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Letter of endorsement from the Head of Department – maximum 500 words

Ms Sarah Dickinson MSc
Athena Swan Charter,
Equality Challenge Unit,
Queen’s House,
55-56 Lincoln’s Inn Fields
London WC2A 3LJ

Monday 26 November 2012

Dear Ms Dickinson

I am very happy to endorse this application from the School of Psychology for an Athena Swan Award. At Leicester, we are committed to promoting gender equality, and the School shares that commitment as part of a wider belief that excellence in academic departments is only sustainable if the need for success is coupled to transparent and equitable management processes that are sensitive to the individual needs and perspectives of its members.

In making this submission, we recognise that whilst considerable progress has been made in recent years, the School of Psychology faces many challenges in the years to come if we wish to demonstrate a sustained achievement of this goal. The management structure of the School continues to evolve as we evaluate the effectiveness of our procedures. The process of submitting to the Athena Swan award has itself, in the collection of survey data and the reflection upon current custom and
practices, suggested further changes and improvements. This is work in progress that reflects the School’s willingness to reflect on its effectiveness and to embrace change.

The Award Committee will also recognise that the gender imbalance in staffing – a preponderance of male senior academics while the majority of Lecturers are female and in the earlier stages of their careers – is an issue that does not admit of rapid solutions and may take many years to remedy. Structurally, this problem is exacerbated because essential areas of expertise for appointments in recent years are not in areas where significant numbers of highly qualified female applicants are to be found. Every attempt has been made to attract female applicants and that remains a policy for the future. Indeed, we work hard to encourage female applicants to apply for senior posts, and the last two external appointments to Senior Lectureships have been made to women. Furthermore, of the staff currently closest to successful applications for internal promotion, the majority of these are also women. We trust therefore, that with time and reasonable maintenance of the principles by which we are running the School, these issues will disappear.

I take this opportunity to commend specific colleagues for their contribution to the progress so far. The running of our undergraduate degrees – an onerous but essential job - has been in the custody of Dr Claire Gibson and Dr Tessa Webb for the past five years. Dr Briony Pulford is the inaugural chair of our workload committee and, with energy and an attention to detail, introduced our workload methodology and the cultural shift in the School that it represented. Dr Caren Frosch arrived as a new Lecturer with experience of Athena Swan submissions elsewhere, and coordinated the School’s submission and the management changes it has engendered. Finally, it is appropriate (although beyond the Athena guidelines for this letter!) to commend a male colleague, Professor Clive Hollin, in his capacity as chair of the Social Committee and also the Staff Progression Sub-Committee, for his experience and balance in the management of these changes.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Professor Mark Lansdale
Head, School of Psychology

496 words
The self-assessment process – maximum 1000 words

The School of Psychology’s Self-Assessment Team

Prof Clive Hollin is Professor of Criminological Psychology at the University of Leicester. He previously worked for the Department of Health where he managed a large department with responsibilities for research (including oversight of research ethics) and staff training. At Leicester he teaches undergraduates and postgraduates and Chairs the School’s Staff Progression Sub-Committee. He maintains a healthy balance between home and family, work, and watching and playing sport.

Diana Pinto is a Graduate Teaching Assistant and PhD student. She has a BSc in Psychology with Biology and a Masters in Psychological Research from the University of Leicester. She has three children which she is bringing up alone. The eldest is at university and the younger two are studying for their GCSEs. In her spare time, she is course director at the University’s Institute of Lifelong Learning.

Dr Tessa Webb is a Senior Teaching Fellow and the Director of Undergraduate Studies, overseeing the three undergraduate degrees currently offered by the school. She is also the school’s Equal Opportunities Officer. She has an 80:20 split between teaching/administrative duties and research. Her husband is a secondary school teacher and they are expecting a baby in December 2012.

Dr Briony Pulford is a Senior Lecturer, Chair of the Workload Committee, Practicals Coordinator and has worked in the School since 2004. Her husband is a self-employed asbestos surveyor and they have a 12 year old son and a 4 year old daughter. She works flexible hours, often from home, to fit in around child-care commitments.

Dr Caren Frosch has been a Lecturer in the School since January 2012 and is the Chair of the Athena Swan Self-Assessment Team. She previously held postdoctoral positions at University College London (2011), Queen’s University Belfast (2009-2011) and University of Reading (2006-2009) where she was also a member of the University Athena Swan Steering group. Her husband works part-time as a Research Administrator at the University and looks after their 2 year old son.

