ATHENA SWAN BRONZE DEPARTMENT AWARDS

Recognise that in addition to institution-wide policies, the department is working to promote gender equality and to identify and address challenges particular to the department and discipline.

ATHENA SWAN SILVER DEPARTMENT AWARDS

In addition to the future planning required for Bronze department recognition, Silver department awards recognise that the department has taken action in response to previously identified challenges and can demonstrate the impact of the actions implemented.

Note: Not all institutions use the term ‘department’. There are many equivalent academic groupings with different names, sizes and compositions. The definition of a ‘department’ can be found in the Athena SWAN awards handbook.

COMPLETING THE FORM

DO NOT ATTEMPT TO COMPLETE THIS APPLICATION FORM WITHOUT READING THE ATHENA SWAN AWARDS HANDBOOK.

This form should be used for applications for Bronze and Silver department awards.

You should complete each section of the application applicable to the award level you are applying for.

Additional areas for Silver applications are highlighted throughout the form: 5.2, 5.4, 5.5(iv)

If you need to insert a landscape page in your application, please copy and paste the template page at the end of the document, as per the instructions on that page. Please do not insert any section breaks as to do so will disrupt the page numbers.

WORD COUNT

The overall word limit for applications are shown in the following table.

There are no specific word limits for the individual sections and you may distribute words over each of the sections as appropriate. At the end of every section, please state how many words you have used in that section.

We have provided the following recommendations as a guide.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department application</th>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Silver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word limit</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Recommended word count</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Letter of endorsement</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of the department</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-assessment process</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Picture of the department</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supporting and advancing women’s careers</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Case studies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Further information</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of institution</td>
<td>University of Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Rowett Institute (RI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of department</td>
<td>STEMM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of application</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Level</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Athena SWAN award</td>
<td>Date: April 2012</td>
<td>Level: Bronze - currently in one year grace period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact for application</td>
<td>Must be based in the department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Lynda Williams</td>
<td>Dr Justin Rochford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:l.williams@abdn.ac.uk">l.williams@abdn.ac.uk</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.rochford@abdn.ac.uk">j.rochford@abdn.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>01224438682</td>
<td>01224437372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.abdn.ac.uk/rowett/">http://www.abdn.ac.uk/rowett/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: James Lush [mailto:James.Lush@ecu.ac.uk]
Sent: 18 July 2016 13:39
To: Williams, Lynda <l.williams@abdn.ac.uk>
Subject: RE: Athena SWAN query

Dear Linda,

Yes, we would be happy to grant you an additional 1,000 words for your submission. Please attach a copy of this email to your intention to submit and the submission itself.

It is helpful if you can indicate where the words have been used in the word counts at the end of each section (even for post-May 2015 submissions, where the actual word limit is aggregated across the whole submission).

Best wishes,
James

James Lush
Equality Charters Adviser
Equality Challenge Unit
T: 020 7269 6547
M: 07889 757 390
E: james.lush@ecu.ac.uk

Follow us on Twitter: @EqualityinHE | @Athena_SWAN
1. LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT FROM THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words

An accompanying letter of endorsement from the head of department should be included. If the head of department is soon to be succeeded, or has recently taken up the post, applicants should include an additional short statement from the incoming head.

Note: Please insert the endorsement letter immediately after this cover page.

Monday, 14th November 2016

RE: Rowett Institute Athena SWAN Bronze application

As the Director of the Rowett Institute (RI) I am delighted to strongly endorse this application for a Bronze Athena SWAN award. Over the past 17 years I have overseen major changes at the Institute. This application is another key step in our development to which I am personally committed. Whilst we have made significant steps towards creating a more equal working environment for all staff, I recognize that we still have work to do.

A key part of the RI narrative is our transition from an independent organization to become part of the University of Aberdeen (UoA) in 2008. This recent, major change to the nature of our institute and our move to a new building in 2016, has involved significant management restructuring. We have used this as an opportunity to critically assess our current position and move forward addressing diversity and embracing the Athena SWAN principles.

We recently appointed new RI Theme Leaders. This was by an open application process and panel interview rather than the Director directly appointing individuals as previously. An important task of the Theme Leaders and Line Managers is to foster the development of staff by Annual Review and to facilitate the flow of information to them from the Institute Executive Committee (IEC).

Another key change was the appointment of two Deputy Directors. Professor Baukje de Roos was recently promoted to a Chair and takes responsibility for teaching and internationalisation. Professor Paul Haggarty has responsibility for research. This provides a more equal gender balance in senior management.

The Rowett’s long-standing commitment to Athena Swan principles is also reflected by:

- A consistent approach to requests for occasional home working to accommodate caring responsibilities.
- A number of term-time working arrangements and job-sharing appointments which have been requested and accepted to help in child care arrangements.
- A positive approach to part-time working requests.

However, there are important issues that have emerged from our self-assessment process requiring action. For example:
• Women remain under-represented at Grade 9.
• The UoA has recently introduced a Mentoring Scheme offering advice for career and personal development but very few RI staff have joined.
• Application rates for promotion are low and the promotions exercise is not well understood by all staff.
• Information for prospective parents regarding leave and help available is not always easy to access.
• Quantitative and qualitative data specific to the RI staff and students was not easy to access. This must be improved to aid identification of areas for improvement and to assess our future progress.

On behalf of the RI Management Team I can confirm that we are committed to fully implement our action plan. This includes providing the necessary financial resources to facilitate these actions from the RI operating budget where needed. Key examples include recognition of the time commitment of SAT/EDT members in the RI Workload Model and personnel commitments for the new EDT Data Manager and Parental Leave Advisor roles.

Yours sincerely,

PETER J. MORGAN

499 words
Abbreviations

CSLM – College of Life Sciences and Medicine
ECR – Early Career Researcher
E&D – Equality and Diversity
EDT – Equality and Diversity Team
EFU – External Funding Unit
F – Female
FAE – Framework for Academic Excellence
FC – Fixed term contract
FTE – Full time equivalents
HERA – Higher Education Role Analysis
H&SC – Health and Safety Committee
HR – Human Resources
IEC – Institute Executive Committee
IH – Ill health
IMS – Institute of Medical Sciences
KE – knowledge exchange
KIT – Keeping-in-touch
M – Male
PERU – Public Engagement with Research Unit
PG – Postgraduate
PI – Principal Investigator
PLA – Parental Leave Advisor
QA – Quality Assurance
RD – Redundancy
REF – Research excellence framework
RESAS – Rural and Environment Science and Analytical Services Division
2. DESCRIPTION OF THE DEPARTMENT
Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words

Please provide a brief description of the department including any relevant contextual information. Present data on the total number of academic staff, professional and support staff and students by gender.

The Rowett Institute (RI) was founded in 1913, and has made major contributions to our understanding of nutrition for over a century. Given its history as a government institute, which became part of the University of Aberdeen (UoA) in 2008, RI organisation and culture differs from a typical university department. In March 2016 the RI moved from a site 4 miles away to a new building on the Foresterhill UoA campus.

RI is part of the College of Life Sciences and Medicine (CLSM) that was restructured in September 2015 and now includes the School of Psychology, the School of Biological Sciences (both located in the Old Aberdeen Campus) and the new School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition (SMMSN) located at Foresterhill (Figure 1). SMMSN encompasses the RI, the Institute of Medical Sciences (IMS), the Institute of Applied Health Sciences (IAHS) and the Institute of Education in Medical and Dental Sciences (IEMDS). Each of the four Institutes has a Director (3M, 1F) who report to the Head of School (M).

RI research focusses on human nutrition including body weight regulation, metabolic and gut health. This includes molecular biology, cell and animal models through to studies on human volunteers in our new state-of-the-art Human Nutrition Unit.

RI typically hosts 20-30 PhD students and up to 12 Human Nutrition MSc student projects. The RI is not administratively responsible for this MSc nor any undergraduate course but increasingly hosts students for laboratory projects and RI-staff contribute to undergraduate teaching and act as UoA personal tutors providing support to life sciences students. Thus, the RI is integrating with UoA teaching programs.

