment. For example, some members of staff felt disconnected from the life of the department and the Division and, interestingly, in the 2013 UCL survey only 64% of Biosciences female staff responded positively to “I feel a strong sense of belonging to UCL”, compared to 77% of males. The SAT thus believes that improving Divisional interaction and communication is a priority for enhancing Divisional culture. Action Points 5.1 and 5.4-5.7 below deal with this. In addition our Early Career Programme should bring postdocs together from different research groups, providing networking opportunities and a space for mutual support and development.

Action Points:

- Ensure that at least 40% of seminar speakers are female (Action Point 5.4) and establish a Divisional lecture recognising women in science
- Ensure that future Divisional surveys separate answers from academic and support staff, in order to provide appropriate action and responses to findings (Action Point 5.5).
- Increase awareness of HR policies and provisions (Action Point 5.6).
- Improve welcoming arrangements for new staff (Action Point 5.7).

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

UCL Biosciences has a very active and ever increasing outreach programme, largely aimed at recruiting a diverse range of undergraduate students and informing patient groups for particular diseases. We run an annual residential summer school with the Sutton Trust, and several other taster days and master classes. Applications from students who attended our summer schools comment on how the summer school encouraged them to apply to UCL.

In summer 2013 we started a ‘talks for schools’ programme where schools request a talk to be given by a member of staff either at their school or during a visit to UCL. The talks range from the general, regarding university applications and tips on writing a personal statement, to more specific topics in Neuroscience and Genetics. Talks given by male and female staff are available for children right through to year 12 and 13, and we hope that by offering female scientists as
speakers we can provide role models to the girls in the classes. So far we have had a very good response from schools in London, and will now expand the programme to schools across the UK.

Prof Djordjevic (SAT academic co-lead) has joined the recently formed ‘UCL’s Inspiring Women in Science’ speakers programme. The aim of this group is to introduce high school students to female role models in science.

Outreach activities are considered as part of the workload during the annual appraisal (see above).

**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.

The number of women taking maternity leave is shown below. Since 2008 we had more than 50 members of staff who took maternity leave and only one did not return to work. When possible, on return we allow reduced or flexible working hours. To determine what, if any, effect maternity leave has on the career progression of our academic staff, we will analyse the research outputs of the members of staff that took a significant maternity break.

**Action Points:**

- *Increase awareness of maternity/paternity and shared parental leave policies (Action Point 4.1).*
- *Evaluate the effect of maternity leave on research outputs and career progression (Action Point 4.2).*

(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.
Since 2009 we have recorded 11 staff members taking paternity leave, one of whom was a Professor, one a Reader, and the remainder were support staff. From April 2013, UCL policy on paternity leave changed, with 20 days of full-pay now available to the mother’s partner. From April 2015, an employee is also entitled to Shared Parental Leave if her/his partner has returned to work without exhausting entitlement to Maternity/Adoption Leave. We will assess whether this policy change increases the number of staff taking paternity/shared parental leave in the future. Previously, paternity leave was often not formally recorded as leave was arranged informally with line managers. In future, we will introduce a formal system to promote and record these periods of leave (Action Point 4.1). Even without these changes, however, it is encouraging that the number of people taking paternity leave has increased from zero/year before 2009-10 to 7/year in 2013-14 (see graph above).

Last year two members of our staff took year-long adoption leave – one Senior Lecturer and one support staff category (both female). We have no data for any staff taking parental care 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.

We do not have a record of applications for flexible working, as many current arrangements have been agreed on an informal basis. We will encourage such requests to be made formally, so that we can ensure they are considered against consistent criteria and that feedback is provided for any requests which are turned down.

Action Point:

• **Record ALL formal requests for flexible working and their outcome and inform staff of the availability of this work option (Action Point 4.5)**

  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.

The number of individuals working flexibly varies depending upon individual circumstances. We almost entirely operate an informal system, formality being used where cover is necessary for teaching. The great majority of academic staff, male and female, at grades from post-doc to Professor, work flexibly, either to suit their work or their personal lives, but inform only their immediate co-workers and line managers. Information on relevant UCL policies, is available through the staff intranet. In addition, HoRDs and Departmental Equal Opportunity Liaison Officers update staff on any new initiatives or changes of policies during staff meetings or through emails.

(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.

When an academic member of staff returns from maternity, adoption or shared parental leave, UCL provides a 1-term teaching sabbatical, in order for her to focus on research activities following the break. Our staff are encouraged to take up this offer.