Dr Doug Barrett has been a Lecturer in the School of Psychology since July 2009. He teaches undergraduate and post-graduate courses and is a member of the Research Excellence Framework committee, the Athena Swan Self-Assessment Team and the Space working group. His wife is a part-time secondary school teacher and he has two children under three.

Prof Mark Lansdale took up Headship of the School of Psychology in 2008. Prior to this he worked as a consultant psychologist with the US multinational ITT before moving to Loughborough University in 1984 and Nottingham Trent University in 2006. He is married with three children.
Gabrielle Ranson is the Senior Administrator in Psychology. She has worked in Higher Education administration for 24 years. She has some caring responsibilities for her disabled mother.

Mr Chris Sharp  
**Equalities Adviser for the University**  
Science degree and subsequent career in HR and corporate management including responsibility for equalities. Now specialises in equalities and diversity. Has designed and managed flexible working systems for large numbers of staff (c 500) utilising annual hours contracts in a local authority setting.

**The Self-Assessment Process**  

We have had 6 full meetings this year.  
1. In March 2012 discussed the objectives and process of the award submission. We discussed whether the team fulfils all the necessary criteria set out by Athena Swan and set out a strategy for completing the submission.  
2. In May 2012 we discussed the pros and cons of applying for bronze or silver first in light of the outcomes of the submissions made by Physics and Infection Immunity and Inflammation. We discussed the questions to be asked in a survey to be circulated to all staff and examined the student and staff data available to us at that stage.  
3. In July 2012 we reviewed the survey questions and finalised them. We agreed to set up a blackboard site (our electronic learning environment) for the dissemination of information about the Athena Swan process to all staff and that reports should be made to staff meetings. The group agreed that the statistics and opinions gathered for Athena Swan would feed into the Staff Progression Committee and the School Management Group. We reviewed a checklist for completing the submission provided by Chris Sharp the equalities advisor and also reviewed our timetable for completing the submission. Finally we allocated report sections to be completed by various members of the committee.  
4. In August 2012 we discussed and approved various sections of the submission and discussed some preliminary data from the staff survey. We discussed the subsection on culture and made recommendations to the ‘New Building Committee’ to ensure there will be a communal coffee room and adequate child changing and breastfeeding facilities. We began to consider the items that should go into our action plan.  
5. The fifth meeting took place on 9/10/12 and was focussed on the results of the staff survey and which actions need to be taken as a consequence. There was a lengthy discussion about culture which also resulted in the identification of items for the action plan.  
6. On 23/10/12 we discussed sections that had recently been completed and identified items for the action plan.
The team will continue to meet every 2 months to ensure that the action plan is implemented and any issues surrounding these can be discussed. The chair will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the action plan but tasks from the action plan will be shared out as appropriate among members of staff in the School. We will continue to update the blackboard site and report to staff meeting. In addition we will receive updates from the equal opportunities committee. We will conduct a further staff survey in 6 months’ time to monitor the implementation of the action plan. In the immediate future we intend to do a follow up survey to probe more carefully some of the issues raised in the first survey.

980 words

2. 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 School of Psychology comprises 41 academic staff (20 male, 21 female) who teach a student profile of: 450 undergraduates (BSc single-honours programmes in Psychology and Cognitive Neuroscience plus a combined degree with Sociology); 25 FT postgraduates (MSc in Forensic Psychology and in Psychological Research Methods); 80 PT postgraduates (distance-learning MSc in Occupational Psychology); plus an annual intake of approximately 10 research students and 16 students enrolled on the Clinical Psychology Doctorate. The School is divided into 4 research clusters of Cognitive Science, Neuroscience, Developmental Science, and Social and Applied Sciences; the latter including units in forensic, occupational, and clinical psychology as well as a unit dedicated to child and adolescent psychiatry. This mix of laboratory-based and applied psychology represents the distinct flavour of Psychology at Leicester. At present, these elements are distributed across 5 separate sites on the main University campus with a further unit (adolescent psychiatry) in an NHS site across the city. This distribution is recognised as not ideal, and the University is currently building new accommodation scheduled to be occupied by the entire School in 2015.