RI continues to be largely funded by the Scottish government via the Rural and Environment Science and Analytical Services Division (RESAS), to which RI reports for this
work. The Institute was precluded from bidding for research council funding until it joined the UoA. As a result external funding was markedly less than in UoA departments. Consequently, the RI workforce had very few short term appointments and has a large number of staff with over 10 years’ service (46%F and 42%M). This has fostered the development of a very close and sociable atmosphere.

There are currently 142 staff employed by RI; 75 academic (35F and 40M) and 67 support staff (51F and 16M). Currently there are 20 postgraduate research (PhD) students at RI (12F, 8M). RI staff were not included in the 2008 REF. Reasons and details of the 2014 REF submissions are given in Section 5.1(iv).

RI has five, recently restructured, research based Themes: Metabolic Health, Obesity and Food Choice, Life-Course and Population Health, Gut Health and Public Health Nutrition (Figure 1). The restructuring provides a line management system that supports the professional development of staff and integrates into the UoA system. Theme Leaders (3F, 1M) manage Principal Investigators (PIs) in their Theme. PIs manage their research teams, which includes research technicians, PhD students and post-doctoral fellows.

The Institute is run by the Institute Executive Committee (IEC) chaired by the Director (M) and includes both Deputy Directors, vice co-chairs, (1M, 1F), Theme Leaders (1M, 3F), the RESAS Theme 3 Co-ordinator (M), the Technical Resources Manager (M), the Knowledge Exchange Food and Drink Sectorial Lead (M), the Rowett Knowledge Exchange Co-ordinator (F) and the Finance manager (F). The IEC meets once a month and information is relayed to Theme members and their teams at monthly Theme meetings. There is also a meeting for the technical staff led by the Technical Resources Manager. Staff are free to attend any of these meetings. Athena SWAN issues are on the agenda of each Theme meeting as well as all IEC meetings so Athena SWAN issues are discussed at all levels within RI. There are 6 committees in RI (Figure 2), although these will shortly be restructured.

**Figure 1**

UoA organisation
Describe the self-assessment process. This should include:

(i) a description of the self-assessment team

The SAT (11F, 6M) was formed in January 2016 after invitation e-mails to staff and students. There are two co-conveners, Professor Lynda Williams and Dr Justin Rochford. It meets monthly and is chosen to represent diversity in genders, grades, full and part-time working, family lives and caring responsibilities. The SAT includes more women but we are working towards gender balance in the future. Only PhD students were invited to join as MSc and undergraduate students are not administratively part of RI. Contributions to Athena SWAN Self-assessment team (SAT) will be recognised in the RI Workload Model, which is currently being developed (see ACTION POINT 5 below).

The SAT also includes the UoA STEMM Athena SWAN Co-ordinator, Dr Maria Cascio, who provides guidance on process and ensures links to the other SATs across the School (SMMMSN), college (CLSM) and UoA. The RI Human Resources (HR) partner, Miss Fiona MacAskill, provides guidance on HR-related issues. The SAT is a recognised RI Committee (Figure 2) and will evolve into the RI Equality and Diversity Team (EDT) (see section (iii)).
The RI SAT reports to the IEC via the Director and to the School Executive via the Head of School. The application and action plans are signed off by the IEC.

The SMMSN also has a SAT chaired by the Head of School (attended by the conveners of the 4 Institutes, Dr Cascio and HR partners) where issues, action plans and responsibilities at the Institute or School level are discussed. The School SAT met 4 times since May 2016 (Figure 3).

**Figure 3** where the RI SAT sits in the UoA Athena SWAN structure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI Self-Assessment Team Members</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof Lynda Williams (F) (Joint-convener)</strong></td>
<td>Promoted to Professor, Grade 9 in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr Justin Rochford (M) (Joint-convener)</strong></td>
<td>Promoted to Reader, Grade 8 in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr Eva-Maria Bachmair (F)</strong></td>
<td>Research Fellow, Grade 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teodora Georgescu (F)</strong></td>
<td>PhD student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr Maria-Grazia Cascio (F)</strong></td>
<td>Promoted to Grade 7 in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiona Macaskill (F)</strong></td>
<td>HR Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr Richard Anderson (M)</strong></td>
<td>Research Technician, Grade 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr Leone Craig (F)</strong></td>
<td>Research Fellow, Grade 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr Sue Bird (F)</strong></td>
<td>RI Knowledge Exchange Manager, Grade 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position and Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Giuseppe (Peppe) D’agostino (M)</td>
<td>Research Fellow, Grade 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Duncan (F)</td>
<td>Research Technician, Grade 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Silvia Gratz (F)</td>
<td>Promoted in 2013 to Research Fellow Grade 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Ingram (F)</td>
<td>Personal Assistant, Grade 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Alexandra (Alex) Johnstone (F)</td>
<td>Senior Research Fellow, Grade 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Knowles (M)</td>
<td>PhD student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Alexander (Sandy) Ross (M)</td>
<td>Research Fellow, Grade 7 since 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Peter Morgan, FRSE (M)</td>
<td>RI Director appointed in 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. SAT membership**
At the first meeting SAT members volunteered for membership of sub-groups addressing key areas: 1. Data quantification, 2. Supporting careers, 3. Flexible working and career breaks and 4. Institute organisation and culture. Lynda Williams led 1 and 4 and Justin Rochford led 2 and 3 (Table 1).

All sub-groups meet on an ad hoc basis, and feed their information to the sub-group leaders. All non-confidential RI data and documents are available on SharePoint accessible to SAT members. The quantification sub-group met regularly with Dr Cascio to discuss and request data from HR and consulted Athena SWAN leads from other universities to determine how best to benchmark RI data.

The Action Points have been shaped by our self-assessment activities. These include:

- A staff survey (May 2016) with a 79% response rate (67F and 38M)
- A post-graduate student survey (Sept 2016) with a 95% response rate (11F and 7M, 1 not specifying).
- Discussion with staff recently appointed at RI (last 2 years) for feedback on our recruitment system.
- Discussion with staff regarding parental leave issues.

We will continue our annual staff and student surveys to provide ongoing self-assessment to determine the efficacy of Action Points [ACTION POINT 1].

In addition:

- To increase Athena SWAN awareness at RI, Dr Cascio presented at a staff seminars in January 2016.
- To ensure consistency across the SMMSN, the co-conveners attend School SAT meetings.
- To ensure communication between RI and the rest of UoA, the co-conveners attend UoA Athena SWAN Leads Networking meetings with our Principal (Figure 3).

The SAT and its activities are widely publicised at the Institute with regular features and updates on our Media Wall (see Additional Information).

The Action Plan is IEC approved and published to all staff via e-mail. The RI Director has committed that SAT membership will be accounted for in the Workload Model (see ACTION POINT 5 below) and to fund an EDT Data Manager to maintain the RI database and a Parental Leave Advisor (PLA) (see ACTION POINT 24 below). Financial resources needed will come from the Institute operating budget.
(iii) plans for the future of the self-assessment team

In January 2017 the SAT becomes the RI Equality and Diversity Team (EDT) which will monitor all Action Points ensuring that plans are realised and our Athena SWAN journey continues. The EDT will meet quarterly and there will be a biennial review of SAT/EDT membership ensuring full representation of groups and genders. From July 2017 professional and support staff will join the EDT ready for a Silver award application in 3 years. When members leave replacements will be recruited that make a more even gender balance. Convenors will be replaced biennially to offer new opportunities to lead this process [ACTION POINT 2].

The EDT will act in defined subgroups with co-opted staff to monitor all Action Points, review and develop surveys (with EDT Survey Coordinator), analyse data and develop strategies [ACTION POINT 3]. The Action Plan will develop into a diary of actions and annual cycle of business, culminating in a formal Annual Review which will be published to staff and reported to the IEC. The review will ensure that completed actions are signed off and new actions are added [ACTION POINT 4].

RI is adopting the UoA Workload Model with 70% of that time allotted to RESAS and 30% of time to UoA, with time available for research, teaching and administration all taking approximately 10%. The Workload Model will into account time spent on the SAT/EDT [ACTION POINT 5].