We encourage male and female staff to take the time off they require and individuals are not put under pressure to return early. We are happy to schedule teaching to fall within hours that are suitable for those with children whenever possible. We endeavour not to schedule meetings in school holidays. We maintain a flexible approach to staff work hours. Teaching loads are re-assessed by Heads of Teaching and the cover provided during the maternity or adoption period can be extended, if needed, on the colleague’s return, if needed. We also consider part-time working and altered daily hours of work to ensure child-care arrangements are possible and easy to operate.

However, we recognize that UCL’s provision of child care does not meet the aspirations of staff (as revealed in surveys and meetings), due to the costs of operating a nursery in central London, and our SAT will work with UCL’s Equality and Diversity Committee to improve these services. We have formed a focus group to explore possibilities for improvements of child care and for organising activities for school-age children during the school holidays, leading to the action points below.

Action Points:

• Explore options for improving UCL child-care facility (Action Point 5.2).
• Explore arranging UCL Summer Camp for 5-11 years old children (Action Point 5.3).

(4849 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.

Many supportive aspects of the working culture in Division of Biosciences have developed over the last decade. Whilst overall the demand for academics’ time has now increased, the working culture has become more inclusive, more flexible and more family friendly. This opinion was passed onto us through informal discussions with senior members of staff. Our survey also showed differences in perception of the working environment and the opportunities for career development based on the age of the participants, with more junior staff having a much more positive outlook. We are happy to see that more female postgraduate students are opting for careers in research and the academic environment by taking up postdoctoral posts, and we hope that through further active support and encouragement of our junior research staff we will see an increased number of female Lecturers.
The Divisional survey that we conducted in May 2013 included both academic and support staff. We queried a range of topics from bullying and harassment to appraisal processes, career progression opportunities and work-life balance. Some of the information that we gathered inspired us to include specific action points in our Action Plan – in particular those relating to work-load, promotion and culture. It was also evident that there was a rather wide range of perceptions and experiences of the members of staff which, at least in part, related to the recent Divisional reorganisation. We were pleased to see however that there was a significant positive opinion that the Division provides adequate opportunities for personal development and training and that the majority of the respondents considered that no practice, policy or behaviour in the Division exists that is discriminatory with respect to gender. In fact, the majority (60%) expressed that Gender attitudes in the Division are respectful while 40% also chose the option of open-minded and fair. The full answer to this question is shown below.

In addition, in order to address one of the key transition points, in December of 2014 we initiated an ‘Early Career Programme’, following detailed consultation with our post-doctoral staff. An initial meeting was attended by 40 postdocs (23% of total) while 103 responded to a survey (59% of total, 53% female, 22% of the respondents have children). Most respondents (73%) wanted access to the courses/workshops aimed at developing scientific and research skills as well as opportunities for developing teaching skills. Few postdocs expressed a need for discussion on gender and equality issues. We named Prof Patricia Salinas as ‘postdoc czar’ to help the Division address postdoctoral needs and implement plans agreed by the postdoctoral body (including induction sessions and a career-planning symposium, as well as setting up their own organisation). The Division has committed to providing support for a postdoc web page and funds for the refreshments at postdoc-organized events. Working with the Vice Dean of Education we have already generated a post-doctoral teaching training scheme that would allow postdocs to obtain UCL accreditation and enhance their CVs. (493 words)
6. Action plan