Since the appointment of a new Head in 2008, the School has seen substantial reorganisation and turnover of staff; including the retirement of six senior academics. This is reflected in the current distribution of staff, with 7 Professors (1 female) and 1 Reader (female); 12 Senior Lecturers (5 female) and 21 Lecturers (14 female). The proportion of female and male staff at junior and senior academic positions is also a reflection of the age profile of the two genders in the School. The median age of female Lecturers and Teaching Fellows has been 37 years for the past three years, compared to 43 years for male Lecturers. The median age for female Senior Lecturers is currently 46 years compared to 49 years for the male Senior Lecturers. The current median age of the male Professors is 58 compared to 49 for the female Professor. Nevertheless, it has been possible to appoint 5 female colleagues to leadership positions in key committees in the School.
Management (Board of Undergraduate Studies, Workload Management, Finance and Resources, Ethics, and Research Student Management).

The School management ethos is one of transparency of process, and in this respect, we draw attention to three significant innovations in which management authority has been devolved away from the Head of School’s office. First, the School runs a transparent and equitable workload model. The majority of academic staff are committed to 60% of their time on teaching and administration and 40% upon their research. Exceptions to this are Teaching Fellows who are committed to 80% of their time teaching and administration. Adjustments are made to these ratios for new lecturers, staff returning from long-term sickness and staff returning from maternity leave. Second, we run a Staff Progression Sub-Committee (including male and female senior staff) whose purpose it is to provide confidential support and advice on all processes surrounding job progression (e.g. probation and promotion). Our aspiration is to extend this to greater mentoring and advice on career development beyond these specific stages (see action plan for details). Third, we have a social committee whose purpose it is to organise opportunities for social interaction between staff and students.

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

**Student data**

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

The School does not run any access or foundation courses.

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

Figure 1 shows the absolute number of female and male undergraduate students for the past three years. All students are full-time as we do not have any part-time students on our undergraduate courses. The figure shows that females consistently make up the larger proportion of students ranging from 83% in 2009/10 to 79% in the most recent academic year. This gender imbalance is a long standing issue in Psychology and consistent with the national average for Psychology which was 79% in 2010/11. This gender imbalance continues at postgraduate level and has attracted attention within the Psychology community as illustrated by articles in 2007 and 2011 in the American Psychological Association’s gradPsych Magazine.
We recognise that some of our students have family commitments that may make full-time study more difficult for them. We have considered both part-time and distance learning provision of our degrees and have indeed conducted feasibility studies of distance learning provision on our degrees. At present we find that these are not realistic options given that our staff are working at full capacity (as evidenced by our workload model). We are, however, planning a survey of our undergraduate students to establish how many students are affected by family commitments and whether there is anything we can do to improve the experience of students who have family commitments (see Action 2.3).

Figure 1: Absolute number of UG students by gender for the last three academic years

(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.

Figure 2. Absolute number of full-time (FT), part-time (PT), and distance learning (DL) postgraduate taught students by gender for the last three years.
As can be seen from Figure 2, the majority of taught postgraduate students are also female, ranging from 87% in 2009/10 to 79% in 2011/12. The national average of female taught postgraduate students was 78% so we tend to have an above average proportion of female students on our taught postgraduate courses. We do not see the need for any action to increase numbers of female students on these courses.

(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.

As can be seen from Figure 3, the majority of postgraduate research students are also female. In 2009/10 and 2010/11 85% of the full time research students were female compared to a national average in 2010/11 of 75%. In 2011/12 females only comprised 67% of the postgraduate research students. This figure can be explained by an increase in applications from males in that year. In 2011/12 we received 34 applications from females (compared to 26 and 35 in the previous two years) and we received 27 applications from males (compared to 12 in each of the two previous years). This increase in applications from male applicants can be explained by an increase in students from overseas countries where their native country is providing the funding. Some of these countries may favour male applicants over female applicants. The proportion of male applicants that were registered in 2011/12 was 22% which is less than the 25% in 2010/11 and 33% in 2009/10. As part of our action plan we will monitor the situation (Action Plan 2.1).

The number of part-time students is very small but in the most recent year the proportions reflect the gender proportions of the full-time students with 69% of the part-time students female and 31% male. Overall, the figures demonstrate that we are generally retaining and attracting a high proportion of female students to complete PhDs and so our attention will turn to ensuring these
female students receive support to embark on an academic career as outlined in our Action Plan (2.2).

(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.