During the self-assessment process RI-specific quantitative and qualitative data was difficult and time-consuming to access. To aid the EDT, RI data will be collated and updated from surveys, focus groups, committees and other UoA sources on a rolling basis. A new EDT Data Manager reporting to the Director will liaise with HR to establish an RI specific database, monitoring relevant staff and student data [ACTION POINT 6]. We will coordinate with HR and other Institutes and Schools within UoA to standardise the process, recognising that each Institute/School has different requirements.

Financial resources will come from the Institute operating budget although we will work with the other Institutes at SMMSN on common issues to minimise unnecessary duplication.

1415 words (using additional 415)
4. A PICTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT

Data have been analysed based on HESA returns (1st August-31st July). We do not include data for 2015/2016 since our census date is in August. Thus August-November is an insufficient window to undertake the associated analysis and planning (this was agreed with James Lush).

Recommended word count: Bronze: 2000 words | Silver: 2000 words

4.1 Student data

If courses in the categories below do not exist, please enter n/a.

(i) Numbers of men and women on access or foundation courses

N/A

(ii) Numbers of undergraduate students by gender

Full- and part-time by programme. Provide data on course applications, offers, and acceptance rates, and degree attainment by gender.

N/A

(iii) Numbers of men and women on postgraduate taught degrees

Full- and part-time. Provide data on course application, offers, and acceptance rates and degree completion rates by gender.

N/A

(iv) Numbers of men and women on postgraduate research degrees

Full- and part-time. Provide data on course application, offers, acceptance and degree completion rates by gender.

Figure 4 Shows the number of RI post graduate (PG) students. Numbers refer to total headcount as there were only three part-time (PT) students at RI during this time. Numbers appear directly on the graphs with percentages on the Y-axis. The black line represents HESA data for full time (FT) postgraduate students in Nutrition. The grey line indicates corresponding data from the Roslin Institute which has a similar history to RI, originating as a government funded institute then joining the University of Edinburgh.

Key =  female  male  HESA data  Roslin

Women made up 60% of the total PG students at RI in 2014/15, a proportion that was the same as in 2013/14 but was slightly lower than in 2012/13. The RI has a lower %F students than the national average for Nutrition, which is over 70%. However, this may reflect diversity of research at the RI, which includes some molecular/genetic/mechanistic studies not classically considered ‘nutrition’. In contrast at the Roslin
only 40% of PG students are women. Overall, the small numbers of students at RI make it difficult to draw conclusions.

**Figure 5** Appointment pipeline for men and women, both full- and part-time, for PG research degrees at RI Total headcount is shown as numbers in the bars while % is shown on the Y-axis.

**Table 2** Overall summary of the appointment pipeline data as numbers are low for any particular time period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Offers</th>
<th>Acceptances</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Proportion of applicants made offers</th>
<th>Proportion of those made offers accepting</th>
<th>Proportion of those accepting registering</th>
<th>Proportion of applicants Registering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2012/13 and 2014/15 there were near-equivalent numbers of applications from M/F (Figure 5). However, in 2013/14 female applicants outnumbered males by a ratio of 5:3, although offers made were in proportion to applications by each gender (Figure 6). In other years offers made were either marginally (2012/13) or more substantially (2014/15) in favour of female applicants, however, in our PG student survey no one reported any perceived bias in the process. Throughout the recruitment process numbers of women are higher than men (Table 2). In the majority of cases offers were accepted regardless
of gender, although in the period covered only 1M applicant declined an offer/withdrew versus 2F. The reasons for this are unclear. In order to minimise any potential bias in the selection process we will implement training in unconsious bias for staff involved in both staff and student selection (see ACTION POINT 11 below)

At present we do not collect information regarding the previous degrees of students or country of origin who apply for PhDs at RI. To enable us to comment on the career progression of undergraduate students we will collect data on where applicants are drawn from (see ACTION POINT 7 below). As part of this action we will also gather information regarding the onward careers of these students after completion (see 5.3(iv)).

Figure 6 Shows the ratio of men and women for both full- and part-time post-graduate research degrees at the stages application:offers, offers:acceptances and acceptances:registered. The ratio as a % is shown on the Y-axis.

Table 3 Shows the % PhD attainments of men and women PG research students at RI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Expected Submission</th>
<th>Successful Submission</th>
<th>Agreed Extension</th>
<th>Withdrawn/No submission</th>
<th>Proportion of successful completions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7 Also shows the successful PhDs of RI men and women PG research students including HESA data. The M:F ratio as a % is shown on the Y-axis and headcounts are shown in the bars.

Key: ■ = women  ■ = men  HESA data for successful completion for both full and part-time doctoral students in nutrition.

While it is difficult to draw any conclusions due to the low numbers of students at RI, in recent years more women than men sought extensions to their projects. Reasons underlying this need to be explored (Figure 7). However, the data available at RI do not show when a delayed thesis is finally submitted, meaning success rates for women in particular appears artificially low (Table 3). We will ensure that RI PhD student data link agreed extensions to subsequent submissions within our RI database in conjunction with CSLM Graduate School and the RI Post Graduate Research Advisor (as part of ACTION POINT 6 above) to continuously update data [ACTION POINT 7].

(v) Progression pipeline between undergraduate and postgraduate student levels

N/A – RI offers only post-graduate research degrees. However we will in future collect data to make this analysis possible (see ACTION POINT 7 above)

4.2 Academic and research staff data

(i) Academic staff by grade, contract function and gender: research-only, teaching and research or teaching-only

Look at the career pipeline and comment on and explain any differences between men and women. Identify any gender issues in the pipeline at particular grades/job type/academic contract type.
Where relevant, comment on the transition of technical staff to academic roles.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI/UoA Grading structure - applicable to all academic staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RI/UoA Grade 6 - Research Fellow/Research Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI/UoA Grade 7 – Research Fellow/Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI/UoA Grade 8 – Senior Lecturer/Senior Research Fellow/Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI/UoA Grade 9 - Personal Chair/Research and Teaching Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows the grade structure at UoA. Those at grade 6 who are Research Fellows and above are considered as academic and career-track scientists. However, some RI staff at grade 6 are Research Assistants or senior technicians and proceed along the academic related promotion track. Around 45% of staff at RI are Research Technicians and support staff for reasons outlined in Section 2 “The Description of the Department”.

Figure 8 Shows academic staff by grade and gender: RI has mostly staff on research-only, and some teaching and research contracts but no teaching-only contracts. All data are shown as Full Time Equivalents (FTE) the % is on the Y-axis and absolute numbers are shown on the bars. Key =

![Graph showing academic staff by grade and gender]
Figure 9. Shows the percentage of women at each grade when research and research and teaching grades are combined.

Women are well represented at grades 6 and 7 although this is more difficult to judge for research and teaching as numbers are so few (Figure 8). Taking both contract types together the proportion of female staff increases in moving from grade 6 to 8 with 62% of staff being women at grade 8 (Figure 9). However, only 20% of staff at grade 9 are women. The data suggest that while there do not appear to be barriers to women’s progression up to grade 8, there may be problems in promoting women to grade 9. Indeed all 3F professors at RI were appointed in the last three years, one appointed in 2013, one promoted in 2014 and another promoted in 2016 after taking up the post of Deputy Director.

We carefully examined the results of the staff survey, particularly questions related to promotion. Overall more women than men cited lack of support (24% vs 9%) or lack of confidence (24% vs 6%) for not putting themselves forward for promotion. This is not grade specific. The majority of RI-staff feel they have a good understanding of the promotion process and do not require further training but around 20% of respondents (equal M/F) do not feel the process is fair. This is addressed in more detail below in Sections 5.1 and 5.3. We will encourage female staff to consider applying for promotion particularly from grade 8 to grade 9 (see later sections). We will also start monitoring the length of time staff spend at particular grades in order to find out if there are any gender differences and encourage those at the top of their grade to apply for promotion via the Mentoring Scheme and Annual Review process [ACTION POINT 8].

(ii) Academic and research staff by grade on fixed-term, open-ended/permanent and zero-hour contracts by gender

Comment on the proportions of men and women on these contracts. Comment on what is being done to ensure continuity of employment and to address any other issues, including redeployment schemes.

