



Department Application Bronze Award



PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This document provides information from the Athena SWAN Awards Handbook which is relevant to Departments making an initial Bronze Application ONLY.

Please note that the information given here is a subset of the ECU Handbook:

<http://www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Athena-SWAN-Charter-Handbook-May-2015-Final.pdf>

Where there is any conflict, the official ECU version is authoritative, but please contact the Equality and Diversity Section (contacts as below) with any issues.

Notes from the Equality and Diversity Section for Cambridge Departments or Faculties are in boxes like this one

Equality and Diversity Section Athena SWAN Contacts:

Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics and Medicine (STEM) Departments

Dr Vivien Guar, (vivien.hodges@admin.cam.ac.uk)

Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Business and Law (AHSSBL) Departments

Louise Atkin (louise.atkin@admin.cam.ac.uk)

David Peet (david.peet@admin.cam.ac.uk)

ATHENA SWAN PRINCIPLES

Athena SWAN is based around a group of Principles, as below. The University has signed up to these in a formal letter: the Department does not need to do this as well: the critical document showing the Department's commitment is the Head of Department's letter in the Application Form.

The Athena SWAN charter process is based on ten key principles. By being part of Athena SWAN, institutions are committing to a progressive charter; adopting these principles within their policies, practices, action plans and culture.

1. We acknowledge that academia cannot reach its full potential unless it can benefit from the talents of all.
2. We commit to advancing gender equality in academia, in particular addressing the loss of women across the career pipeline and the absence of women from senior academic, professional and support roles.
3. We commit to addressing unequal gender representation across academic disciplines and professional and support functions. In this we recognise disciplinary differences including:
 - = the relative underrepresentation of women in senior roles in arts, humanities, social sciences, business and law (AHSSBL)
 - = the particularly high loss rate of women in science, technology, engineering, mathematics and medicine (STEMM)
4. We commit to tackling the gender pay gap.
5. We commit to removing the obstacles faced by women, in particular, at major points of career development and progression including the transition from PhD into a sustainable academic career.
6. We commit to addressing the negative consequences of using short-term contracts for the retention and progression of staff in academia, particularly women.
7. We commit to tackling the discriminatory treatment often experienced by trans people.
8. We acknowledge that advancing gender equality demands commitment and action from all levels of the organisation and in particular active leadership from those in senior roles.
9. We commit to making and mainstreaming sustainable structural and cultural changes to advance gender equality, recognising that initiatives and actions that support individuals alone will not sufficiently advance equality.
10. All individuals have identities shaped by several different factors. We commit to considering the intersection of gender and other factors wherever possible.

ATHENA SWAN BRONZE DEPARTMENT AWARDS

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.

COMPLETING THE FORM

Use the 'Athena SWAN Department Application Form May 2015' that can be used for both Bronze and Silver Department awards. You should complete each section of the application applicable to the award level you are applying for.

Style

There is no prescribed style for completing the various sections of the application form. You may find it helpful to review successful submissions published by current award holders. These should be made available online when the application is successful. (See current submissions online)

<http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charter-marks/athena-swan/athena-swan-members/>

ECU staff cannot read through submissions prior to the deadline and cannot provide feedback on specific content.

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.

Department application	Bronze
Word limit	10,500
<i>Recommended word count</i>	
1. Letter of endorsement	500
2. Description of the department	500
3. Self-assessment process	1000
4. Picture of the department	2000
5. Supporting and advancing women's careers	6000
6. Supporting trans people	n/a
7. Further information	500

The word count includes:

- = all body text
- = footnotes and other types of references
- = any standalone text or included in tables or graphs

The following are not included in the word count:

- = tables and graphs providing they do not include standalone text or prose. Any text included within the table should only make sense within the context of the table or graph (e.g. titles and data labels).
- = action plan
- = details of your self-assessment team: these can be displayed as a table using a maximum of 20 words for each team member

Requests for extended word limits

Applicants who wish to request extensions to word limits on the following grounds must contact ECU's Equality charters team before submitting their application.

Large faculties

Requests for additional words are considered on a case-by-case basis for large faculties, colleges or other organisational units consisting of numerous departments applying for a department award. These words should be employed to demonstrate how Athena SWAN principles are embedded in each constituent unit, and, in the case of Silver show impact. These extra words can be used across the submission document, and it should be noted in the word counts at the end of each section where they have been used.

Faculties who wish to extend their word limit in this way should contact ECU's Equality charters team for approval at least two months in advance of the submission deadline. Where additional words are granted, the maximum allowance will be 1000 words.

Exceptional circumstances

Requests for additional word allowances to account for exceptional circumstances are considered on a case-by-case basis. Examples of where such awards may be made include where a restructure has recently taken place, or where the submitting unit has a particularly unique or unusual structure, or is subject to particular constraints.

Additional words should always be used to explain how the special circumstances have impacted or been taken into account with respect to the Athena SWAN activities and the progression of gender equality.

Applicants who wish to extend their word limit in this way should contact ECU's Equality charters team for approval at least two months in advance of the submission deadline. Where additional words are granted, the maximum allowance will be 1000 words.

Additional information

Appendices are not permitted. Any appendices will be removed from submissions and will not be considered by the awards panel.

Do not include links to further information, as panellists will not consider anything in addition to the information included in the application form itself. Relevant information should be included in the substantive application.

Evidence of good practice

Panels are particularly keen to see examples of innovative and inventive good practice.

We expect examples of this kind to be limited at Bronze level, but consider including some good practice examples, however seemingly insignificant.

While it is recognised that good practice benefits both men and women, Athena SWAN awards are designed, in particular, to recognise efforts to address the absence of women in senior academic, leadership, management and policy-making roles.

Accordingly, panels expect to see some evidence of gender-specific measures if appropriate, and/or commentary and evidence on how initiatives have in particular benefited women.

There is no prescriptive list of measures that panels expect to see in place at every institution or department. However it is important to show that you recognise issues fundamental to career progression, for example, the importance of universal appraisal and equitable promotions processes.

Where good practice is cited, ensure that policies are explained in sufficient detail rather than just stated as a title. Submissions should also avoid presenting legal compliance as good practice.

Data considerations

The self-assessment team needs to decide the clearest way of presenting data in the narrative to allow the awards panel the maximum insight into the issues affecting the department or institution.

Your assigned Athena SWAN contact can offer support preparing data, pivot charts, graphs and diagrams from Excel.

Equality and Diversity will provide a comprehensive set of data from central records. E&D will also hold workshops to help Departments analyse and prepare their data, including benchmarking.

It may, however, be necessary to make sure that the Department has records that can be mined as well. Three years data (minimum) are required.