At undergraduate level the gender ratio of applications, offers and acceptances is consistent throughout the application process. The average proportion of applications by females over the past three years was 80% and on average 81% of the offers were made to females and on average 81% of the registered students have been female. At postgraduate level these figures tend to follow the same consistent pattern with a couple of exceptions. The proportion of female applicants for the taught postgraduate courses averaged 81%, only 78% of the offers were made to females but on average 84% of the registered students were female. From these figures and also from the distance learning figures where an average of 24% of applications and offers were from males and only 19% of the registered students were male, it appears that if there is an issue, it is that male students who receive offers do not ultimately register for the course. At full-time postgraduate research level the average proportion of female applicants was 67% over the past three years, but 80% of the offers and of the students registered were female. These figures suggest that we have no issues in recruiting and ultimately registering female students and hence no action is required at this stage, but we will continue to monitor these figures (Action 1.4; 2.1).

(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.

[Figure 4. Percentage of each gender who gain each degree class across the last three years.]
As can be seen from Figure 5, our female undergraduate students tend to attain slightly higher degree classifications than their male counterparts. We see no need for action, but will continue to monitor these figures (Action 1.5).

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.

Figure 5 shows the proportion of male and female staff at the various grades. There is a strong representation of females up to the grade of Lecturer. The grade of Lecturer includes Teaching Fellows and Senior Teaching Fellows. At the more senior levels of Reader, Senior Lecturer and Professor there is still an underrepresentation of female staff but the figure demonstrates some gradual improvements over the past three years. It should be noted that the School has a high proportion of young members of staff who are still at a fairly early stage of their career. As a consequence the numbers of female staff at more senior positions should increase over the coming years, in particular with the help of the measures put in place in our action plan to support members of staff negotiate the path to promotion (Action Plan 1.3; 3.1).

![Figure 5. Percentage of male and female staff at the different grades for the last three years (GTA=Graduate Teaching Assistants, SL=Senior Lecturer).](image-url)
(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.

In the past three years 12 members of staff (8 female) left the School. Nine of these (7 female) were research (accounting for 38% of research staff in 2011 and 13% in 2012) and teaching staff (accounting for 11%-25% of teaching staff in the past three years) on fixed-term contracts, though one female started a PhD upon completion of her contract. One male and one female Lecturer (accounting for 5% of staff at that grade at the point of leaving) left for positions elsewhere, the male left for a Senior Lecturer position and the female, who was from New Zealand, left for a position in Australia. One male Professor retired. Aside from the number of staff leaving at the end of their fixed-term contracts, the number of staff leaving is very small and there are no differences between male and female staff. However, we intend to revise our current leaving form to include additional questions which will ensure that we can monitor the reasons staff have for leaving (see Action Plan 1.2).

Total word count this section 1665

**Supporting and advancing women’s careers – maximum 5000 words**

4. **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.

For the past three years the mean number of applications from women for teaching and research positions was 83% and of the 17 offers made for teaching and research positions, 15 were to women. At Lecturer grade the ratio of applications from men and women has changed from 37% female in 2009/2010, to 57% female in 2010/2011 and 73% female in 2011/2012. Of the four appointments made, three were female and one male. In the past three years there has only been one appointment at Senior Lecturer (a woman) for which the application rate was 60% female and one appointment to chair (a man) for which 60% of the applications came from men. It is clear from these figures that the school has no difficulty in attracting female applicants and indeed the majority of the appointments made have been female. However, the application rate from women for the chair position emphasises our need to work on our recruitment processes to encourage female applicants at this level (Action Plan 1.1; 3.2).
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.

In the past three years, one application for promotion has been made by a man and eight applications have been made by women. All of these applications were for promotion to Senior Lecturer; apart from one application by a woman for promotion to Chair. Of these applications, two applications to Senior Lecturer have been successful; one man and one woman. The mean success rate for promotion in SET departments across the University for the past three years is 55%. Promotion rate for females across SET for the years 2010, 2011, and 2012 is 40%, 78% and 42% respectively. The overall success rate for the three years is 52%. Whereas for men it is 57%, 47% and 63% with an overall success rate of 57%. In light of the University wide figures, it is clear that the experiences made by staff in the School require further examination. Three of the applications were first time applications, one of which was successful, and four of the applications were repeat (second time) applications, only one of which was successful. These figures very clearly highlight the need to improve the support we provide to staff preparing for and applying for promotion (see Action Plan 3.2).

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.

We are very careful to follow the strict procedures set out by Human Resources. The majority of our applicants are women and so we have no concern about attracting female candidates to apply. Nevertheless, we intend to revise the materials that we as a School send to potential applicants to highlight the family-friendly nature of our working environment. We also intend to revise our website to include such information (Action Plan 3.2).
(ii) Support for staff at key career transition points – having identified key areas of attrition of female staff in the department, comment on any interventions, programmes and activities that support women at the crucial stages, such as personal development training, opportunities for networking, mentoring programmes and leadership training. Identify which have been found to work best at the different career stages.