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

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

The action plan does not need to cover all areas at Bronze; however the expectation is that the department will have the organisational structure to move forward, including collecting the necessary data.
## Appendix 1: UCL Division of Biosciences Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for action identified</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Success Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Support for students**| (i) Through Divisional website and termly emails provide information on funding and fellowship opportunities for senior PhD students and postdocs (PDRAs) including those specific for female PDRAs. Information on flexible working options, maternity & paternity leave will also be included.  
(ii) Present Athena SWAN-related poster at the Biosciences Postgraduate Research Day. Additionally organize 'life as a Lecturer’ session, including presentation of case studies, a Q+A session, and an informal reception with senior academics, as well as discussion of career paths.  
Ensure 50% representation of female speakers at this event. | (i) Website links were made available in February 2014; first email sent at the end of term and then twice/year.  
(ii) Event to coincide with the Postgraduate Research Day, starting in 2015. | Graduate Tutors supported by administrators  
SAT member accountable: S. Djordjevic | (i) Our female PhD students applying for fellowships (to be assessed from next job data to be collected by Early Career Programme organisation, see 2.1 below).  
(ii) Good attendance at the event each October (at least 50% of enrolled PG students).  
Positive feedback from attendees in feedback form. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for action identified</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Success Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback form to be handed out at end of each event. Improvements made each year based on feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Involvement of PhD students in Athena SWAN activities.</td>
<td>PhD student representatives to be elected for the departmental Athena SWAN units of activities.</td>
<td>Reps have now started to sit on the SAT.</td>
<td>Graduate Tutors; SAT member accountable: S. Djordjevic</td>
<td>PhD students actively engaged in Athena SWAN activities. Minimum of 1 PhD student rep per department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support for staff at key career transition points</td>
<td>Create an <em>Early Career Programme</em> that will disseminate information regarding post-doctoral funding opportunities and job application process, increase Divisional networking and provide informal support. Conduct ‘exit survey’ to determine next job position for this cohort.</td>
<td>Starting in 2015.</td>
<td>Executive Officers and HoRDs SAT member accountable: P. Salinas</td>
<td>Increase in number of female PDRAs gaining Research Fellowships and obtaining academic positions (data to be collected by Early Career Programme organisation). Positive feedback from postdocs when monitored in our Athena SWAN survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Post-doctoral level researchers, especially females, require preparation for career progression with focus on gender and family issues.</td>
<td>(i) Survey of early career researchers to further understand requirements and desires in terms of training.</td>
<td>Survey of training needs: was first carried out in December 2014.</td>
<td>Executive Officers SAT member accountable: A. Barrios</td>
<td>Survey conducted – with a good response rate (&gt;50%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area for action identified</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Success Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(ii) Liaise closely with training providers to provide relevant and tailored courses for scientists.</strong></td>
<td>Most postdocs wanted additional training in writing skills, CV preparation, interview skills, teaching skills; few expressed a need for discussions on gender issues. Redo survey in 2016. Link with UCL-wide Development team to set up customized training in 2015-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant (&gt;40 %) participation of PDRAs in training sessions. Positive feedback from PDRAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Need for expanded mentoring for PDRAs (especially females) beyond direct influence of the PI.</td>
<td>Include PDRAs in the new compulsory mentoring scheme – see Action Point 3.5.</td>
<td>Compulsory mentoring implemented from 2015. Survey of opinions of its success in 2017.</td>
<td>Departmental mentoring facilitators (to be appointed) SAT member accountable: K. Thalassinos</td>
<td>All PDRAs will have two formally assigned mentors, including their direct supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Small number of our female PDRAs applying for fellowships.</td>
<td>Require PIs to discuss funding opportunities during the appraisal process and to actively support their PDRAs in applying for the</td>
<td>From January 2015; to be presented in PDRA induction sessions with</td>
<td>SAT member accountable: D. Attwell</td>
<td>30% increase in the fraction of female PDRAs applying for fellowships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area for action identified</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Success Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schemes, in particular those specially designed for female applicants. Support those who are shortlisted for fellowships by providing interview practice.</td>
<td>regular updates on Divisional PDRA website to be established. PIs to be sent relevant information on training and available fellowships as deadlines arise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Recruitment, promotion and retention of female staff

3.1 Low representation of women at Reader and Professor level.

(i) Run CV workshop at the Departmental Retreats or Divisional Staff Meetings.
(ii) Formalise consideration of career progression during annual appraisal process. Introduce additional rubric into appraisal document to address promotion and career progression.
(iii) Departmental committees and HoRDs to jointly consider and identify departmental candidates for promotion; keep a record of success rates
(iv) Inform all staff of these

Introduce the change in the forms and inform staff by May 2015. CV workshop for summer term 2015 organised.
From 2015 departmental committees assess all academics for nomination for promotion, and the process and committee composition publicly announced.