Data that is provided centrally includes:

Student numbers and achievement, by gender, by year. Undergraduate; postgraduate (taught and research)
Academic staff (includes researchers) broken down by Research Associates, Lecturers, Senior Lecturer and Reader; Professor; by gender
Appointment (applicants, short list, appointed; by gender) and promotion data (applicants (compared to potential pool), successes; by gender)
Compulsory training (e.g. H&S; E&D);

Data to be sourced locally includes:

Induction, staff review and development by gender. Take up of training opportunities, by gender; outreach work, hours by gender

More interesting questions to consider include – is there any difference in the time taken to complete a PhD by gender? Do international applications skew data for postgraduate or research posts?

Data should not be reported in isolation. Answer the 'So what?' question to feed into the analysis and action plan.

Applicants should use data for the following:

= As an evidence base and rationale to formulate proactive actions, including activities, programmes and changes to policy to address problems identified, that can be measured and evaluated. Demonstrate both in the narrative and the action plan where the rationale/evidence of need to implement initiatives comes from, and how hypotheses will be tested through future activities in the action plan.

= To identify key trends and issues in the institution/department. Consider whether this can be used to demonstrate positive (or negative) effects of existing actions/policies on particular groups of staff.

Consultation

At all levels of award staff should be consulted for their views on a broad range of issues covered by the submission. Teams should consider what strategies can be employed to learn about and be responsive to the views and issues pertaining to the culture and processes of their institution or department. This will help the self-assessment team to identify key areas for development and to put in place actions to address these. Consultation may take a variety of forms, for example, focus groups or staff surveys.

= Where a survey is conducted, consider how any qualitative data will be presented. Where appropriate, qualitative consultation responses may be presented alongside quantitative data to provide further evidence.

= An honest appraisal is essential. Panels welcome reflection on good practice and that which requires development, attention or improvement. For example, if a staff consultation identifies a problematic culture, outline and evaluate the results and set out the actions you will implement, together with any successes in addressing the problems.

General data requirements

= Data should be presented in whichever way applicants feel most explanatory and appropriate (tables or graphs), as long as they clearly highlight trends and draw these out in the narrative.

= Data should correspond to the section heading, and present at least the three years preceding the submission.

= Where data is not available, this should be explained with reasons given (and, in most cases, a relevant action). Applications will not be penalised for only presenting the minimum number of years of data. Check each section of the relevant application form for the exact data requirements for that section.

= Percentages and raw numbers should be presented (both in tables and within the narrative).

= Graphs and tables should be clearly cross-referenced to the narrative and relevant section number and trends should be evaluated.

= Data should be compared with the national benchmark data.

= Where data is used to inform a particular action point, the rationale and the actual action point should be embedded in the narrative and cross-referenced to the full action plan. The panel will look at how effectively data, evaluation and action plans have been linked.

[= If applying for Silver, it is important to demonstrate any evidence of impact to date.]

Tips on presenting data

= A mix of graphs and tables should be used to present the data.

= Do not feel the need to present all the data that has been collected: carefully consider which data is relevant to the application.

= Make sure that graphs and tables are clearly labelled so that it is clear to the panellists what data is being presented.

= If using greyscale rather than colour for applications, consider how clearly the data in the graphs is represented.

= Refer to national benchmark data throughout the application.

= Consider the size of the graphs and text in tables, it should be easy and clear to read and understand.

Benchmarking data

Throughout the self-assessment and subsequent action plan, the applicant should be benchmarked against comparators, both to measure progress and to ascertain where there may be good practice to learn from and strive towards.

Appropriate benchmarking provides assessment panels with an indication of applicants' understanding of the scale of the issues they are facing as well as an indication of their ambitions and awareness of gender equality initiatives.

Purpose of benchmarking

Benchmarking is for the benefit of the applicant; while panels are interested in the benchmarking data used, and it can help to inform their decision to award the charter mark, the main focus should be in using the data to drive the applicant's aspirations.

Benchmarking initiatives and actions

Benchmarking can be used not only to compare the demographics of your workforce or student population, but to measure the success of the initiatives you implement. For example, you might choose to introduce a programme of work to improve the rate of promotions for women staff. Part of the evaluation of that programme could be to compare its success with different programmes undertaken in other organisations (that need not be related to higher education) tackling similar issues.

Which benchmarks should we use?

The Athena SWAN process is not prescriptive in what data is used or how it is benchmarked, as it will depend upon the institutional context.

Be ambitious in the benchmark chosen and use the benchmark to challenge your institution to make significant improvements as well as to measure progress and celebrate successes.

Make sure that it is clear throughout the application which benchmarking data source has been used, for example, the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), and the timeframe the data refers to.

Some organisations may find it particularly challenging to identify appropriate external benchmarking data. For example, departments may focus on a particular specialism for which there are very few research centres. In these cases, benchmarking should still be attempted, and it should be explained in the submission why particular benchmarks (as opposed to, for example, the national averages) have been used.

Internal benchmarking is also a particularly important element of the action plan. For example, where a success measure is an increase on an initial proportion, an indication of both the current and targeted outcome should be presented.

BRONZE DEPARTMENT AWARD

Prerequisites

The institution to which the applicant department belongs must hold a valid Athena SWAN Bronze award (or above), have signed up to the May 2015 Athena SWAN principles, and have no outstanding membership fees.

The institution must hold a valid Athena SWAN Bronze award or ECU's gender equality charter mark award (granted in October 2014).

A department may decide to apply for an award in the same submission round that the parent institution applies for its first institution award. While this is allowed, applicants must be aware that should the institution be unsuccessful in its application the department will be ineligible for an award.

The University of Cambridge has an Athena SWAN Silver Award. Departments do not need to concern themselves with issues of the validity of the University Award.

What needs to be demonstrated

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. The department must also plan future actions. This includes:

= an assessment of gender equality in the institution, including quantitative (staff and student data) and qualitative (policies, practices, systems and arrangements) evidence and identifying both challenges and opportunities.

This normally means that the Department will have taken part in a staff survey (could be a School-wide survey) and/or carried out some conscious consultations such as targeted focus groups.

= a four-year plan that builds on this assessment, information on activities that are already in place and what has been learned from these
= the development of an organisational structure, including a self-assessment team, to carry proposed actions forward

The key element here is that the Department is demonstrating efficient implementation of University policy in terms of its practice, but Departments cannot solely rely on central policies. Panels like to see evidence of what local initiatives and improvements have been implemented that support central policy and how these are assessed. This then provides the basis for the action plan.

SUBMITTING AS A DEPARTMENT OR FACULTY

The full ECU Guidance is given here. If you are considering a joint application with another Department (or Departments), please contact Equality and Diversity first. If this section is not relevant to you, move on to the Section 'Submitting an Application'.

There are many different structures in institutions, faculties and schools and it is down to the individual institution to decide the composition of units that put forward award applications.