The Staff Progression Sub-Committee reports to and advises the Head of School on any issues related to staff progression and development. In practice its activities consist of the organisation of Staff Appraisals and summarising the main aggregate points to arise across the School; having an input into staff probation as requested, reviewing cases for promotion and making recommendations to the Head of School; promoting staff development and training and maintaining a running record within the School. The main role of this group has been to prepare candidates for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and to discuss required actions for unsuccessful applicants, such as providing additional support for networking. The Athena process has highlighted a clear need for revisiting the current arrangements and thus our action plan includes measures to improve the support our colleagues receive in preparing for promotion. The planned actions include a revision of the current appraisal system and annual sessions to address career progression and promotion. We are also structuring the research groups to provide greater mentoring Action Plan 3.1; 4.1; 4.2).

5. Career development

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

(i) Promotion and career development – comment on the appraisal and career development process, and promotion criteria and whether these take into consideration responsibilities for teaching, research, administration, pastoral work and outreach work; is quality of work emphasised over quantity of work?

Any member of academic staff may apply for promotion directly to the university, although the School has procedures in place for those who wish to use them in applying through the School. At any time a member of staff may discuss applying for promotion with the Head of School. Those academics who wish to apply may elect to meet to discuss their application with the Head of School and the Chair of the School Staff Progression Sub-Committee (both of whom have extensive experience of university procedures and practice regarding promotion). In the first of what may be a series of face-to-face meetings the potential applicant is guided through the promotions procedure and given advice on how to structure an application. In the following meeting(s) drafts of the individual’s promotion application are commented upon and refined prior to submission. The Athena process has highlighted that appraisals and promotion are two key areas in need of attention. One of
our actions will therefore be the introduction of an annual away day(s) focused upon career development. At this time all appraisals will be carried out which will focus attention on staff development issues and allow us to identify key areas for action. This event will also be an opportunity to run workshops on how staff members align themselves toward promotion. Workshops will be appropriate for both staff members preparing more immediately for promotion and staff members who are working towards promotion as a more long term goal. We intend to invite the Head of College to this event for his input but also as a means for him to receive feedback. Currently, only staff members on probation are formally allocated a mentor and there are various informal arrangements for mentorship of other staff. As part of our action plan we will be offering mentorship to all staff members (Action Plan 3.1; 4.1; 4.2).

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

New staff on probation are allocated a mentor and they receive an informal induction from the Director of Undergraduate Studies who is also currently the School’s Equal Opportunities Officer. New staff members also attend the induction organised by the University. The School of Psychology Learning and Teaching Committee are planning to introduce an online staff repository of information on Blackboard. This repository will be helpful for new, as well as existing staff, as many new procedures get lost in the minutes of meetings and to people’s memories. The Staff Progression Sub-Committee currently plays no role at induction but focuses on supporting staff during the promotion process.

We have conducted policies of flexible working and good employment practices for some time. But recognise that these now need to be formalised. In future, new colleagues and all present colleagues will be given a version of this report as a description of our School Policy in these respects (see Action Plan 3.3; 4.3).

(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.

We are keen to encourage our students to think about their future careers. We therefore have a programme of careers speakers (both male and female, though more male than female, see 2.3.1 in Action Plan) throughout the year aimed at our undergraduate students (this includes talks by Chartered Psychologists, but also by academics speaking about postgraduate study
opportunities). These speakers come in at a time identified in the timetable as ‘available’ across all three year groups to enable access for all. During the main teaching term, it is not possible to find a time and suitable location during the middle part of the day and so the slot tends to be at the end of the working day (5-6pm). Many speakers are also not able to attend a daytime slot. In recognition of this, all speakers have provided electronic versions of their materials which we make available online. Towards the end of term, when the timetable frees up, we timetable sessions to take place during normal working hours. We find that attendance rates do not differ for the daytime and end of day slots. However, as part of our survey of undergraduate students with family commitments (Action 2.3) we intend to establish how problematic the timing of these sessions is and examine whether alternative arrangements are possible.

Undergraduate students are allocated a personal tutor at the start of their course, but can request to change this person at any time. We guarantee to give them a different person and will accommodate requests to transfer to a female (or male) tutor.

