1. Letter of endorsement from the Head of Department

I am delighted to write in the strongest terms to endorse our action plan and application for an Athena Swan Silver award. I will work with our self-assessment panel, and all members of the department to ensure that our action plan is implemented and we move further towards gender equality in all areas.

The University of Southampton’s Ocean and Earth Science Academic Unit (SOES) is housed in a unique environment. We share the National Oceanography Centre Southampton (NOCS) with the NERC National Oceanography Centre at the University’s Waterfront Campus. NOCS is one of the top half-dozen centres of its kind in the world. Our world-class facilities and research environment ensure that we attract excellent students and staff. Within NOCS we work on all aspects of ocean and earth science, from marine biology, through the physics and chemistry of the oceans to the geology and geophysics of the solid Earth. Our students find employment in a wide range of sectors including education, academic and industrial research, oil and gas exploration and conservation. We strive for excellence in all we do, and this can only be achieved if our recruitment and promotion processes are gender-blind and gender equality is pervasive, so I see our Action Plan as an integral component of our pursuit of excellence.

We have worked with our NERC partners in NOCS for several years to ensure and promote gender equality. In recruiting scientific staff we include NERC representation on our appointment panels, and they include UoS staff on theirs, to ensure that best practice is shared. We have had joint NERC-UoS workshops to tackle well-being and gender issues at NOCS which have been identified by NOCS-wide surveys. We positively identify potential female staff and ensure that they are aware of the generous benefits offered by the University to those with families. We ensure that staff can adjust their hours where appropriate, and that those with families can work flexible hours so that they can achieve an appropriate work-life balance.

We have benefitted greatly from the self-assessment that we have made as part of this application. Our statistics compare favourably with most relevant national averages, but we acknowledge where we have more work to do. I will ensure that the Athena Swan panel continues to operate after submission of this document, and will play an active role in ensuring that our action plan is implemented and that sufficient resources are in place.

Through implementation of our Action Plan, I believe that we will make substantial progress towards gender equality within SOES.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Tim Minshull.

Head of SOES

Ocean and Earth Science, National Oceanography Centre Southampton, University of Southampton, European Way, Southampton
SO14 3ZH United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)23 80595898 Fax: +44 (0)23 80 593059 www.southampton.ac.uk/oes
1. The self-assessment process

(a) The self assessment team (SAT)

The team (4 women, 3 men) comprises academic staff and a postgraduate student and balances stage of career with a range of lifestyles reflective of the department (SOES). Members were invited by the Lead Academic, Dr. Martin Solan. SAT was formed in April 2012 and has met on 3 occasions, although representation at various departmental and University level meetings provided additional input.

Dr. Tom Bibby joined the University as an RCUK research fellow in 2005 and in 2010 joined the staff as a lecturer. He leads a research group of post-docs and PhD students and participates actively in international research cruises and fieldwork. He is in a dual career household with two young children (ages 2 years and 4 months).

Professor Jonathan Bull is Associate Dean Research in the Faculty of Natural and Environmental Sciences, and leads the Geology and Geophysics research group in SOES. He sits on the Faculty Executive group. Married with 3 children, he acutely understands the difficulty in achieving a good work-home life balance.

Ms. Colette Couves is a Geology PhD student. She is approaching the end of her PhD studies and is deliberating between an academic career in science or a job within industry.

Dr. Martha Gledhill is a Research Fellow and represents the interest group “Women in Science, Engineering and Technology (WiSET)”. She has balanced work and caring for her two children through working part-time.

Dr. Cathy Lucas has been a Lecturer since 2005. She has worked part-time (0.5 fte) since 2001 and has two children aged 8 and 11. Prior to her current position, she was employed on a series of fixed-term appointments (Teaching Fellow, Post-doctoral Researcher, temporary Lecturer, Project Manager) for 12 years, mainly within SOES, but she also spent one year at a US institution. Her husband is a Technical Manager and Design Engineer in a local medium-sized commercial company.

Professor Rachel Mills is Associate Dean in the Faculty of Natural and Environmental Sciences with responsibility for Graduate Schools and Infrastructure. Her research group consists of 2 Post-doctoral Fellows and 3 PhD students working across a number of disciplines. She chairs a cross-University Working Group addressing Career Development of Researchers and implementation of the Concordat. She has two sons aged 13 and 11 and a partner who is a Geologist. She took periods of maternity leave when she had her children and has worked full-time since returning to work.