We use the term department to apply to a range of units that sit below institution-level awards. There are precedents for a wide range of successful submissions from very small departments to large faculties

ECU's Equality charters team is happy to advise on which organisational unit should be put forward for an award, but ultimately this is a decision that must be taken within the institution. This should be done as early as possible in the application process to assist you to prepare your application, and must be decided by the two-months' notice of your intention to submit.

There are a number of considerations to be taken into account when considering your application.

Size

Size alone does not preclude a unit from submitting and there is no minimum or maximum size (however, please contact us if the unit has fewer than 15 academic staff so we can discuss your application).

Departments should bear the following in mind:

= all departments need to find suitable comparators for benchmarking

= all departments are subject to the same word limits with the exception of very large departments (see page 27 on requesting extended word limits)

Small units

= Units need to be able to prove that they hold adequate decision-making power within their organisation to allow them to make changes that will effect cultural transformation.

Large units

= Communication of and commitment to the Charter principles needs to be apparent across the submitting unit; responsibility and ownership should not be driven by an individual sub-unit.

= Large departments need to clearly demonstrate good practice (and impact at Silver level) across all units, and that issues specific to different subject areas have been identified.

= Data is required for every constituent subject area as averages across diverse departments may conceal problems in individual subject areas.

Note: Applications from faculties that span a range of subject areas may find it difficult to meet the application requirements.

Faculty or department?

Whether you choose to submit as a faculty as a whole or as a separate department hinges on the make-up and autonomy of the individual sub-units.

When deciding whether to submit as a faculty or individual departments, the following should be considered:

- = sufficient size to pursue the self-assessment process
- = autonomy and control over relevant policies (eg recruitment, induction, promotion, core hours, flexible working)
- = ability to provide data for students and staff disaggregated from the rest of the faculty
- = distinct structure and culture within departments

Note: If a department currently holds, or previously held, an award it is not eligible to be included in a faculty submission unless there has been a significant restructuring event.

Similarly, departments included in a successful faculty submission are not eligible to apply for individual awards. Should they wish to apply individually, the faculty award would be invalidated.

Management structure

The head of department or faculty should have overall responsibility for resource allocation, budgets, academic strategy and policy in the submitting unit, so as to be able to effect the changes set out in the action plan.

Joint Department Applications

ECU accepts joint applications from closely aligned departments.

A joint department application may be applicable where departments are small (fewer than 15 academic staff) and/or are of very closely-related subject.

Below are some areas for consideration when making a joint department application.

- = The self-assessment team is likely to be best placed to decide which size unit is submitted for an award.
- = The panel expects data from all the constituent units/departments within the application, not averages.
- = Joint department applications need to clearly demonstrate effective practice (and impact for Silver awards) across all units.
- = Issues specific to different subject areas must have been identified and addressed.
- = Communication of the charter principles needs to be apparent across all the departments, it should not be driven by one single unit, and the links between the units should be evident.

Newly Formed Departments

Bronze and Silver level applications are required to submit three years of quantitative data. It may be difficult for new or recently formed departments to provide this data, or to provide analysis and commentary in the absence of historical data.

If this is the case, please explain in your application where and why you are not able to provide three years of data. You may wish to place more emphasis on the use of qualitative data. If the department has developed out of pre-existing departments (eg following a merger), consideration of the data pertaining to those individual units will be relevant and should be included. If you are not sure whether to submit, please contact ECU's Equality charters team for advice.

Changes to Structure

If the structure of the award-holding institution or department changes significantly during the period of award validity, please contact ECU's Equality charters team as a new, updated submission may be required.

Examples of structure change:

- = merging or the splitting of departments or institutions
- = staffing restructure

Awards may be withdrawn if information is established that means the award holder no longer satisfies the requirements of the award. See ECU's Athena SWAN Charter: guide to processes (Section 4).

Students

Where a department has its own students (undergraduate and/or postgraduate), this data should be provided. A unit may still apply if it does not provide teaching or supervision, but this should be noted in the Picture of the Department section. National student figures for that subject area should be considered in the application as this will impact on the pipeline in that area.

Parent Institution Awards

A department may decide to apply for an award in the same submission round that the parent institution applies for its first institution award. While this is allowed, applicants must be aware that should the institution be unsuccessful in its application, the department will be ineligible for an award.

SUBMITTING AN APPLICATION

Institutions and departments that are preparing submissions should notify ECU's Equality charters team of their intention to apply two months in advance of the submissions deadline (by the last working day of the month). This enables panels to be scheduled in advance of the deadline. Application forms should be submitted by email to athenaswan@ecu.ac.uk by 5pm on either the last working day of April or November.

All communication between the University of Cambridge and ECU should be through your assigned Athena SWAN Officer in the Equality and Diversity Section. If in doubt please contact the Athena SWAN leads above.

This should be consolidated as one PDF file and should include:

- = cover page including contact details
- = a copy of the original letter of endorsement from the head of department (we do not require this as a separate original)
- = completed application form
- = action plan

Renewals

There are currently no renewal forms for the May 2015 criteria. Pre-May 2015 members wishing to renew under the May 2015 criteria will be treated as new applications. Applications do not therefore need to include the original action plan or progress log.

The receipt of applications will be acknowledged by ECU within five working days. Please allow this time to elapse before contacting ECU's Equality charters team.

Colour copies

ECU will reproduce your application for consideration by the awards panel. These will be printed in black and white. If you prefer for your submission to be considered in colour you should post ten colour copies to arrive at ECU within five working days of the deadline. These should be printed double-sided and corner stapled, rather than bound.

Send copies to:

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

Please make it clear, during the application process whether or not you will be providing colour copies. It will be the Department or Faculty's responsibility to ensure despatch. The Department or Faculty must have the resources to produce the copies themselves.

Additional information

If a panel is not able to reach a decision based on the information in the application, in exceptional circumstances they may seek additional information from the applicant. Applicants should be prepared for such requests, which could be made up to three months after the submission deadline. The applicant will be given ten working days to provide the additional information.

Submission timeline

Timeline	Action	Cambridge Comment
-3/4 months	Organisational units that are unsure about whether to submit as a department, faculty school or similar should contact ECU	This should be done at the outset of the application process in consultation with E&D
-2 months	Applicants should inform ECU of their intention to submit	This must be done through E&D and will be conditional on the Department or Faculty having had their application assessed by a mock panel.
Last working day April / November 5pm	Submissions should be sent in PDF format to athenaswan@ecu.ac.uk . Late submissions not considered	This should be done through E&D unless express permission is given to the contrary
+5 working days	Colour copies of the application must be sent to ECU	Department responsibility; single copy to E&D
+2 months	Panels take place; supplementary information may be requested	Departments must ensure that appropriate staff are available to provide this
+5 months	Results are sent to applicants; feedback is sent to unsuccessful applicants. Applicants that receive awards should publish their submission on their website and inform Athena SWAN of the associated web address. Any personal or confidential information may be removed from the submission prior to publication	
+6 months	Feedback is sent for applications which received a lower level of award than applied for	
+7 months	Feedback is sent for applications which were successful at the level applied for.	Do not wait to start implementing your action plan.