Staff at the RI may be employed on any of the following UoA contracts:

- Open-ended contracts, with no fixed end date, the standard form of appointment.
- Open-ended but funding/activity limited contracts, lasting for more than 9 months. When the funding ends staff enter the redeployment scheme.
- Fixed term contracts of less than 9 months, used only to cover specific activities such as maternity leave.
- There are no zero-hours contracts at RI
For the most part, staff on project-limited, open-ended contracts are limited to grade 6. From 2012-2015 most RI-staff at grade 6 are post-doctoral fellows on open-ended project-limited contracts (Figure 10). Numbers of staff depend on the grants available and their duration leading to significant year-on-year variation. In 2014/15 75% of women and 73% of men at grade 6 were on open-ended project-limited contracts. Only one other staff member, a male research fellow at grade 7 was on an open-ended project-limited contract. The data suggest that there is no gender difference in the use of project-limited contracts.

At grades 7, 8 and 9 almost all contracts are open-ended. The differences in the number of men and women reflect the numbers at these grades.

In line with the UoA policy on “Avoiding of Redundancy”, RI uses the UoA redeployment scheme, in which jobs are advertised internally before external advertisement, to retain staff at the end of open-ended but funding/activity-limited contracts.

Figure 10 (A) Numbers or Research Staff (B) Research and Teaching staff on different contract types at RI
(iii) Academic leavers by grade and gender and full/part-time status

Comment on the reasons academic staff leave the department, any differences by gender and the mechanisms for collecting this data.

Table 5 shows the academic leavers by gender and reason for leaving.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaving Grade</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female Headcount</th>
<th>Female Leavers</th>
<th>Female Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaving Grade</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male Headcount</th>
<th>Male Leavers</th>
<th>Male Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general the number of leavers each year is low, however, the turnover of women at grade 6 appears to be higher than men at this grade from 2012-2015 (Table 5). Although this is something which we will continue to monitor, one cannot draw any conclusions from such low numbers over this time period. The reasons for leaving being resignation, the end of a fixed-term contract, redundancy and ill health. The numbers per annum for either gender in each category do not exceed one so it is exceedingly difficult to draw any conclusions.
5. **SUPPORTING AND ADVANCING WOMEN’S CAREERS**

Recommended word count: Bronze: 6000 words  |  Silver: 6500 words

5.1. **Key career transition points: academic staff**

(i) **Recruitment**

*Break down data by gender and grade for applications to academic posts including shortlisted candidates, offer and acceptance rates. Comment on how the department’s recruitment processes ensure that women (and men where there is an underrepresentation in numbers) are encouraged to apply.*

**Table 6.** Job applications and success rates showing grades where vacancies were available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Offers</th>
<th>Appointments</th>
<th>Proportion of applicants interviewed</th>
<th>Proportion of those interviewed made offers</th>
<th>Proportion of applicants made offers appointed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6** shows more women applied for grade 6 posts (2012-2015) (53-61%). Proportions of F and M interviewed were similar but F were slightly less likely to be offered posts. Only
one F turned down a grade 6 offer. Although differences are slight, data suggest gender bias at interview or may result from low numbers. N.B. A Grade 9 (F) appointed in 2012 did not take up the position until 2013 and so is absent from the data in Table 6.

Line Managers write advertisements for posts using HR guidelines. Following HR review ensuring suitability, including E&D principles, the position is advertised internally (redeployment process). If suitable candidates are not found the position is advertised externally, principally via the UoA website.

Line Managers convene gender balanced interview panels who shortlist candidates for interview. Posts are advertised/managed by HR, with RI using the UoA online recruitment system (eRecruiter) and job vacancies web-pages. An anonymous shortlisting procedure is operated. Personal data is retained by HR for monitoring and does not feature in the selection process.

Recently appointed staff were asked about their perception of the recruitment experience. All staff interviewed (3F, 1M) said they found the process straightforward. Nonetheless, it is important that we conduct a more in depth analysis of views on all aspects of recruitment [ACTION POINT 9].

To ensure the attractiveness of job advertisements to women these will be reviewed using principles recommended by experts on unconscious bias. Including factors known to influence appeal to women such as layout, language and number of skills requested [ACTION POINT 10].

RI-staff involved in recruitment must pass the UoA’s mandatory Equality and Diversity (E&D) training which encompasses unconscious bias. This is monitored by HR and required for eRecruiter registration. We will enhance this training by inviting experts in unconscious bias to give yearly RI-staff seminars. Attendance will be recorded and RI-staff on interview panels must attend a presentation every 2 years [ACTION POINT 11].

We will require gender balance on RI search committees to improve gender balance at senior levels. Gender of recruitment committee members will recorded in RI and reviewed by the EDT [ACTION POINT 12].

(ii) Induction

Describe the induction and support provided to all new academic staff at all levels. Comment on the uptake of this and how its effectiveness is reviewed.

RI staff/PhD students receive a mandatory individual induction. This includes RI/CLSM information, an induction checklist/evaluation form. Line Managers are responsible for induction. Inductees meet “key” staff e.g. Health and Safety, Quality Assurance (QA) and Technical Resources Managers. All Staff must complete the online E&D module. PhD Students also attend a presentation by the Post-Graduate Research Co-ordinator.
Staff have a probationary period dependent on the appointment. Progress is reviewed annually with informal reviews once per term. For academic staff the review paperwork goes to the Head of College to ensure consistency.

From the survey 50% M/F found the induction useful and 20% M/F found it partly useful. The recent RI move ensured that all staff attended an up-to-date induction. Over 90% of staff attended, with records kept by the QA unit.

Feedback from induction will be collected by the QA manager and EDT to ensure that the effectiveness of this process is assessed and improved where possible [ACTION POINT 13].

Early Career Researchers (ECRs) can access the “Fellowship Support Fund”, part of the Wellcome Trust’s Institutional Strategic Support Fund (ISSF) (section 5.3(iii)). The ISSF fund also supports “Seed-Corn” grants, up to 6 months and £15,000. ECRs are favoured aiming to support data generation enabling competitive project grants.

ECRs and post-doctoral fellows are encouraged to join the Mentoring Scheme (section 5.3(iii)). RI uptake has been poor and improving this is a priority (see ACTION POINT 20)

New-start specific assistance is not always relevant to new RI staff recruited for RESAS posts, as immediate access to a budget at the same level as established staff is provided.
(iii) Promotion

Provide data on staff applying for promotion and comment on applications and success rates by gender, grade and full- and part-time status. Comment on how staff are encouraged and supported through the process.

Figure 11. Promotions process—from 2015/16 process. HoC – Head of College, HoS – Head of School, LM – Line Manager, SL – Senior Lecturer, SVP – Senior Vice Principal.
Table 7 Promotion data, grade applied for, number of applications and outcomes (2012 -2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade applied for</th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2013/2014</th>
<th>2014/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>Women 0</td>
<td>Men 0</td>
<td>Women 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>Women 1</td>
<td>Men 0</td>
<td>Women 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>Women 1</td>
<td>Men 0</td>
<td>Women 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven applications for promotion were submitted from RI at Grades 6-9 (2012-2015) (Table 7). The small numbers make it difficult to conclude anything regarding applications by gender, although more applications were made by women than men. Only one application for promotion was unsuccessful (1F applying for Grade 9). All applications were from full-time staff (Table 8). Applications numbers are low for 75 staff, implying a need to encourage/support staff to apply (see ACTION POINT 14). Eligibility for promotion is relevant with a preponderance of women at Grade 8 and only 3 at Grade 9 indicating that women remain at the top of their grade rather than achieving promotion.

Table 8 Promotion data for part-time and full-time staff 2012 –2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade applied for</th>
<th>% Full-time Application rate</th>
<th>% Part-time Application Rate</th>
<th>% Success Full-time</th>
<th>% Success Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RI staff indicated, in the survey, that understanding the promotion process was limited (50%) and further training was required (20%). Some staff disagreed that the promotion process was transparent (32%) or fair (24%) equally split between M and F. Comments
included that support could be improved from Line Managers and the Director. This a significant area for improvement (see ACTION POINT 14 below).