HoRDs SAT member accountable: F. Brodsky

Increased fraction of women at Lecturer level applying for promotion to Reader and Professor level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for action identified</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Success Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Ensure transparency in Biosciences promotions committee.</td>
<td>Membership of the Research Department’s promotions committees to be made available on the Biosciences website.</td>
<td>To become available for the 2015 round and updated annually.</td>
<td>Divisional staffing office</td>
<td>Increased satisfaction with promotion process by at least 20 % in UCL staff survey (from 23 % females that answered positively in 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Female staff under-represented on recruitment panels.</td>
<td>Annually monitor representation and ensure that female members are adequately included in those committees. Limit female staff to 3 or 4 panels a year. Annual circular to all eligible academic staff to remind them of recruitment and selection procedures.</td>
<td>We are already applying the policy (since March 2014) that ≥25% of panel members be female, and wish to increase this to 30%.</td>
<td>HoRDS</td>
<td>Panel members are now recorded. Females are adequately represented (women comprise ≥30% of the panels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Encouragement of female applicants for academic posts.</td>
<td>Inclusion of positive action statement. Inclusion of the equality and diversity Essential Criteria for HOD and other senior posts.</td>
<td>Inclusion of positive action statement and Essential Criteria has already been done (from December 2013).</td>
<td>Divisional staffing office</td>
<td>100 % of all advertisements contain the new statements. Increase female gender balance in new positions filled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area for action identified</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Success Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active recruitment of diverse applicants by search committee members (see section 4 a (i) of application).</td>
<td>Diversity recruitment activity implemented in 2015.</td>
<td>Divisional Manager SAT member accountable: L. Caine</td>
<td>Increase in research funding, research outputs and promotions for female staff. Positive feedback from mentees in the Athena SWAN survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Improvement needed for formal mentoring of junior PIs and Lecturers (especially females).</td>
<td>A new compulsory mentoring scheme, requiring all junior staff to select two mentors, was devised and is being implemented in 2015. In addition to general principles, this will address specific concerns relating to female staff career progression. Provide opportunities for annual training sessions for mentors.</td>
<td>To be fully implemented over 2015.</td>
<td>Director of Division, HoRDs and appointed departmental mentoring facilitators SAT member accountable: F. Brodsky, K. Thalassinos, C. Orengo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Improvement needed in staff training on equality and diversity matters.</td>
<td>Arrange E&amp;D training session for the Division. From October 2013, all new recruits have been trained in E&amp;D as a part of induction and probation. Division-wide training session to be held in summer 2015 and summer 2016.</td>
<td>Divisional Manager SAT member accountable: L. Caine</td>
<td>75% of staff trained in E&amp;D by end of 2015, 100% by end of 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area for action identified</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Success Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Career breaks, workload and flexible working</td>
<td><strong>4.1</strong> Improve awareness of maternity/paternity/shared parental leave policy and financial assistance for postdoctoral staff.</td>
<td>Include information on maternity/paternity/shared parental leave for postdoctoral staff, PhD students and PIs in welcome packs. Increase awareness of HoRDs and PIs about UCL’s resources to cover maternity/parental leave when not covered by external funder.</td>
<td>Welcome packs continue to be developed in 2015. Policy information to be given at the Divisional staff meeting and at one-to-one meetings with HoRDs by February 2016. Include information in newly introduced PDRA induction sessions.</td>
<td>HoRDs, Divisional Staffing Team, Divisional Manager.&lt;br&gt;SAT member accountable: E. Caine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2</strong> Impact of maternity leave on research output.</td>
<td>Set up focus group to analyse the effect of maternity leave on the research outputs following the return.</td>
<td>Focus group to be set up in September 2015.</td>
<td>SAT member accountable: J. Rihel</td>
<td>Report created on the impact of the maternity leave to be produced by 2016. Actions in place as a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3</strong> Need for transparency and consistency between departments in work-load allocation that may lead to</td>
<td>Increase transparency and consistency of work-load allocation. Include all administrative, teaching, enabling and research activity in consideration of working load.</td>
<td>From July 2015, in preparation for the 2016-17 Academic Year.</td>
<td>HoRDs and Teaching Leads&lt;br&gt;SAT member accountable: F. Brodsky</td>
<td>Distribution of activities more equitable amongst all staff. Higher satisfaction in the responses to the future Divisional survey in 2015 (See Action Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area for action identified</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Success Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overburdening of female staff with some activities.</td>
<td>(i) Enforce annual appraisal system including PDRAs. (ii) Organize Division-wide training sessions for appraisers to ensure that female staff receive assistance in management of career breaks, flexible working and promotion stages. (iii) Ensure that all our appraisers have been appropriately trained in line with UCL policy</td>
<td>Annual appraisals have already started. Division-wide training to be carried out in 2015.</td>
<td>Divisional Staffing team SAT member accountable: R. Tribe</td>
<td>95% of staff appraised in 2015; 80% of staff reporting useful annual appraisals in 2015 and 2016. 100% appraisers trained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Inconsistent appraisals throughout Division.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Incomplete data on flexible working.</td>
<td>Introduce departmental system of logging formal flexible working request and their outcomes. Inform staff of UCL policy on allowing flexible working where possible.</td>
<td>From Jan 2015</td>
<td>Executive Officers, Staffing Office SAT member accountable: S. Datta</td>
<td>Clear evidence of flexible-working approval rates and approved arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area for action identified</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Success Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.6 Committee membership gender balance. | (i) Committee memberships to be reviewed and logged.  
(ii) Where possible deputy chairs of the opposite gender to be appointed. | We have already collected information on the Divisional committees for this application.  
Deputies to be appointed in spring term of 2015 for academic year 15-16. | Executive Officers SAT member accountable: C. Langridge | Improved female gender representation on the committees. |