AWARDS PANELS

ECU's Athena SWAN Charter award applications are assessed by peer review panels convened by ECU. The panel recommends decisions on awards to ECU. At least two members of ECU staff will be present on the panel to moderate and provide secretariat functions. The moderator will assist the panel by providing guidance on the application and assessment process and ensure that the panel complies with the requirements and guidance set out in the panellist role description.

To ensure consistency of panel assessment, if required, the moderator will provide guidance on whether the application meets the requirements of the award level applied for. The secretary will record the key discussion points of the award panel and request that the panel identifies what feedback should be provided to the applicant.

The panel will review up to six submissions in advance of the meeting.

Panellists will discuss each application and make a decision on whether to recommend to ECU that an award is conferred. The panel have a number of options when making a decision about each application.

The panel may recommend to ECU that they:

- = confer or renew the award at the level sought
- = confer or renew the award at a lower level
- = confer or renew the award at a higher level
- = do not confer an award

We don't believe that the third option – award at a higher level – is realistic.

Consistency of decisions

Chair

The panel is run by a chair appointed by ECU. The chair is a panellist and is involved in the decision-making process. The chair will normally have experience of participating in previous panels and will have undertaken ECU's panellist chair training. The training helps ECU to be able to provide robust and consistent decisions.

The training includes information on:

- = the panel review process
- = possible decisions
- = the roles of the panellists, the ECU moderator and secretariat
- = the role of the chair
- = challenges the chair may face and advice on how they may be overcome
- = biases and conflicts, including information on unconscious bias

Moderator

The moderator assists the panel by providing guidance on the application and assessment process and ensures the panel complies with the requirements and guidance set out in ECU's Athena SWAN Charter: guide to processes.

To ensure consistency of panel assessment, if required, the moderator will provide guidance on whether the application meets the requirements of the award level applied for.

Assessment criteria

This is the key to the process – a 'story' which starts with commitment, is based on data (qualitative and quantitative) and their analysis, which results in the action plan

When assessing submissions the panel expect to see evidence of a rigorous and thorough evaluation process. It will consider the following themes at all levels of award.

Theme	Evidence
Communication	How well are the policies and plans communicated to staff?
Senior or high-level commitment	Is there commitment from senior staff? How is it communicated?
Effective analysis of the data	What does the data show, and which actions are being taken to address the issues identified . How will impact be measured?
Self-reflection and honesty	The panel accepts that challenges may be faced and mistakes may be made, but these need to be recognised openly together with the steps taken to address them.
Engagement	Are staff at every level involved in the development, implementation and evaluation of policies?

In reaching a decision on the appropriate level of award, panels will consider:

- = the clarity of the evidence provided of what has been done and what is planned
- = the rationale for what has been done and what is planned and how they link to the organisation's strategic mission and goals
- = how successful the actions taken have been, how that success was measured and evaluated and how the organisation and the individuals who work in it have benefited.

At Bronze level, the emphasis is on self-analysis and action planning, with limited need to demonstrate success. Your Departmental process must ensure that the issues of communication, commitment and evaluation, involving the entire Department, are addressed and recorded in the application.

- = the link between the data and the action plans
- = the understanding of the institutional context/local circumstances and key issues demonstrated
- = the significance of any changes, programmes/initiatives in terms of their anticipated outcomes, their sustainability and the likely longer term impact on the organisation, its processes and its culture
- = the level of input, investment, involvement, commitment and support from senior management, heads of departments, senior academics and research team leaders (men and women)
- = consultation with input from all research academic staff (men and women), particularly encouraging women's participation
- = the extent to which what was developed and introduced was different, innovative or particularly challenging
- = the suitability and sustainability of what has been developed and the ease with which changes have been or are likely to become embedded in the organisational/departmental culture
- = the extent to which activities, programmes and changes have successfully addressed perceptions and expectations that shape or constrain career choices and outcomes
- = the extent to which the value of what has been done is recognised, welcomed and valued by staff generally

Additional information

In addition to the application the panel is also in some cases provided with further information. The panel will not receive any previous applications.

Post-May 2015 criteria

Applicants for renewal, those applying for a higher-level award, or who were previously unsuccessful, will have their most recent feedback submitted to the panel in full.

Previous successful Cambridge Departments have found it has been very effective to have dedicated departmental resource to focus on submissions. Your E&D assigned contact will be able to direct you to a good example for reference.

It is worth reflecting at this stage on whether you have the commitment and the internal resources to carry through an application.

1. LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT FROM THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

Recommended word count: **Bronze: 500**

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** the cover page.

ECU Guidance

- The letter of endorsement from the head of the institution or department sets the tone for the submission. It is vital that it demonstrates support, commitment and investment.
- The letter should explain why the department or institution values the Athena SWAN Charter, and how the action plan will help meet their strategic aims.
- Wherever possible the letter should outline specific activities/actions undertaken by the head of the institution (and/or senior leadership team) or the head of department to promote gender equality.
- If the applicant holds an Athena SWAN award and is applying for an award under the post-May 2015 criteria, reference should be made to the impact of the previous award.
- For higher levels of recognition, the panel will expect to hear how the department or institution has championed gender equality.
- Although the head of the institution or department may well wish to refer to an institution's history and achievements, this should not be the focus of the letter. Panels are keen to get a sense of individual commitment to gender equality at the top of the organisation or department.
- The letter should include a statement that the information presented in the application (including qualitative and quantitative data) is an honest, accurate and true representation of the department.
- If the head of department is soon to be/has been recently succeeded, applicants should include an additional short statement from the incoming head. An additional 200 words is permitted for use in this statement.
- Letters should be addressed to: Athena SWAN Manager, Equality Challenge Unit, 7th Floor, Queens House, 55/56 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London WC2A 3LJ

The letter should highlight key challenges for the department and explain how the Athena SWAN action plan and activities in the department will address the challenges and contribute to the overall department and/or institution strategy. Comment on how staff at all levels are, and will continue to be, engaged with the process at present and during the lifetime of the award. Include any evidence of actions taken by the head of department to support/promote the charter.

Cambridge Guidance

The Equality and Diversity Section will provide the correct name for the letter. Ideally the Head of Department will have been involved in the Self-Assessment process to some extent, but it is vital that some past activity is reported and that specific future actions to be carried out by the Head of Department are included.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE DEPARTMENT

Recommended word count: **Bronze: 500**

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.