We recognize the need within the School to encourage female PhD students to develop academic careers. As a first step in this process, we asked all PhD students to describe the support (formal and informal) provided for female PhD 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. Our PhD students feel that they can approach their supervisors for advice regarding future career options and also help in making decisions to pursue a future in academia. These students recognise the need to start their job search early and acknowledge that there are various possible areas of interest. Our female PhD students feel that they can trust female academics to informally discuss areas of concern more specific to female academics. They also feel that female academics within our department pose as good role models and are suitable mentors for junior researchers. At present we do not have any formal mentoring schemes within the department, but this is a focus within our action plan. Our PhD students would also like the department to promote other groups active in the university who are keen to assist women in academia. Female postgraduates without female supervisors felt this was not an issue, as they felt that they could consult female researchers active in their area for support. Trust and approachability are the most important aspects for our students, not the gender of their supervisors. As part of our action plan we will be introducing annual career development sessions targeted at our postgraduate students (Action Plan 2.2).
6. Organisation and culture

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

(i) **Male and female representation on committees** – provide a breakdown by committee and explain any differences between male and female representation. Explain how potential members are identified.

Tables 1-3 below provide information on the gender composition of all the committees in the School. Previously membership of committees was decided by initially asking for volunteers and if there were no volunteers the Head of School would allocate roles. However, since the introduction of the workload model we can identify people with the capacity. The totals of male and female representation on the committees for each year demonstrate that 43% of the committees are composed of female staff. Whilst the representation of female staff on the committees has not changed over the past three years, the number of female chairs has increased from three to seven. Thanks to our workload model we can now also easily obtain data on staff representation on committees external to the School, i.e., University and College Committees. These figures show that in the current year 43% of the representatives are female. Given the imbalance of genders in more senior positions these figures reflect that we have begun to take steps to provide opportunities for staff at more junior positions to participate in committees outside of the school. Nevertheless, we will remain vigilant in the long term aim of ensuring through good process that this imbalance disappears in time. At which point we will expect these statistics to match the gender balance of the School as a whole. As part of the action plan we will monitor the representation of women on internal and external committees (Action Plan 5.2; 5.7).

Table 1. Committee members in 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Female Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Research Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial Advisory Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Research Ethics Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web and Library Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Board of Studies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Student Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Staff Liaison Committee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Revolving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (acting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Working Party</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes (acting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Studies (now SPLAT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Board of Examiners</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Resources &amp; Infrastructure committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena Swan Group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Internal</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff representation on Committees outside the School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes (acting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Management Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Research Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Academic Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Employability Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessability (University Committee)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course termination (University Committee)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other University Committees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme approvals (University Committee)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercalated college committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Theme Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Early Career Research Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Enterprise Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College IT committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Studentship Selection Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College VIP committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total External</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Committee members in 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees 2010-11</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Female Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Research Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial Advisory Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Research Ethics Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web and Library Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Board of Studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Student Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Staff Liaison Committee</td>
<td>15 (6 of whom students)</td>
<td>9 (1 of whom student)</td>
<td>Yes (Student Revolving with male staff member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Resources Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Working Party</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Board of Examiners</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16 (2 of whom External examiners)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Resources &amp; Infrastructure committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 68 | 90 | 7 |

Table 3. Committee members in 2009-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees 2009-10</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Female Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Research Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial Advisory Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Research Ethics Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web and Library Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Board of Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Student Committee</td>
<td>3 (1 of whom student)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(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.

All research staff are on fixed-term contracts, as is quite typical for this grade due to the nature of how these positions are funded. In 2010 there were two female Teaching Fellows and one male Professor on fixed-term contracts. In 2011 the numbers were three female Teaching Fellows and one male Professor and currently there are two female Teaching Fellows and one female Lecturer on fixed-term contracts. The numbers are too small to be able to draw any firm conclusions. Of note is that one Teaching Fellow and one Professor went from fixed-term to open-ended contracts. We hope that the remaining members of staff on fixed-term contracts can benefit from our ongoing and planned actions outlined in our action plan (e.g., Action Plan 4.1; 4.2; 4.3; 5.1; 5.3; 5.3.1; 5.4).

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

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

Several important committees within the School are chaired by women at Senior Teaching Fellow, Lecturer, and Senior Lecturer grade (Workload Committee, Resources and Finance Committee, Board of Undergraduate Studies, Ethics Committee, Postgraduate Research Committee). Outside of the school a number of important college and University committees are attended by women at Lecturer grade, including the Senate and the College
Academic Committee. As a consequence, the women at more senior levels do not suffer from ‘committee overload’, as women at more junior levels are given these opportunities as part of their career development. As part of our Action Plan we intend to monitor these numbers and ensure that in future the representation of women on decision making committees continues to increase (Action Plan 5.2; 5.7).