Dr. Martin Solan is a Reader and leads a research group. He is Co-ordinator for the university-wide Climate and Environment Research Theme, plays an active role in strategic planning, mentors and appraises Postgraduate students and staff, and co-ordinates and teaches several courses. In 2012, he was an invited Reader for the L’Oréal-UNESCO UK and Ireland Fellowships For Women In Science. Recently married to a Research Fellow within the same discipline, and expecting their first
baby in the Spring, both he and his wife recently (February 2012) took advantage of separate opportunities to move to the University.

(b) The Self-Assessment Process

Our self-assessment process builds upon the aspiration of the University to advance and maintain the contribution of women in STEMM and achieve an Athena SWAN Gold award. Using information from previous activities, we conducted a scoping assessment in advance of the initial meeting of the Self-Assessment Team (SAT) to identify any trends and/or impacts prior to, and following, the implementation of gender related policy and practice. These data were presented to the SAT and, to help understand and benchmark current gender equality culture, were supplemented by an independent survey (QuickCAT survey\(^1\); \(\frac{113}{301} = 37.5\%\)) of staff perceptions. These data were used to determine key areas of good practice and areas in need of attention, and formed the basis of subsequent focus group discussions. During this phase, close consultation with other university units that were working towards Athena SWAN awards was initiated to ensure that we would benefit from any demonstrable good practice and avoid unsatisfactory processes. This was particularly effective in (i) creating an environment during the focus group sessions that was conducive in encouraging in-depth information on perceptions, insights, attitudes, experiences, and beliefs of the participants, (ii) choosing the right activities to engage participants (generation of cartoons/drawings; use of analogy, experience-based storytelling, and case studies; bullet point summaries; priority/decision making role play; structured brainstorming), and (iii) assembly of an operational structure, including defined roles for the facilitator (Dr. Martin Solan), neutral observer and note taker. To ensure participants were not inhibited or influenced by peers from other grades or with different experiences, groups were separated by career level (Postgraduate students; Postdoctoral and Early Career Lecturers; Senior Staff). Interest in participating was championed by a SAT member. Participants in each group were encouraged to share their perceptions and points of view following a structured series of activities led by the facilitator. In addition, each focus group considered how good practice could be maintained and cascaded to other parts of the University, and how areas requiring attention could be improved and/or resolved. Summaries of these sessions were electronically communicated more widely and further feedback following request was considered. These data, together with further input from the SAT, senior management and the SOES Policy Resources Committee (PRC) underpin the Action Plan, which was signed off by the PRC and Head of Academic Unit prior to submission.

(c) Future plans

The Action Plan will be appraised annually and developed further by the SAT who, in turn, will interface with the PRC for resource allocation/approval, prior to a subsequent renewal application. The SAT will meet once per semester to continually review and revise the Action Plan, which will enhance ongoing promotion of gender equality by the University Diversity Team through (i) the appointment of a dedicated administrator within the academic unit, responsible for ensuring the implementation of the Action Plan and furtherance of activities that build upon same, (ii) the inclusion of gender, diversity and well-being matters in staff induction processes, and (iii) participation in University-wide events.

(Section 2 subtotal, 998 words)

\(^1\) based on the CAT questionnaire and adapted for a Higher Education STEMM audience.
2. A picture of the department

This submission is for University of Southampton (UoS) staff within the Academic Unit called Ocean and Earth Science (SOES) based at the National Oceanography Centre Southampton (NOCS). NOCS sustains UoS and NERC staff, and is one of the world’s leading centres devoted to research, teaching, and technology development. The two components of NOCS collaborate in a range of ways, including through the jointly run Graduate School (GSNOCS), the sharing of research facilities and laboratories, and many joint research grants and publications.

In August 2010 the University component of NOCS (SOES) was incorporated into the newly formed Faculty of Natural and Environmental Sciences (FNES), with Biological Sciences and Chemistry.

SOES supports (at 1 December 2011) 631 undergraduate and 70 postgraduate taught (PGT) students. The principal disciplines covered are Oceanography, Marine Biology, Geology, and Geophysics. There are 157 Postgraduate Research (PGR) students, 52 Postdoctoral Researchers and 63 academics, plus technicians and support staff. Most administration is carried out at Faculty level. All headcounts are for SOES staff at 1 December of the relevant academic year unless stated otherwise.