ECU Guidance

- Describe the institution or department so that panellists can readily understand this without specific prior knowledge. Clearly outline the structure including reporting structures and anything that may be particularly different to sector norms. Remember that panellists assess the application as a standalone document.
- Present information on the numbers of staff (with academic and professional and support staff disaggregated) and students, along with information on any other relevant features, for example, any recent changes in structure or management, quasi-autonomous groups or split-site arrangements.
- A quasi-autonomous group may include:
 - = a research institute/group within a department that receives specific external funding
 - = staff managed/contracted by a different organisation/management structure, for example, a shared research institute
 - = a teaching-only group embedded within the department that may be subject to a different management structure
- If the structure is particularly complex, it may help to include a diagram of the departmental structure to illustrate the reporting mechanisms within the department.

Cambridge Guidance

Note that the inclusion of professional and support staff is something new and it may be helpful to break this down by broad function: library; IT; finance and by gender. Note that questions on intersectionality are addressed in the institutional award only.

3. THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Recommended word count: **Bronze: 1000**

Cambridge Guidance

This is a critical element of the process. Once the Department has agreed to proceed, a group needs to be established to work on the application. You will need (at least) an academic lead, an admin lead, representatives of academic, research and assistant staff. You may wish to consider adding undergraduate and/or postgraduate students if appropriate (this is viewed positively by awarding panels), or involving them in other ways such as through a focus group. Smaller departments may have difficulty covering all the areas suggested below. If so, explain why in the application.

ECU Guidance

- Having an effective self-assessment team will be key to the success of an application to ECU's Athena SWAN Charter. The submission will require significant reflective analysis, which should be driven as far as possible by the full team (rather than it being reliant on a few or single individuals).
- A self-assessment team can be a committee in its own right or it can operate under the umbrella of another group. This umbrella group must also follow the Athena SWAN self-assessment process.

Representation

- It is likely that for an institution application the team will include at least one representative from each of the institution's faculties. You will want each of the main areas of your institution to be represented while maintaining a manageable group size.
- The team should comprise a mixture of grades and roles representing different stages of the career ladder (particularly at the early and mid-career stages).
- It may be appropriate to consider having a more complex structure to ensure adequate representation, such as a smaller central group and larger working group.
- For departmental applications the self-assessment team should be representative of the staff in the department, and should usually include student representation.

Meetings

- The self-assessment team must meet at least three times a year.

You should plan for monthly meetings at the beginning of the process and in the run up to the submission date.

Shared responsibility

It is unlikely that any one individual will be responsible for completing or working on the whole application. Your final submission should be the result of intensive group work and collaboration across the self-assessment team and the institution or department.

It is advisable for one lead author to take responsibility for, and have oversight of the submission document, producing the final version using contributions from assigned working groups as appropriate.

Describe the self-assessment process. This should include:

(i) a description of the self-assessment team

ECU Guidance

The description of the self-assessment team should include:

- = members' roles (both within the institution and as part of the team) including identifying the chair
- = how people were nominated or volunteered to the role and how any time involved in being a member of the team is included in any workload allocation or equivalent
- = how the team represents the staff working in the institution or department (eg. a range of grades and job roles, professional and support staff as well as academics and any consideration of gender balance, work-life balance arrangements or caring responsibilities)

Note: This description can be displayed as a table (maximum 20 words about each team member) and is not included in the word count.

Cambridge Guidance

It is recommended to include members with wide-ranging backgrounds and experience in your SAT. Formal terms of reference, including turnover of membership arrangements are useful. There should be some stated process for selecting team members

(ii) an account of the self-assessment process

ECU Guidance

- Outline the process the self-assessment team has gone through preparing for the application. This should include information on when the team was formed, how often it has met, and what was the focus of the meetings.
- This section should include:
 - = when the team was established, including how the team communicated, for example, face to face, email, etc
 - = how often the team has met
 - = the focus of the meetings
 - = how the team has consulted with members of the institution (and students)
 - = consultation with individuals outside the institution: external consultation refers to consultation outside the institution or department, for example, a critical friend reviewing the application, consultation with other successful Athena SWAN departments/institutions
 - = how the self-assessment team fits in with other committees and structures of the institution. It is important to include information on the reporting structure. For example, is there a direct route for the team to report to, is Athena SWAN a standing item on the department/institution's key decision-making board?

Cambridge Guidance

It is advisable to form your SAT as early as possible and to meet regularly (usually monthly) at the beginning of the application process. Mixed modes of communication are fine (e.g. face-to-face meetings; electronic circulation of documents). Include your Athena SWAN assigned contact where appropriate for guidance. Think about engaging a critical friend to review early drafts of your submission.

(iii) plans for the future of the self-assessment team

ECU Guidance

Outline:

- = how often the team will continue to meet
- = how the team intends to monitor implementation of the action plan, including how it will interact with other relevant committees and structures within the institution
- = how the team intends to keep staff (and students) updated on ongoing work
- = succession planning for where membership of the team will change, including any transfer of responsibility for the work, role rotation and how the workload of members of the team will be accounted for in workload allocation

4. A PICTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT

Recommended word count: **Bronze: 2000**

ECU Guidance

General data requirements include the following.

- = For departmental applications, self-assessment teams may also choose to use the UCEA/Expert HR codes. It will be important, however, for the team and panellists to be able to identify types of staff using the department's own terminology (and again central data teams may be useful here, see above). The UCEA/Expert HR codes can be aggregated and presented in the most efficient way to demonstrate the requirements of each section.
- = Where a department is large enough (more than 20 staff), data should also be broken down by contract type, that is full- or part-time, zero-hours, open-ended or permanent, and research-only, teaching-only or research and teaching.
- = Where STEM departments contain clinical and non-clinical staff, their data should be presented separately.
- = State whether data on staff is presented by FTE, FPE or headcount. Please refer to the **Terminology** section for full definitions of these terms.

4.1 Student data

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

ECU Guidance

- At least three years of student data should be presented, as this will help to identify trends. Applications will not be penalised for only presenting three years of data.
- Throughout this section present data and provide analysis. Applications should try to identify key trends in the data, and put actions in place to address and improve the data. For Silver applications, demonstrate impact of any previous initiatives/actions where possible.
- In addition to the data requirements above, the following points should also be considered.
 - = Reflect upon the key issues in the department, the steps have been taken and the support given to address any gender disparity.
 - = Comment and reflect on the proportions/percentages of women and men compared with the national picture for the discipline(s). If it is felt that benchmarking data may not be appropriate, a clear explanation must be provided.
 - = Comment and reflect on any differences in data for men and women.
 - = Comment and reflect on any differences in data for full- and part-time students.
 - = Describe any initiatives implemented to address any possible imbalance and biases, and for Silver level any impact to date.
 - = Action any plans for the future, including how any gaps in the data will be addressed, linking these to the action plan.
- Where possible and relevant, provide data on the numbers of students by gender for the courses run by the department. Data on the numbers of full- and part-time students should be provided. Information on applications to the courses and data on number of offers, acceptance rates and degree attainment/completion rate should be presented.