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

The School has recently developed a sophisticated on-line workload model to document the work all staff do. This includes FT and PT academics and Teaching Fellows. The system is transparent and tariffs for all the tasks in the School have been agreed, publicised and are open to adjustment. If staff wish to make an adjustment to the tariff for a task, they complete a short form to request that change. The model also enables us to formalise adjustments made for particular reasons, such as new staff and staff returning from maternity leave. The model can produce reports to show individual staff member’s workload (and in which semester it takes place) and which staff perform each task. Staff member’s gender and job title are recorded in the system and the software can produce reports for tasks examining gender breakdown.

Examination of these reports has not revealed any serious concerns over the workload distribution between female and male staff. Some of the role allocation reflects the staff profile of the School. Hence, two thirds of the appraisals are conducted by male staff members, four of the six research groups are led by men, and the College Management and Research Committees are attended by 3 male members of the school. However, female members of staff are represented at the Senate and the College Academic Committee and the Research Excellence Framework Committee has two female members and only one male member. In order to make allowances for different circumstances, a ‘discretionary hours’ box can be used by administrators to give hours to staff for things such as maternity/paternity leave or for new staff, so that the total hours worked does not look low when other staff see the totals of hours worked. All committee roles in the School and University are modelled in the system (including the members and Chair of the Athena Swan committee). Pastoral and administrative responsibilities are spread across all members of staff (each member of staff typically has 20-25 personal tutees). The School actively tries to distribute PhD students across staff so that all staff get the opportunity to supervise, which is good for career progression. In terms of advancing gender equality we intend to undertake regular monitoring by gender (as has been done for this submission), and modelling changes in rules to see what impact changes might have on gender representation (Action Plan 5.7).
(iii) **Timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings** – provide evidence of consideration for those with family responsibilities, for example what the department considers to be core hours and whether there is a more flexible system in place.

All meeting dates (e.g., staff meetings, board of undergraduate studies etc) are set at the start of the academic year to give people maximum notice. Core meetings always take place on a Wednesday afternoon when there is no University teaching to ensure as many as possible have the opportunity to attend. The meetings tend to start at 2 so that they are over by 4 and do not interfere with childcare responsibilities. Other meetings are typically arranged by ‘doodle poll’ so as to ascertain the most suitable time for everyone.

A number of academic staff have lunch together once a week during teaching terms. All members of staff are invited to this. The Christmas meal also takes place during lunch hours. Additional social gatherings, such as a ghost walk and the Psychology quiz take place during the evening as they include staff and students who have lectures and other commitments during the day.

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

The School is currently spread out between 5 sites, which has its clear drawbacks in bringing members of staff together. However, there are plans for a new building which will be available from 2015 where the majority of staff will be housed together. We have requested a coffee room and breastfeeding and baby changing facilities in the new building. There are several friendship groups among the staff and some staff members have been meeting for lunch once a week for some time. During the assessment process we recognised the value of these lunchtime meetings to foster a greater sense of community and so an invite was extended to all staff to join these weekly lunchtime meetings. We recognised that there is a need for more opportunities for staff and students to meet informally. As a consequence we have introduced a wine reception after the external speaker seminar and have extended the staff meetings by thirty minutes to include coffee at the start of the meeting.

As previously described, pastoral care for personal tutees is shared among all staff. Further pastoral care is provided by year tutors, two of whom are currently male. There is a strong representation of women in various key roles, such as the Director of undergraduate studies and the Course Director of Occupational Psychology. Speakers at the external seminars have previously been mainly male but in the past year there were an equal number of male and female speakers and the programme for the current year has more female than male speakers (some slots for next semester are yet to be filled). The annual Sluckin Lecture (a big lecture and reunion of staff in honour of a previous Head of School) has so far only had male speakers but the 2013 event has a female speaker. We include an action to monitor the gender
representation at the external seminars and Sluckin Lecture. (Action Plan 5.1; 5.3; 5.3.1; 5.3.2; 5.4; 5.8)

(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.

There are several tiers of outreach work that members of staff participate in. On an individual and voluntary basis, some people give one-off research led talks to local schools organised through the University outreach team. These talks are timetabled at the staff member’s convenience around their formal teaching commitments with the schools involved. Staff members involved in this activity have responded individually to Central University calls for assistance and take part on an entirely voluntary basis and are a mixture of males and females, generally without young child care responsibilities.