There are 3 UoA career tracks: 1.Teaching & Research; 2.Research and 3.Teaching & Scholarship (no RI staff are on this track). Criteria considered in promotion are research grants, conferences attended, presentations, publications, membership of professional bodies, teaching, supervision, public engagement/outreach and promoting equality and diversity. The balance is adjusted depending on career track. Allowances for career breaks/absence/part-time working are specifically factored into the assessment process.

Line Managers should discuss promotion during Annual Review. We will ensure that the process is formalised and recorded. Staff who have spent 2 or more years at the top of a grade (see ACTION POINT 8) will be highlighted to the IEC who may contact individuals and Line Managers encouraging application/supporting the process. Review feedback forms will be modified to record line manager’s discussions with staff regarding promotion during the Annual Review, which must be constructive [ACTION POINT 14].

All staff will be made aware of the promotion process and the UoA Mentoring Scheme via the Annual Review checklist (see ACTION POINT 17 in section 5.3(ii)). Staff will be encouraged to attend promotion information sessions and provide feedback on the usefulness of these sessions [ACTION POINT 15].

(iv) Department submissions to the Research Excellence Framework (REF)

Provide data on the staff, by gender, submitted to REF versus those that were eligible. Compare this to the data for the Research Assessment Exercise 2008. Comment on any gender imbalances identified.

**Figure 12** Number of RI staff eligible for the 2014 REF. Headcount in percentage is on the y-axis, total numbers of staff are shown in the bars. Black lines represent HESA % for 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Not Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RI was newly part of UoA and did not make a submission to the 2008 REF. RI submitted to the 2014 REF, where 28 RI staff were eligible and 19 submitted based on criteria set by UoA senior management (Figure 12). Expectations were at least two 3* papers with a minimum of two 2* papers. Of those eligible 75%F and 63%M were selected, both
greater than HESA data for 2008, despite publication in high-impact journals not being a priority for RESAS work. The low numbers make it difficult to reach any conclusions regarding gender.

Submission to the 2020 REF is coordinated by the RI Deputy Director (Research). All RI staff eligible met individually with him to maximise their research/impact activities. The REF submission will be assessed by the Deputy Director (M) and RI Theme Leaders (1M, 3F and members from IMS and IAHS to ensure consistency of assessment across the Institutes/SMMSN.

**SILVER APPLICATIONS ONLY**

5.2. **Key career transition points: professional and support staff**

(i) **Induction**

Describe the induction and support provided to all new professional and support staff, at all levels. Comment on the uptake of this and how its effectiveness is reviewed.

(ii) **Promotion**

Provide data on staff applying for promotion, and comment on applications and success rates by gender, grade and full- and part-time status. Comment on how staff are encouraged and supported through the process.

5.3. **Career development: academic staff**

(i) **Training**

*Describe the training available to staff at all levels in the department. Provide details of uptake by gender and how existing staff are kept up to date with training. How is its effectiveness monitored and developed in response to levels of uptake and evaluation?*

As well as compulsory E&D training, including one for teaching staff (see section 5.1.ii) RI staff receive training in RI specific procedures, e.g. QA for RESAS-funded work.

Information on staff training is available on the UoA web-site, which includes: Time Management, Recruitment and Interview Techniques, Essential Supervisory Skills, Building and Developing Teams etc. Courses are also advertised to staff through e-mail and the School Newsletter.

Line manager training is mandatory comprising a series of one-day workshops covering finance, management, HR processes and leadership. Attendance is recorded to ensure compliance.

CLSM also hosts PI Development events with the Centre for Academic Development, aimed at enabling networking/development of critical leadership skills aiding the
management of research projects and staff. Four RI junior PIs attended in 2014 and another in 2009 (4M). Two senior PIs from the RI (1M, 1F) attended in 2009.

Courses attended and future training are discussed and recorded at Annual Review. In our survey the training courses attended were: Grant Writing (24%), Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (2%), International Leadership and Development Programme (8%) and PhD Supervision (22%). Some courses had low uptake with individuals unaware of them. Overall RI attendance at course is low (Figure 13). Thus, awareness needs to be improved and Line Managers will highlight training during the Annual Review which will be added to the checklist (see ACTION POINT 17, section 5.3(iii)).

Particularly relevant is the Aurora course. RI will offer a place annually on this Leadership Foundation's women-only development programme which was created to help combat female underrepresentation in senior positions. Aurora provides an additional opportunity for women to influence their institutions and to develop leadership skills. In 2015/16 every school supported one attendee. So far no women from RI have attended.

**Figure 13** Attendance at UoA training courses. % is shown on the y-axis. Headcount is shown in bars Key = men = women

![Figure 13](image)

To ensure that career advice for women is provided we will organise an annual career advice seminar at RI, in collaboration with IMS, providing information from HR on both mentoring and training but also inviting inspirational women in STEMM to present. To measure the effectiveness of these approaches questions will be included in staff review feedback forms and the annual staff and student surveys [ACTION POINT 16].

(ii) Appraisal/development review

*Describe current appraisal/development review schemes for staff at all levels, including postdoctoral researchers and provide data on uptake by gender. Provide details of any appraisal/review training offered and the uptake of this, as well as staff feedback about the process.*
RI follows the UoA Annual Review developed with representatives from all staff categories/areas and the Campus Trade Unions. RI staff Annual Review is mandatory and for PIs is performed by Theme Leaders. PIs act as Line Managers to team members such as post-doctoral fellows. RI runs compulsory training in staff reviewing. All RI PIs have all received this training within the last 2 years.

Annual Review enables staff to reflect on performance over the year and obtain feedback. Line Managers/PIs are trained to explore workload and goals for next year appropriate to career track, grade, and aspirations of the reviewee so staff are clear what is expected of them. Annual review also advises staff regarding promotion. RI academic staff (grades 6-9) also have enhanced review referencing the UoA Framework of Academic Expectation (FAE).

The RI survey showed that the majority (>65%) felt that at least some aspects of their Annual Review were valuable. However, some felt that their career progression (24%) and workload (15%) was not usefully discussed and reasons for this remain unclear. For the next reviews we will include a checklist to be completed to ensure that all key topics are covered [ACTION POINT 17]. These are listed in Section 7 “Further Information”.

The Annual Review includes an evaluation form for feedback which will now be collated by EDT and integrated into the RI Athena SWAN database, ensuring improvements in the review process. We will run a specific discussion group following the 2017 review to gather further feedback and suggestions for improvement [ACTION POINT 18].

(iii) Support given to academic staff for career progression

Comment and reflect on support given to academic staff, especially postdoctoral researchers, to assist in their career progression.

RI has adopted the UoA staff Mentoring Scheme to create a supportive environment and achieve career goals with targeted, relevant advice. This scheme is particularly valuable for women in RI as in the survey 41% specified that better advice would benefit career development. Indeed 23% of staff identified mentoring as something that would benefit their careers. Despite this the mentoring scheme has little uptake in RI with 2F mentors (Grade 7 and Grade 9) and 2F mentees (Grade 5 and Grade 7) and must be better publicised with staff encouraged to become mentors and mentees. 20 staff reported being mentored, implying that whilst the formal scheme is not widely used mentoring from colleagues occurs. We will ensure that all staff are made aware of the Mentoring Scheme. Information will be included in the RI induction information, raised at Annual Review and posted on the RI media wall. We will also appoint an RI Mentoring Coordinator [ACTION POINT 19].

The UoA Centre for Academic Development provides RI staff seeking to develop their teaching, learning and research practice with courses and advice on leadership/management and personal development.

RI staff wishing to increase their skills in public engagement do so via the RI Knowledge Exchange (KE) team who provide RI staff with links to the UoA Public Engagement with Research Unit (PERU). PERU helps generate ideas, and provides a web-based toolkit to foster public engagement.
RI ECRs are supported in fellowship applications through the CLSM “traffic light” fellowship management scheme. This involves the following five steps to assess, advise and support applicants: 1. A mandatory induction; 2. Completion of required documents; 3. Traffic-light interview, held by senior academics; 4. Institutional endorsement; 5. Personal timetable, where the candidate is assigned a personal mentor. 4M fellowship applications have been made via the scheme with one successful.