Note: Acceptance rate refers to the number of students that accept their offer and commence the course. Any trends in the data should be highlighted and actions put in place to try to address the issues identified.

Cambridge Guidance

- The following statement must be included. 'At Cambridge, undergraduates are admitted by one of the 31 autonomous colleges. Departments have no control over the entry to a specific course. Further details will be provided to the panel.' There has been trouble in the past with problems with panels failing to appreciate the inability of Departments to directly influence the gender breakdown of entry. ECU now have a standard briefing to cover this.
- Where possible avoid terms idiosyncratic to Cambridge, such as Tripos; Part 1, 2, Supervision, Director of Studies, names of computer systems; UTO, CTO etc

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

(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.

(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.

(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.

(v) Progression pipeline between undergraduate and postgraduate student levels

Identify and comment on any issues in the pipeline between undergraduate and postgraduate degrees.

ECU Guidance

This section should identify any issues that are identified in the pipeline between undergraduate and postgraduate degrees. Actions should be put in place that aim to address the issues identified.

Cambridge Guidance

The proportions of where applications are coming from: UK, Cambridge, EU etc may be useful considerations.

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.

ECU Guidance

- This section is an opportunity to present the numbers of academic staff by gender across the department. Look at the career pipeline and comment on and explain any differences between men and women. Identify any issues in the pipeline at particular grades/job type/academic contract type.
- The 'leaky pipeline' refers to the loss of women or men at consecutive career stages within academia. The data presented should be compared with the national picture.
- In addition to the data requirements above, the following points should also be considered.
 - = Comment on the key issues in the department, the steps that have been taken and the support given to address any gender disparity.
 - = Comment and reflect on the proportions/percentages of women and men compared with the national picture for the discipline(s). Where benchmarking data does not provide meaningful comparison, a clear explanation must be provided.
 - = Comment and reflect on any differences in data for men and women across the department.
 - = Comment and reflect on any differences in data for full- and part-time staff.
 - = When presenting data and information on academic staff, postdoctoral researchers (or equivalent) should be included.
 - = Data should be presented by contract function, for example, research-only, research and teaching, and teaching-only (or equivalent).
 - = Comment and reflect on the role of the intersection of gender with ethnicity. At Silver level provide an explanation of actions and any impact in this area.
 - = Describe any initiatives implemented to address any possible imbalance and biases.
 - = Include any plans for the future, including how any gaps in the data will be addressed, linking these to the action plan.
 - = Where a STEMM department comprises clinical and non-clinical staff, data should be disaggregated and presented separately.
 - = Where a department is large enough (more than 20 staff), data should be also broken down by contract type, for example, full- or part-time, zero-hours, fixed-term, open-ended or permanent.

(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.

ECU Guidance

- The use of fixed-term and zero-hour contracts can have particularly detrimental effects on women's career development, retention and progression. The use of fixed-term contracts is more widespread in some parts of the sector than others. Institutions adopting the most inclusive approach appoint the majority of staff on open-ended contracts and limit the use of fixed-term contracts to, for example, maternity cover or for one-off appointments lasting less than a year.
- Provide analysis and commentary on the proportions of men and women on these contracts. Highlight information on the actions being taken to address issues around contract type with some focus on what is being done to ensure continuity of employment, including redeployment schemes.
- Does the data show any issues which are damaging to particular groups of staff? What support has the institution put in place to mitigate for any negative impact for particular groups of staff?

(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.

ECU Guidance

Identify the main reasons that academic staff are leaving the department, highlighting any mechanisms for collecting this data. The proportions of men and women across different grades should also be considered to help to identify if there is a particular point at which people leave the university. Where possible refer to exit interviews or other appropriate mechanisms. This may help to identify actions to address leavers.

5. SUPPORTING AND ADVANCING WOMEN'S CAREERS

Recommended word count: Bronze: Bronze: 6000

ECU Guidance

Throughout the following sections:

- = provide data (numbers and percentages) for at least the past three years, with commentary on their significance: where possible and relevant, use clearly labelled graphical illustrations
- = provide data and evidence obtained via consultation
- = action any plans for the future, including how any gaps in the data will be addressed, linking these to the action plan
- = reflect upon the key issues in the department, the steps taken and support that has been given to address any gender disparity
- = describe the initiatives implemented to address any issues and for Silver, any impact to date
- = where the number of women in the department is small, applicants may wish to comment on specific examples
- = provide information on different career pathways and training for both academic and professional and support staff

5.1 Key career transition points: academic staff

ECU Guidance

- When providing information about academic staff please remember that this should include information about postdoctoral researchers.
- This section requires consideration of what your data tells you about the effectiveness of arrangements for key transition points. It provides an opportunity to assess and reflect on policies and practices in place and to identify any areas for improvement. Reflect upon data gathered through staff consultation as well as the data specific to each section.

(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.

ECU Guidance

Break down application data by gender and grade. The data should also include the long- and shortlisted candidates, and offer and acceptance rates.

- = Information on the department's recruitment processes should be provided, with particular emphasis on how women (and men where underrepresented) are encouraged to apply. For example, are there policies in place to ensure gender representation on recruitment panels, is there any training provided and what is done to try to address unconscious bias?
- = Comment on how the department's processes and criteria for shortlisting and selection comply with, and build upon, the institution's policies for equality and diversity, and recruitment and selection.
- = If the dataset is large, please break it down into the different disciplines or units.

Cambridge Guidance

- The minimum here is that all involved in recruitment should have completed E&D online training. Recruitment data is available from the Equality and Diversity Section.
- Include here ideas of what the Department actively does to attract women to apply. Is the process open and transparent? How does the Department support interviewees to attend interview? (e.g. provide/pay for child care).

(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.

ECU Guidance

What are the induction processes for new staff? For example, what training is provided, what resources are available and how are they introduced to other staff and welcomed into their new workplace? Comment on uptake and how its effectiveness is reviewed.

Cambridge Guidance

E&D training should be included and mandatory. Individual welcome interviews are recommended, as are induction packs containing critical information. Mentoring must be considered.

(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.

ECU Guidance

- Information on promotions should include data on staff applying for promotion and numbers of applications and success rate. This should be broken down by gender, grade (the grade being applied for) and full- and part-time status.
- This section should also include:
 - = details on the promotions process, including how candidates are identified, and how the process and criteria are communicated to staff
 - = commentary on the criteria for promotion, including how university policy and practice considers the impact of career breaks on promotions: comment on how the full range of work-related activities (including administrative, pastoral and outreach work) are taken into consideration
 - = provide details of any training or mentoring offered around promotion
 - = comment on staff's perception of the promotions process, including whether it is transparent and fair
- Data should be presented as proportions of the eligible cohorts. Where numbers are small consider commenting on individual cases and whether particularly onerous tasks an individual may have undertaken are valued. Also consider including information on the decision-making process, how career breaks are accounted for, whether pay is negotiable or standardised and what is done to support those that were unsuccessful in applying for promotion.