We are in the process of setting up a more formal outreach activity; an open day aimed at local sixth form colleges. This annual event will take place over a period of about 4 hours and has come about from staff members wishing to take a more formal and organised school-wide approach to outreach. The participants are volunteers working together with CULN (Colleges University of Leicester Network) to put together this short programme. The activity is recognised in our workload model but the staff members involved are all volunteers, who have proactively sought to be involved in this type of work. They are a mixture of males and females at different grades (e.g. Lecturer and Senior Lecturer) and some have young child care responsibilities.

The final tier of outreach work is the most formalised and time intensive whereby Course Tutors are involved in student recruitment activities. This task features heavily in their formal administrative load. These events take place during the day and fall throughout the year and on a mixture of weekends and weekdays (staff sign up their availability to particular dates). Historically these roles have been carried out by those without young childcare responsibilities. This year course tutors have been supplemented at these events by volunteers from among the staff and undergraduate and postgraduate community.

7. Flexibility and managing career breaks

a) Provide data for the past three years (where possible with clearly labelled graphical illustrations) on the following with commentary on their significance and how they have affected action planning.
(i) **Maternity return rate** – comment on whether maternity return rate in the department has improved or deteriorated and any plans for further improvement. If the department is unable to provide a maternity return rate, please explain why.

In the past three years four women have taken maternity leave and all of them have returned to work.

(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.

Currently, one lecturer is on extended paternity leave for 6 months, having also taken his entitlement of paternity leave at the birth of his child. We know of three additional men who became fathers in the past three years, two of whom took paternity leave. One failed to take his entitlement as he did not make enquiries within the deadlines set out by the government. One of our actions is to improve access to paternity, adoption and parental leave to ensure that such a situation does not arise again (Action Plan 3.3).

(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.

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.

Currently, two female and one male Senior Lecturers, one female Lecturer, one female Research Fellow and two female Administrators have formal flexible working arrangements arranged with the Head of School. The Head of School is supportive and open to discussions for flexible working. Nonetheless, we have included an action to give more information and training for managers to improve their management of flexible working. Consequently, we have asked the Equalities Office to run a workshop on this and we will ensure all managers attend it. Furthermore, we will introduce the role of ‘flexible working mentor’ as someone who can provide support and advice on the advantages and disadvantages of flexible working (Actions 3.3; 6.1; 6.1.1).
(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.

Consistent with its demography, the School has considerable experience of maternity leave (ML). At present 2 members of staff are returned from ML in the last 2 months, 2 are on ML as well as a current paternity leave (for one semester), and three more are due to go on leave. The workload model allows for careful monitoring and planning of work. In one case, we employed a Teaching Assistant to cover the work and in another we have been able to extend an existing fixed-term Lectureship to provide maternity cover. We have often timetabled study leaves to run before or after maternity leaves to support women’s ability to maintain their research profile. We provide support for maternity leave by assisting with planning, contact days and return to work arrangements. We have negotiated with timetabling to avoid 9-10 or 5-6 lectures where possible. In one case a member of research staff negotiated a 4-day week upon her return to work with her full-time hours made up elsewhere as suited her personal circumstances. Our most recent appointment to Senior Lecturer, to start on 1/11/12, informed us of her pregnancy at the point of appointment and so we have appointed her with special measures to accommodate her transition to the new post whilst pregnant. Overall, the school is as supportive as possible and does its best to support female staff before, during and after a period of ML. Our survey suggested that staff members are not clear on our ML policies and therefore we include an action to make a formal statement of intent for the departmental policy, based on the precedent of existing custom and practice. We will reasonably support those undertaking maternity or adoption leave beyond our statutory duties in whatever ways that will diminish or hopefully remove any negative impact maternity or adoption might have upon the careers of women and men. (Action Plan 3.3; 5.4)
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8. **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.

A staff survey highlighted the need for greater transparency of how maternity leave is covered. As a consequence, an announcement was made to ensure
staff members appreciated some of the current arrangements in place to cover current and impending maternity leave. As part of our action plan we will ensure that such arrangements are brought to the attention of staff (Action Plan 5.9). The survey also highlighted the need to improve the role of the Staff Progression Sub-Committee (or an alternative Committee to be established by the Head of School); this has resulted in a number of actions associated with appraisal and promotion support outlined in the action plan.
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9. 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.