The “Supporting Women Returners” program provides funding to female academic staff returning from maternity leave or a career break (see Section 5.5(iii)).

A Family Support Award provides costs of up to £250 to parents, with children up to the age of 12, to help over costs for childcare and/or facilitate attendance at conferences/courses is also available for RI staff (see 5.5(iii)).

Line Managers should inform staff about help available for fellowships and supporting women returning to work at Annual Review. To ensure that this happens it will be included in the Annual Review checklist (see ACTION POINT 17 above).

(iv) Support given to students (at any level) for academic career progression

Comment and reflect on support given to students at any level to enable them to make informed decisions about their career (including the transition to a sustainable academic career).

RI PhD students have at least two Supervisors providing academic guidance. Students also have an Advisor providing pastoral/academic support. Regular progress reports are submitted to the CSLM Graduate School by the student and supervisor. Over half of students in our survey felt that the advice they received was fair and helpful, with only one of 19 students reporting dissatisfaction.

A wide range of courses are available to RI PhD students within the Researcher Development Framework at UoA. These include Exceptional Conference Presentations, CV and Cover Letter and Interview Workshops, Planning Your Professional Development and Becoming a Professional Researcher. Assessment of student training records is part of the assessment with students expected to show evidence of training.

RI awards an annual Cuthbertson Prize for the best PhD student presentation. The winner competes against other Scottish Research Institutes, developing presentation skills and providing networking opportunities. The 2016 winner was female as was the 2015 joint winner. Both students did well in the Scotland-wide competition, winning and coming third, respectively.

Students are encouraged to take part in knowledge exchange (KE) activities. While RI focus on Scottish Government and Scottish food and drink industry PERU encourages students to both develop their own and/or take part in events e.g. “Brightclub” and “I’m a Scientist Get Me Out of Here.” We will ensure that students are aware of KE activities by adding a student specific KE page on the media wall and measure satisfaction in the survey [ACTION POINT 20].
We have limited information on future careers of RI students. This would inform advice to students and allow assessment of the program. Collecting this information is included in ACTION POINT 7 (see section 4.1 (iv)).

PhD students can obtain career support from the UoA careers service, however, given the specificity of research careers, support typically comes from the supervisors/advisors.

(v) Support offered to those applying for research grant applications

Comment and reflect on support given to staff who apply for funding and what support is offered to those who are unsuccessful.

RI applies internal reviews for external grant applications, managed by the CLSM Research and Innovation team. Staff receive feedback from two colleagues and the RI Director. Failure is also reviewed. In future, we will ensure that all unsuccessful grant applications enter a more structured ‘Grant Academy’ scheme [ACTION POINT 21]. Additionally a “Grant Writing Workshop” is available. However, the survey shows only 20% (9M/7F) attended this workshop with 80% finding it useful. We will ensure that Line Managers verify all staff are aware of workshops/courses by inclusion in the Annual Review checklist (see ACTION POINT 17).

We will organize focus groups to explore satisfaction regarding support available for grant writing and plan future actions accordingly [ACTION POINT 22]. Satisfaction on this topic will be reviewed in our 2018 staff survey (see ACTION POINT 1).

Support is also available to ECRs via the College “Traffic Light” Scheme, specifically offered to those preparing fellowship proposals (see section 5.3(iii))
5.4. Career development: professional and support staff

(i) Training

Describe the training available to staff at all levels in the department. Provide details of uptake by gender and how existing staff are kept up to date with training. How is its effectiveness monitored and developed in response to levels of uptake and evaluation?

(vi) Appraisal/development review

Describe current appraisal/development review schemes for professional and support staff at all levels and provide data on uptake by gender. Provide details of any appraisal/review training offered and the uptake of this, as well as staff feedback about the process.

(ii) Support given to professional and support staff for career progression

Comment and reflect on support given to professional and support staff to assist in their career progression.

5.5. Flexible working and managing career breaks

Note: Present professional and support staff and academic staff data separately

(i) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: before leave

*Explain what support the department offers to staff before they go on maternity and adoption leave.*

When staff inform their line manager that they are pregnant a risk assessment of their work environment is undertaken. Research commitments are discussed with Line Managers and the RESAS Work Package Co-ordinator. Although previously arranged informally, a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) is in preparation by the RESAS Theme 3 Coordinator [ACTION POINT 23] (RESAS specific). If additional cover is required funding may come from RESAS. Similarly teaching commitments are covered in consultation with the individual, line manager and Deputy Director (Teaching).

Maternity leave information/policy is available on the “Policy Zone” of the UoA website, in an HR handbook signposted on the UoA webpage and on all plasma screens. Staff are offered a one-to-one meeting with HR to discuss options.

RI staff have had access to a CSLM coaching program helping parents back to work after parental leave (see 5.5 (iii)). During the reporting period no-one from RI had requested this but more recently one parent has used the resource.

Arrangements can be made prior to a career break/maternity leave for flexible working on return, with part-time work for a flexible period building up to full-time gradually. This is decided in conjunction with Line Managers and is assessed on a case-by-case basis.
There is a view at RI and a CSLM focus group that there is no single HR contact who provides all details of procedures. We will identify a RI PLA to share information/expertise and policy updates in consultation with HR [ACTION POINT 24].

(ii) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: during leave

*Explain what support the department offers to staff during maternity and adoption leave.*

RI staff on parental leave may use 10 keeping in touch (KIT) days, but no staff used KIT days (2012-2015), either because they didn’t understand them, no childcare was available or they visited colleagues informally/kept in touch via e-mail. Parents are also included in invitations to all social events and most visit RI with their babies at coffee time at least once during parental leave.

During maternity leave, extension of probationary periods are possible as are extensions of contracts at risk of redundancy until return to work

Advice on all these aspects, and contact (if desired) during the period of leave will be provided by the PLA (see ACTION POINT 26) in addition to HR advice.

(iii) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: returning to work

*Explain what support the department offers to staff on return from maternity or adoption leave. Comment on any funding provided to support returning staff.*

Upon return to work alternative working arrangements may be organised. RI is supportive of this and several staff work flexibly, part-time or use job-sharing (see Section 5.5(vi)).

Risk assessments are carried out for mothers who have given birth within the last 6 months or who continue breastfeeding. In RI these are co-ordinated by the QA manager. Facilities for expressing and storing breastmilk are shared with the IMS, directly adjacent and connected to RI. These include a private room, comfy chairs and a lockable refrigerator.

RI staff can access the UoA’s newly extended Rocking Horse Nursery on the main University campus. This provides childcare for up to 78 preschool children in three departments (0-2, 2-3 and 3-5) and is open from 8.30am to 5.15pm. RI staff can also use the UoA salary-sacrifice Childcare Voucher scheme. In June 2016 there were 11F and 6M RI-staff members using this scheme. Additionally, full-time UK students are eligible to apply for the University Childcare Fund that assists with childcare expenses.

RI researchers can apply to the CLSM Wellcome Trust ISSF “Support for Women Returners” scheme enabling staff returning from maternity leave/career break to apply for protected research time. The scheme covers teaching and administrative replacement, and also supports an assistant for a limited period, and/or consumables. Awards are for 3-6 months and must be made within 3 months of returning to work.
In 2014 CSLM introduced a “Family Support Award”, which provides support of up to £250 to assist with childcare costs associated with attending conferences with priority for ECRs. Since 2016 this has been run by SMMSN. No RI staff have applied for this award yet but the PLA will ensure all eligible parents are aware of this scheme (see ACTION POINT 24).

From the staff survey, whilst 46%F felt that maternity/adopter leave had not damaged their career progression, 21%F felt it had. The numbers of women (39) are low and it is important to know whether it is the academic or support staff or both who feel this way. A UoA-wide survey is needed to reach more valid conclusions based on larger numbers [ACTION POINT 25].

(iv) Maternity return rate

*Provide data and comment on the maternity return rate in the department. Data of staff whose contracts are not renewed while on maternity leave should be included in the section along with commentary.*

In RI 2 academic and 1 support staff member took maternity leave (2012-2015). All returned to work. No one used KIT days making it difficult to determine how useful this scheme is. However, the PLA will ensure staff know about the opportunities and we will collate all views regarding maternity leave (see ACTION POINT 24).