Cambridge Guidance

Note the comment on 'eligible cohorts'. Do not just consider SAP; what about RA promotions to SRA, PRA? Departments should not rely on 'informal' processes: there should be structured processes.

(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.

ECU Guidance

Data on the number of staff submitted to REF should be presented. The data should include the numbers that were eligible and the numbers submitted and should be broken down by gender. A comparison of the REF data should be made with the data from the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) 2008, with commentary on any gender imbalances.

5.3 Career development: academic staff

ECU Guidance

When providing information about academic staff please remember that this should include information about postdoctoral researchers.

(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?

ECU Guidance

- This section should outline the training available to academic staff at all levels of the institution or department. In particular, the application should present information on training that is related to equality and diversity, management, leadership, and/or other opportunities linked to career progression.
- Provide information on the uptake of these courses, and break down the information by gender if possible. Also explain how staff are kept informed of training opportunities.
- Describe how the institution monitors the effectiveness of training, and provide details of how training is developed in response to levels of uptake and evaluation.

Cambridge Guidance

Consider here how Research Staff are encouraged to develop their skills under the Research Concordat and how this is recorded and impact assessed. Data are available from the E&D Section.

(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.

ECU Guidance

- Use this section to describe the current appraisal/development review process for academic staff at all levels across the institution or department. Explain whether promotion and work-life balance are discussed and taken into consideration as part of the appraisal/development review process.
- Provide information about any training the institution/department offers to prepare for the appraisal/development review process. This could be training for those conducting the review, and/or for those being appraised.
- Provide information on the uptake of these training opportunities, including any differences by gender. Also include narrative detailing any feedback that staff have provided about this training.

Cambridge Guidance

There is an online package for training Reviewers for SRD; make sure scheme is published and that it is implemented. Is the 'loop closed' with an overview of outcomes generated for the Head of Department / SAT? Bear in mind that completion rates at Cambridge are low. This is an area of key concern for panels.

(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.

ECU Guidance

This question is an opportunity to provide information about the support you offer to staff to assist in their career progression. The support currently provided should be commented and reflected upon. For example, are mentoring, coaching schemes or shadowing opportunities offered? For academic staff it is particularly important to provide detail about the support given to postdoctoral researchers.

Cambridge Guidance

It is important to consider mentoring here. If schemes have not worked, why? What alternatives could be considered? Are there any Departmental experts? Try and disentangle professional mentoring from initial socialisation.

(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).

ECU Guidance

This question is an opportunity to provide information about the support offered to students to assist in their academic career progression. The support currently provided should be commented and reflected upon. For example, are mentoring, coaching schemes or shadowing opportunities offered? How are students wishing to stay on for a PhD supported, and for those finishing a PhD and looking to start as a postdoctoral researcher?

(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.

ECU Guidance

Comment and reflect on the guidance given to staff when applying for research funding and what support is offered to those who are unsuccessful. For example, consider whether there are internal peer-review systems, or processes that enable early career researchers to be named on grants. Consider whether there are any gender gaps in application or success rates, and whether there are any patterns in the amount of research funding granted per award.

NB. Section 5.4 is for Silver applications only

5.5 Flexible working and managing career breaks

ECU Guidance

Present data for professional and support staff and academic staff separately.

- This section requires consideration of the efficacy of arrangements for supporting staff who may, given a range of circumstances, need to change their working patterns. This may be because they have, for example, started a family, taken on caring responsibilities for another family member or had to change their working pattern to accommodate other personal or physical difficulties.
- Also consider what the data shows about the institutional or departmental approach to cover absences of staff who take extended absence for example for adoption, maternity, parental or paternity leave.
- For sections (i) (ii) and (iii) outline the proactive arrangements (including central policy) for covering academic and professional and support staff work during maternity and adoption leave, arrangements to enable staff to keep in touch during leave, and how staff are supported before and upon their return to work. Comment on any difference in maternity leave provision for staff on fixed-term contracts.

Cambridge Guidance

Whilst it is recognised that many academic and research staff appreciate informal flexible working, consider implementing more formal processes which will in turn support all staff to consider flex working. 'Proactivity' is essential.

(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.

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

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

(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.

(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.

ECU Guidance

Provide data and comment on the maternity return rate for the institution or department. Provide commentary on any differences of provision for staff on fixed-term contracts, including any information on staff whose contracts are not renewed.

(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.

ECU Guidance

Provide data and comment on the uptake of paternity leave, adoption leave and parental leave by gender and grade for the institution or department. Comment on the uptake of statutory additional paternity leave and shared parental leave. Provide details on the institution's or department's paternity package and arrangements.

(vi) Flexible working

Provide information on the flexible working arrangements available.

ECU Guidance

- Comment on whether there is a formal or informal system in place for flexible working. Provide data on application and success rates by gender and grade, commenting on any disparities. Give details of the support provided for managers in promoting and managing flexible working arrangements, and how the institution or department raises awareness of the options available.
- Provide information on how aware staff are of flexible working arrangements. Consider using results of staff consultation to evidence staff awareness.

(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.

ECU Guidance

Evaluate and consider the support given to staff wishing to transition from part-time to full-time work, for example, after childcare or caring responsibilities reduce or stop. Things that may be useful to consider include:

- = mentoring or coaching support
- = phased increase in workload or working pattern

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.

ECU Guidance

- Culture refers to the language, behaviours and other informal interactions that characterise the atmosphere of the department and includes all staff and (if applicable) students.
- Demonstrate how the department actively considers gender equality and inclusivity. Provide detail of staff and student consultation relating to the culture of the department. Analyse any data and evidence gathered around the culture, highlight any gender differences and link actions to address any issues the data highlights.
- Provide details of how the Athena SWAN May 2015 principles have been, and will continue to be, embedded into the culture and working of the department.
- Submissions need to consider the ways different staff contribute to culture in a variety of ways. For example, where significant proportions of staff are visiting lecturers or particular grades of staff employed on one type of contract, have the effects of this on culture been explored?

(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 policies.

ECU Guidance

- Provide an honest assessment of how the department monitors the consistency of HR policies on equality, dignity at work, bullying, harassment, grievance and disciplinary processes. Describe actions taken to address any identified differences between policy and practice. Applicants will not be penalised for identifying issues. Comment on any issues that have been identified and what the department has done or is planning on doing to address them.
- **Note:** If this question results in an answer that the department does not wish to be made public, please remove the answer to this question before publishing the application publically. ECU does not publish applications.
- What is being done to ensure that staff with management responsibilities are up to date in their HR knowledge, for example, through training or workshops? How frequently are these updated, how does the department monitor the uptake, what is the uptake and is there any gender discrepancy?