| 5. Culture, communication and departmental organisation | | | | |
| 5.1 Meetings and seminar series schedules incompatible with family and caring responsibilities. | Ensure that all essential meeting and seminars are scheduled in core working hours of 10am – 4pm. | This has been introduced gradually from Sep 2013. Meeting times reviewed annually in consultation with members. | Administrators in charge of organizing academic meetings and seminar series SAT member accountable: J. Rihel | More than 80% of meetings and seminars constantly scheduled in core working hours by June 2015, 100% by 2016. |
| 5.2 UCL nursery not matching the excellence standard of UCL, and waiting | Organize focus group that would explore possibilities for improvement in nursery provisions and construct | The focus group was organised in 2014. | Focus group and UCL Equality and Diversity Committee | Improvement in nursery provisions as measured by Ofsted report and/or increased number of |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for action identified</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timescales</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Success Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>list unacceptably long.</td>
<td>recommendation document to be submitted to Equalities and Diversities Committee (EDC). Monitor progress and continue working with EDC.</td>
<td>Its initial recommendations were reported to the SAT in Dec 2014. In future it will Report to SAT annually.</td>
<td>SAT member accountable: M. Stocker</td>
<td>places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 No provision for child care during summer holidays.</td>
<td>Explore options for arranging Summer Camp on UCL premises (or in collaboration with an external provider) during July-August school holiday time for 5-11 years old.</td>
<td>Report to SAT by March 2016.</td>
<td>Focus group SAT member accountable: M. Stocker</td>
<td>Recommendation to Equality and Diversity Committee and organise a pilot programme for summer of 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Improvement needed in gender equity of invited seminar speakers.</td>
<td>Pan-Division ensure and monitor gender parity with respect to invited seminar and other speakers. Establish an annual Divisional lecture honouring women in science.</td>
<td>From the start of new Departmental/Divisional seminar series in 2015/2016.</td>
<td>Seminar Series Organizers and Director of Division SAT member accountable: A. Barrios</td>
<td>At least 40% of all departmental speakers in a given year will be female. 50% of Divisional seminars given by women and establishment of a Divisional lecture honouring women in science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Need better assessment of</td>
<td>Organize another Divisional survey with support staff data</td>
<td>To be carried out in Autumn 2016.</td>
<td>Executive Officers SAT member</td>
<td>Participation of over 60% staff and increased job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area for action identified</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Success Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separate professional needs of academic and support staff regarding work environment and Divisional culture.</td>
<td>analysed separately from academic staff data.</td>
<td></td>
<td>accountable: H. Smith</td>
<td>satisfaction as judged by number of positive responses. Actions developed in response to feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Communication gap and lack of awareness of UCL HR policies.</td>
<td>(i) Have annual reminder of key HR policies at the Divisional and Departmental staff meetings.</td>
<td>Links have already been placed onto the website. First annual reminder to be presented at the next Divisional staff meeting in summer of 2015.</td>
<td>HoRDs and Divisional Manager accountable: R. Tribe</td>
<td>Better awareness of the policies and higher positive response to the relevant questions in surveys. Increase in uptake of flexible working and maternity/paternity/shared parental and adoption leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Review of our welcoming arrangements.</td>
<td>(i) Continue to review and amend welcome packs regularly to reflect welcoming and inclusive culture. Give new welcome pack to all staff for information. (ii) Division-wide announcement of new appointments to be made. (iii) HoRDs encouraged to meet and introduce all new staff. (iv) Start two induction sessions per year for new postdocs.</td>
<td>We have already introduced new welcome packs in 2014; these will be reviewed in September 2015 and amended on regular basis.</td>
<td>Staffing Office and Executive Officers accountable: F. Brodsky</td>
<td>New welcome packs in place from August 2014. Review in September 2015. Regular updating on new recruits through Divisional web-site, Divisional Director email announcements and at the Divisional Staff meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>