(v) Paternity, shared parental, adoption, and parental leave uptake

*Provide data and comment on the uptake of these types of leave by gender and grade.*

*Comment on what the department does to promote and encourage take-up of paternity leave and shared parental leave.*

RI is committed to supporting staff whose partners (including same sex) are pregnant, recently given birth, or adopting. UoA policy allows partners time off for two antenatal appointments.

In RI, there were 5 fathers in total but only 3 took paternity leave (2012-2015). One father had just joined and was not entitled to paternity leave and took annual leave, as did a second who was entitled to paternity leave. To increase uptake better information is required, particularly from Line Managers who will direct expectant fathers to the PLA.
(see ACTION POINT 22). So far no RI-staff have taken shared parental leave but one father plans to use this in the future.

Under flexible working we describe how staff can specify times when they cannot be available due to caring commitments both for children and elder care.

Staff commented that covering for other’s parental leave is not always recognised, risking unwillingness to do this in future. We will introduce measures to ensure this is acknowledged officially [ACTION POINT 26].

(vi) Flexible working

Provide information on the flexible working arrangements available.

Flexible working is supported at RI, which agrees to all reasonable requests for part-time working, including term-time only. Approximately 25% of RI staff work part-time. These arrangements are formalised, via HR, if hours are reduced but can be reversible if desired. Research technicians often return to work part-time after maternity leave increasing to full-time work as caring commitments diminsh. Conversely, those returning full-time may subsequently reduce hours if needed. Long–term flexible working with no change in hours is arranged informally with Line Managers and Director’s approval.

The Staff survey revealed 55% of staff working flexibly, the majority informally. The main reasons cited in the staff survey were a need to cover childcare requirements.

Nonetheless, 1M and 10F disagreed indicating that support for flexible working is not universal. We will ensure that a positive attitude to flexible working is communicated via a targeted message to Line Managers from the Director, via the media wall to all staff [ACTION POINT 27] and as an item on the Annual Review checklist (see ACTION POINT 17).

(vii) Transition from part-time back to full-time work after career breaks

Outline what policy and practice exists to support and enable staff who work part-time after a career break to transition back to full-time roles.

For career breaks/sick leave, arrangements are made for flexible working on return, as detailed above. Staff may return part-time for a flexible period and gradually increase to full-time. This is decided with Line Managers during regular meetings to discuss settling-in. The EDT will ensure that the possibility of changing hours after a career break is flagged-up to staff as an item on the Annual Review checklist as are regular meetings with Line Managers to check settling in [ACTION POINT 28].

Only 1M reported taking a career break and felt supported on leaving and return. However, only 50%F felt supported on leaving and 60%F on return. We will obtain feedback from individuals having taken career breaks to determine how support for women can be improved [ACTION POINT 29].
5.6. Organisation and culture

(i) Culture

Demonstrate how the department actively considers gender equality and inclusivity. Provide details of how the Athena SWAN Charter principles have been, and will continue to be, embedded into the culture and workings of the department.

As described in Section 2, the RI workforce has many staff with over 10 years’ service. This has fostered a close/sociable atmosphere where staff are supportive of their colleagues within/across academic and technical staff. This is evidenced by the results of the staff survey where 67%M and 57%F found their working environment supportive and 39%M/F welcoming. There were fewer who found the environment miserable, 7F and 2M, cliquey, 10F and 2M and sexist/ macho, 3M/F. The majority of students (84–53%) felt that men and women were treated equally at UoA with regard to a number of issues including facilities and recruitment. However, the lowest score (47%) was for progression and a comment cited the low numbers of RI female professors.

RI has historically had excellent channels for communication between management and staff – receiving ‘Investors in People’ awards. Now, Research Theme Leaders meet with staff in their Theme monthly after the IEC meeting to communicate outcomes and to seek issues and information to feed back to the IEC ensuring a two-way exchange of information. The Institute Technical Resources Manager holds monthly meetings with scientific support and administrative staff. We will review this communication network using “Café Culture” events organised by our KE Co-ordinator (SAT/EDT member) to determine how information channels might be improved [ACTION POINT 30].

The RI building is modern and pleasant with excellent facilities. It has a large, dining room with a glazed wall and access to communal garden space. The room is popular with staff at lunchtimes. There are areas on each floor for coffee breaks/informal discussions. Several meeting rooms are available for presentations/private meetings. A larger lecture room on the ground floor is used for seminars and Theme meetings.

There is a strong sense of RI identity. Staff respond well to requests for contributions to RI activities, evidenced by the willingness to join the Athena SWAN SAT, which could not accommodate everyone. There are several activities held in the building e.g. lunchtime Yoga classes. The RI Science Engagement Officer, circulates a weekly newsletter with news featuring RI staff.

RI has embraced the Athena SWAN process and principals and will deliver the necessary resources (time and running costs) to ensure that gender equality and inclusivity are attained in the Institute. The SAT is one of the official RI committees and Athena SWAN events are advertised on the media wall.
(ii) **HR policies**

Describe how the department monitors the consistency in application of HR policies for equality, dignity at work, bullying, harassment, grievance and disciplinary processes. Describe actions taken to address any identified differences between policy and practice. Comment on how the department ensures staff with management responsibilities are kept informed and updated on HR polices.

The RI induction process directs staff to HR policies on the UoA website and RI has a designated HR partner. For issues of grievance, bullying, harassment and mediation, RI staff can contact their line manager, trade union representative or the RI HR partner directly who will provide access to UoA Harassment Advisors and mediation information from the UoA website. Staff are always directed to the HR partner, who together with Line Managers ensures the correct, online-published procedures are followed. This may be via an informal action or, if matters deteriorate, formal disciplinary processes. Line Managers are aware of these policies via mandatory line management courses. Nonetheless, awareness amongst staff could be improved and we will ensure that Line Managers actively highlight these to staff by including this on our Annual Review checklist (see ACTION POINT 17).

(iii) **Representation of men and women on committees**

Provide data for all department committees broken down by gender and staff type. Identify the most influential committees. Explain how potential committee members are identified and comment on any consideration given to gender equality in the selection of representatives and what the department is doing to address any gender imbalances. Comment on how the issue of ‘committee overload’ is addressed where there are small numbers of women or men.

**Table 9 Academic and support staff representation on RI committees.** Support staff contribution is detailed below. IEC - Institute Executive Committee; RMC - RESAS Management Committee; SMC - Scientific Management Committee; EFU – External funding Unit: H&SC - Health and Safety Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;SC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>41%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
<td><strong>44%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At RI, there were five committees (2012-2015) (Table 9). Recently the SAT/EDT became a sixth.

Support staff are represented on most committees. The IEC has 4 support staff members, 2M and 2F. RSM has none. SMC has 4F support staff, EFU has 1M and H&C has 2M and 2F.

There is just over 40%F on committees closely reflecting academic staff (47%F). However, only one committee had a female chair (2012-2015), which is concerning (see ACTION POINT 29 below). Committee overload by gender does not appear to be an issue.

RI now has better gender balance on the IEC. To ensure gender balance on other committees, particularly for chairs, membership information will be collected centrally by the EDT. Where possible, committees will be formed by application and selection including regular rotation of duties [ACTION POINT 31].

(iv) Participation on influential external committees

How are staff encouraged to participate in other influential external committees and what procedures are in place to encourage women (or men if they are underrepresented) to participate in these committees?

RI staff are encouraged via e-mail to apply for positions on external committees including research councils/editorial boards when calls arise. Calls for membership of UoA committees are e-mailed to staff and are a criteria for promotion to senior academic roles (HERA (Higher Education Role Analysis) -Liaison and Networking - Level 4 and above).

From the survey 20%M and 33%F felt contributions to external committees were not recognised. We will ensure that participation on external committees is both recognised as an item on the Annual Review checklist and the Workload Model and monitor this in the feedback form [ACTION POINT 32].

(v) Workload model

Describe any workload allocation model in place and what it includes. Comment on ways in which the model is monitored for gender bias and whether it is taken into account at appraisal/development review and in promotion criteria. Comment on the rotation of responsibilities and if staff consider the model to be transparent and fair.