(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.

ECU Guidance

Provide data by committee, gender, staff type (academic/professional and support staff/ student) and grade. Outline how committee members are identified. For example, do they nominate themselves, or are they approached to join and if so, by whom and through what process. What initiatives are in place to improve any gender imbalance on committees, for example, role rotation, deputising, shadowing? Is there a gender imbalance on any committees, for example, senior management, equality and diversity, research, student experience committees? What action is going to be taken to address this?

Cambridge Guidance

Do women in the department suffer from committee overload? A balance is needed across all committees.

(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?

ECU Guidance

Provide data by gender, staff type and grade. How are staff encouraged to participate in external committees? Describe any procedures that are in place to encourage participation in external committees.

(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.

ECU Guidance

Describe any workload allocation model in place and what it includes, for example teaching, pastoral, administrative and outreach responsibilities. Who is responsible for setting the workload model? Is there consideration for role rotation, for example, those with a particularly heavy workload (such as leading on an Athena SWAN submission, or undergraduate admissions tutor)? Is it fair and transparent? Is the model linked to the promotion criteria and discussed at appraisals? How often is the model reviewed and who reviews it? Use any staff consultation to evidence this and comment on any gender discrepancies.

Cambridge Guidance

A formal system for workload management: transparency is the key. This means annual consideration of teaching and administrative responsibilities, college teaching etc to ensure the HoD's oversight and transparency across academic staff.

(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.

ECU Guidance

- Describe the consideration given to those with caring responsibilities and part-time staff around the timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings. Does the department have formal core hours and if so what are they? Use staff consultation to comment on whether staff feel core hours are adhered to. Is there a difference in opinion between staff who work part-time versus those who work full-time?
- Are key staff meetings and staff away days planned far enough in advance for those with caring responsibilities to attend? What formal and informal social gatherings are there in the department? When are they held and how many people attend? Do staff feel they are inclusive and are held at appropriate times? What systems are in place to prevent staff being excluded from activities?

Cambridge Guidance

Opinions are divided here: some advocate core hours within the working day (1000-1600); while others are happy to work caring responsibilities around work demands. The key aim here is to make sure all staff are included in key Departmental meetings, seminar series etc. Each Department will know which approach is appropriate for them. Just be sure to make clear the reasons why.

(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.

ECU Guidance

- Is diversity considered in publicity materials, including the departments' website and images used? Comment on how the department builds gender equality into its organisation of events. Provide data and comment on the gender balance of speakers and chairs in seminars, workshops and other relevant activities.
- If the data reveals that there is a gender imbalance of speakers and chairs for talks, seminars and workshops, comment on what is being done to combat this. Where one gender is in a minority, applicants should aim for a gender balance that supports the agenda to redress this, while remaining realistic.

(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.

ECU Guidance

- Provide data on staff from the department involved in outreach and engagement activities, by gender and grade. Comment on how gender is considered in outreach. While it is important to have underrepresented groups involved in outreach, often people from these groups end up doing a lot of outreach which can impact on other parts of their job, for example, research. Comment on how outreach is formally recognised and whether it is included in workload modelling. Use staff consultation to evidence whether there is any gender imbalance around the participation in outreach.
- Comment on the participant uptake of outreach activities by school type (e.g. private, comprehensive, grammar, single sex) and gender.

7. FURTHER INFORMATION

Recommended word count: Bronze: 500

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

ECU Guidance

This section is an opportunity to provide additional relevant information that has not already been discussed. It is not compulsory to use this section. Examples of content could include:

- = other gender equality-related initiatives not already discussed
- = commitment/involvement with other equality work
- = work being undertaken with external partners (not covered by the outreach section)
- = future changes to the submitting unit that will provide an opportunity to extend gender equality work

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).

ECU Guidance

The action plan is a crucial part of a submission and its importance should not be overlooked.

- = Actions that are identified in the submission document should be clearly highlighted and cross-referenced so that when a panellist reads the action plan it is clear what the rationale for the action is.
- = Actions should be scheduled across the four-year duration of the award.
- = Actions (and action plans) should be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound).
- = The panel will expect to see evidence of prioritisation. Action plans may be ordered by priority level rather than chronologically or thematically.
- = Responsibility for completing actions should be distributed across a range of staff. Action plans where HR and equality and diversity practitioners are responsible for everything will not be well received by panels.
- = Descriptions of measures already in place should not be included in the action plan without detail on their monitoring or development.
- = It is important to indicate how the success of an action will be measured. This should take the form of a column in the table.
- = There is no right or wrong number of actions. However, it is important to balance conciseness with a good level of detail.
- = Action plans should be aspirational and innovative, particularly at higher levels of award.
- = Action plans should be organic documents, constantly reviewed and updated (not just prepared as part of an award submission). throughout the form: 5.2, 5.4, 5.5(iv)

Reference	
Planned action / objective	
Rationale (i.e what evidence is there that prompted this action/objective?)	
Key outputs and milestones	
Timeframe (start/end date)	
Person responsible (include job title)	
Success criteria and outcome	

An example action plan template is shown above which you may choose to use, or you are welcome to present your actions in your own template. The example below is not an exemplar, and many applicants have successfully used a variety of alternative formats of their choosing. It is possible that internally your actions are embedded into existing action plans, but for the purposes of this application we do ask that you collate all of the actions and present them in one combined, consistent document.

Embedding actions within the application

Panellists will be looking to see that appropriate actions have been put in place to address the issues and challenges identified throughout the application. There is no need for the narrative to describe each action in full. However, it is very helpful for a brief description to be provided of a key action which will be implemented to address the issue identified. These descriptions should be cross-referenced to the full action plan. The action plan should form a comprehensive summary of all actions at the end of the application. *Example:*

In text: (Action 4.1 – modify induction package)

In Action Plan:

Ref	Planned action / objective	Rationale	Key output / milestone	Timeframe	Person responsible	Success criteria
4.1	Induction package of printed information modified to include briefing on SWAN actions	Focus group of postdocs demonstrated little awareness of the SWAN programme but were keen to see more	New documents drafted and signed off by 1/10/ xx,; limited to 2 sides A4	1/6/xx – 1/10/xx	Dept Administrator	90% of postdocs showing awareness of SWAN programme and activities by next focus group by (date)

Cambridge Guidance

Responsibility for specific actions should extend beyond the HoD, Department Administrator and SAT. Directors of Teaching, Programme directors should all be involved. Support staff have central roles as well. Traffic lights / other colour code on the action plan can be used to indicate priority or timing. Do not plan to start everything in the first year. Actions must flow from the data and analysis: the data say this... it means this... therefore we are going to...

See the example above: you may wish to include a column indicating priority or use a colour code, if you are submitting colour copies of your application.