A Workload Model is being developed at RI involving regular reviews of staff workload at Annual Review (See section 3 (iii) The Self-Assessment Process and ACTION POINTS 5, 33 and 36).
The Workload Model is taken into consideration during promotion and depends on which career track is followed i.e. Teaching and Research or Research (there are no Teaching and Scholarship staff at RI (5.1 (iii)). The University has implemented a “Framework for Academic Excellence” (FAE), which runs alongside and is taken into account in the Workload Model, where specific attainment markers are assessed by management at Annual Review meetings which will permit gender comparisons of workload in future.

It is not apparent that gender balance in workload is considered at present as there is no mechanism for collecting gender specific data. However, databases of contributions towards teaching, grant writing and administration, are being developed and will be available on SharePoint, providing transparency.

In the staff survey a higher proportion of women (74%F vs 56%M) were happy with their workloads. Nearly equal, proportions were unhappy (12%F and 11%M). There was no gender difference between those agreeing that how workloads were assigned was fair and transparent, but a higher proportion of men (29%M vs 19%F) thought this was unfair.

In RI, there is support for special requests for adjusted working hours (see flexible working), with 30%F and 5%M working part-time. However, 45%M and 38%F feel that part-time working is detrimental to career progression.

At present there is no role rotation of senior management at RI in keeping with normal practice at RESAS funded Institutes. However, this will be introduced on RI committees (see ACTION POINT 31 above).

To evaluate staff perception of the Workload Model and aid its development we will add a question to the RI staff survey in 2018 [ACTION POINT 33].

(vi) Timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings

Describe the consideration given to those with caring responsibilities and part-time staff around the timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings.

RI has a policy of holding meeting between 10.00AM and 4.00PM as does the UoA. Nonetheless, the survey indicates that >20% of staff find meetings are not scheduled at times when they are able to attend. This is a problem where meetings overrun, such as UoA Senate meetings which have now been given an earlier start time to mitigate this. We will determine why some staff find difficulty attending meetings by including a specific question regarding this in the next staff survey [ACTION POINT 34].

Social gatherings in the Institute, such as the Burns lunch, Christmas lunch and party and staff barbeque are organised by staff and are usually held outside working hours. However, staff keep in touch with by e-mail including those on parental leave to ensure that as many people attend these events as possible. Additionally, a barbeque for UoA technical staff has been held during working hours so that as many staff as possible can attend.
(vii) Visibility of role models

Describe how the institution builds gender equality into organisation of events. Comment on the gender balance of speakers and chairpersons in seminars, workshops and other relevant activities. Comment on publicity materials, including the department’s website and images used.

Over the reporting period, on average there was no gender bias in invited speakers, with an average over three years of 56%M to 44%F as shown in Table 10 below.

Table 10 Staff talk seminars presenters (2012-15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Presenter gender</th>
<th>%F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=male; F=female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the nature of RI research, and the need for volunteers, we always try to use images in our communications (electronic and print) that represent all stages of human life and gender equally, although we acknowledge the importance of increasing the ethnic diversity of images. RI has an SOP for the “dissemination of information outwith the Institute” this will be updated to encompass gender and ethnicity balance in all intra and internet RI web-sites. This will be surveyed regularly with the RI KE Co-ordinator who sits on the EDT and IEC and action will be taken as necessary [ACTION POINT 35].

The recent appointment of a 1F Deputy Director and 3F Research Theme Leaders has significantly enhanced the visibility of women as management role models.

(viii) Outreach activities

Provide data on the staff and students from the department involved in outreach and engagement activities by gender and grade. How is staff and student contribution to outreach and engagement activities formally recognised? Comment on the participant uptake of these activities by gender.

RI has a successful track record in engaging stakeholders/community audiences. Public engagement is part of the current Scottish-Government-funded programme reporting framework. We will ensure that public/stakeholder engagement is formally recognised in the Workload Model and in the Annual Review [ACTION POINT 36].

RI research in food and health attracts community audiences and RI participates in science festivals and public engagement events e.g. Aberdeen’s Techfest, Edinburgh
International Science Festival, Café Scientifique and other smaller events. Although more women than men undertook public engagement activities, this has now changed (Table 11). RI also been active in local school outreach via a Science Engagement Officer (M) who is responsible for collecting and reporting all data to RESAS on outreach activities.

Individuals who make an outstanding contribution to public engagement at the UoA are recognised by the Principal’s Prize for Public Engagement. A female RI staff member won this award in 2015.

The staff survey did not reveal any issues with 7%F and 6%M indicating that anything had limited their participation in public engagement over the last 2 years.

RI currently doesn’t collect data on attendance/evaluation of these events. In future we will collect this data via the Science Engagement Officer and EDT [ACTION POINT 37].

**Table 11** RI outreach activities (2012-2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Talks</td>
<td>M 1 F 5 %M 17 %F 83</td>
<td>M 1 F 4 %M 20 %F 80</td>
<td>M 1 F 1 %M 50 %F 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Highland Show</td>
<td>4 8 %M 33 %F 67</td>
<td>2 0 %M 100 %F 0</td>
<td>7 1 %M 88 %F 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Science Festivals</td>
<td>3 12 %M 33 %F 67</td>
<td>2 7 %M 22 %F 78</td>
<td>9 8 %M 53 %F 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>11 25 %M 28 %F 72</td>
<td>5 11 %M 47 %F 53</td>
<td>17 10 %M 63 %F 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6063 words (using additional 63)
6. CASE STUDIES: IMPACT ON INDIVIDUALS
Recommended word count: Silver 1000 words

Two individuals working in the department should describe how the department’s activities have benefitted them.

The subject of one of these case studies should be a member of the self-assessment team.

The second case study should be related to someone else in the department. More information on case studies is available in the awards handbook.

7. FURTHER INFORMATION
Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words

Please comment here on any other elements that are relevant to the application.

Specific Content of New RI Checklist for Annual Reviews (see ACTION POINT 17).

An RI specific checklist for reviewers will be added to the Annual Review documentation. This will be used to ensure that during the review the following are discussed and understood by reviewees:

1. The promotion process
2. The UoA Mentoring Scheme
3. Training/courses workshops/courses for external grant applications
4. Help available for fellowships
5. Support for women returning to work
6. Support for flexible working
7. Options for changing hours after a career break
8. Regular meetings with Line Managers to check settling in
9. HR policies on grievance, bullying, harassment and mediation
10. Participation on external committees recognised
11. Participation in KE activities recognised
Publicity for Athena SWAN activities on the RI Media Wall.

A media wall information page is currently being shown at RI. Below is the rolling text which is continually renewed to publicise Athena SWAN related events. The current text is given under the picture

We’re the Athena SWAN self-assessment team (SAT) for the Rowett.

Athena SWAN is here to ensure gender equality at all levels from undergraduate students through to the highest levels of academia. A massive amount of talent is lost from scientific research by women leaving the career pipeline.

If you wonder why you receive staff and student surveys it’s so that we can identify where problems and barriers lie in the progression of women through their careers.

Do you have unconscious bias when it comes to gender roles in science? How can you find out? Look out for the staff seminar this semester to explore this issue.

Why don’t you join the Athena SWAN SAT at the Rowett and have your say. Gender equality benefits us all.

Please contact either:

Maria Cascio, Athena SWAN coordinator for the University extn. 7084 m.cascio@abdn.ac.uk

Lynda Williams, RI SAT co-convenor extn. 8682 l.williams@abdn.ac.uk

Justin Rochford, RI SAT co-convenor extn. 7372 j.rochford@abdn.ac.uk

318 words
8. ACTION PLAN

The action plan should present prioritised actions to address the issues identified in this application.

Please present the action plan in the form of a table. For each action define an appropriate success/outcome measure, identify the person/position(s) responsible for the action, and timescales for completion.

The plan should cover current initiatives and your aspirations for the next four years. Actions, and their measures of success, should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound (SMART).

See the awards handbook for an example template for an action plan.

Action Plan Priorities are given in the item column as either: H – High, M – Medium, L – Low.