Initiatives in gender equality and general well-being have historically been completed pan-NOCs, and have included staff surveys and subsequent workshops. In our action plan we will re-invigorate these initiatives across NOCS involving NERC staff equally, as many of the services within the building (e.g. library, canteen, IT, common-rooms), and joint research and outreach facilities are shared [Action AP1].

(234 words)

3. Historical data

3.1 Student data

3.1.1 Numbers of males and females on access or foundation courses

The Foundation Year (FY), directed by Dr. Anna Barney, is an additional year of study that prepares those lacking traditional entry qualifications for entry to UoS Science degrees. Successful completion guarantees a place on the relevant degree programme, and 10 women and 7 men have taken advantage of this route into SOES in the last 3 years. There is evidence that female participation is growing and that gender and subsequent progression\(^2\) is reasonably balanced and appropriate for both UK and International students.

\(^2\) Of the annual Science FY cohort that progressed to SOES degrees, 37% (2009), 57% (2010) and 40% (2011) were female.
### Foundation years: all students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>All residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(82 words)

#### 3.1.2 Undergraduate male and female numbers – full and part-time

SOES offers a range of 3 and 4-year undergraduate programmes in Marine Biology, Oceanography, Geology and Geophysics. Charts and tables below show gender breakdown of entrants and of the Undergraduate population across all years:

**Undergraduate first-year students in SOES by gender**

![Chart displaying gender distribution of first-year students across different years.]

- **Males**: 100, 102, 110, 109
- **Females**: 77, 71, 83, 83
- **% of female students**: 43.5%, 41.9%, 43.0%, 43.2%

### (82 words)
Female intake at first year has remained reasonably constant (mean = 42.6%, range 41.0-43.5%) and we are pleased that retention across all years seems to be stable (39.4 – 42.5% over the period), with some indication that the number of females is increasing. Across disciplines, the male:female ratio is reasonably balanced in Marine Biology and Oceanography, but less balanced in Geophysics and Geology.
Southampton is slightly below average in gender ratio among Russell Group (RG) Universities offering Geology courses in 2010-11 (SOES 32.8%, RG 38.6%), but exceeds the average in Ocean Sciences (SOES 55.9%, RG 44.6%). We continue to monitor the gender balance on all our courses and while we align closely to other Russell Group Universities, we recognise the need to investigate why the proportion of female Geology/Geophysics students are below the national benchmark. In terms of continuation levels, we are proud that an average of 99.6% females (2008-2011) progress from 1st to 2nd year.

(189 words)
3.1.3 Postgraduate male and female numbers completing taught courses

SOES offers 5 taught programmes (PGT) leading to MSc qualifications, which are usually completed full-time after one year. Since there is some overlap of modules, we treat all PGT as a single cohort for analysis.

Historically there has always been a predominance of females in our PGT courses, however in 2011-2012 the male:female ratio was more balanced (54.3% female) following a recent expansion (1.46x females and 1.88x males in 2011-12 compared to the previous year) in the PGT population. Completion rates have been high, with just 4 students (2 male, 2 female) failing to complete between 2008-11.

The proportion of female students in PGT in SOES (62.9%) is much higher than that achieved across the Russell Group Universities (48.1%) for those active in this field during 2010-11\(^4\), but the decline in the proportion of females from 2008-09 to 2011-12 is a concern, albeit a reflection of an increase in intake of both females and males.

(156 words)

3.1.4 Postgraduate male and female numbers on research degrees

SOES offer 3 MRes programmes that, for statistical purposes, are classed as Research Degrees as well as PhD programmes. Between 2008-09 and 2011-12 we achieved, on average, a 50:50 gender balance across our PGR courses, indicating that our recruitment strategy is unbiased.

\(^4\) Source: HEIDI (The Higher Education Information Database for Institutions). Some differences between this and other data may be due to variations in how research work is defined or administered, and to headcounts being rounded on HEIDI.
The gender balance is relatively uniform across programmes and by registration and has become increasingly balanced over the last 3-4 years despite variation in intake size:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRes (all registered)</strong></td>
<td>M 13</td>
<td>F 10</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>M 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRes (new registration)</strong></td>
<td>M 7</td>
<td>F 6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>M 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPhil/PhD (all registered)</strong></td>
<td>M 93</td>
<td>F 87</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>M 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPhil/PhD (new registr's)</strong></td>
<td>M 22</td>
<td>F 17</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>M 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals (all registered)</strong></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals (new registration)</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accepting that there are year-on-year variations for MPhil/PhD cohorts, as well as variable length of doctoral research, there is nothing to suggest that women are disadvantaged. In fact, of the small number of PGR students failing to complete, the vast majority were male:

### Progress of MRes students in SOES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>%F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%M</th>
<th>%F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 13 | 10 | 56.5 | 43.5 | 11 | 18 | 37.9 | 62.1 | 19 | 18 | 51.4 | 48.7 |
Overall, the number of PhD awards show a good gender balance, despite some annual variation that reflects differences in male:female ratios. The proportion of female PGR students in SOES for Geology (53.3%) and Ocean Sciences (53.3%) is higher than that achieved across the Russell Group Universities (46.7 and 45.7% respectively) active in this field during 2010-11\(^5\). This gender balance is maintained across interactive activities, such as demonstrating to Undergraduate students, providing an appropriate proportion of female role models that will help inspire female Undergraduates to succeed and have aspirations of achievement in their chosen career beyond their period of study. To reinforce this activity, we do inform Demonstrators of their responsibility as a role model and we encourage particularly enthusiastic females to participate, although we cannot be wholly selective as we also recognise the universal need for training in teaching and communication. Our goal is to ensure that representative proportions of men and women progress from one stage to the next.

(273 words)

\(^5\) Source: HEIDI (The Higher Education Information Database for Institutions). Some differences between this and other data may be due to variations in how research work is defined or administered, and to headcounts being rounded on HEIDI.
3.1.5 Ratio of course applications to offers and acceptances by gender for undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research degrees

As shown earlier, the proportion of women at Undergraduate level is ~40%, a proportion that is maintained at Postgraduate level following progression from application to successful enrolment. The variation in the proportion of female students across all degree programmes from application to entrance is constant and within statistical error. A higher conversion rate for 2011 entry\(^6\), indicates that there is no bias in our shortlisting and interviewing procedures. Although we feel that the level of female participation in our degrees is good, it remains desirable to further enhance the number of female applications.

![Female applications-to-entry percentages for undergraduate programmes in SOES](image)

In terms of applications and acceptances, SOES compares favourably on national gender averages for Geology (applications, 33.6%; acceptances, 33.3%) and Ocean Sciences (applications, 48.0%; acceptances, 54.1%) compared to all Russell Group Universities offering related courses in Geology (applications, 26.0%; acceptances 36.9%) and Ocean Science (applications, 45.4%; acceptances 42.5%) 2010-11.\(^7\)

A similar picture exists for PGT programmes, with levels of progression from application to enrolment consistently higher than comparable courses across the Russell Group Universities. Here, the proportion of applicants has remained about the same, but there has been a fall in the number of female entrants that reflects a small increase in intake (from 31 in 2008-09 to 40 in 2010-11) following the introduction of a new degree (Remote Sensing).

---

\(^6\) Minor differences in headcounts between datasets are likely to be due to factors such as late applications, or changes of programme after registration.

\(^7\) Source: HEIDI (The Higher Education Information Database for Institutions). Minor differences between these and some internally-held figures may be due to variants in classification, and to rounding headcounts in HEIDI.
For PGR, female applications-to-entry percentages have remained consistent, with a superior conversion rate for women relative to men, providing further confirmation that our shortlisting and interviewing procedures are fair.

Overall, for all UG, PGT and PGR, there is no bias against females, assuming that there is no gender difference in qualification attainment at the point of application. Female applicants are more likely to accept a place than men and, whilst our recruitment process is transparent and equitable, a full analysis of why this may be has not been investigated. To be confident of our processes, however, we will investigate whether there are any gender differences in entry qualifications.
3.1.6 Degree classification by gender

When degree classifications are compared across all awards within SOES, we find no difference in the level of degree attainment by gender.

Undergraduate award classifications as a percentage of 2011 SOES graduates by gender

Closer examination of the data (2009-2011), however, does indicate that a higher proportion of women attain high degree classifications whilst a lower proportion of women attain lower degree classifications, but these differences are small and not statistically significant.

SOES has a small drop-out rate for Undergraduate courses (2008-9 - 2010-11: male, 2.8 - 5.5%; female, 1.6 - 3.8%). While numbers are at the boundaries of statistical significance for gender comparison, the number of females failing to complete is lower than for males. Reasons for leaving were predominantly ‘personal’ rather than academic failure.
### Students failing to complete undergraduate degrees in SOES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic failure, bad standing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entered employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, personal, other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written off after lapse of time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of all students failing to complete</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, we conclude that there is no systematic difference between gender in degree performance. Indeed, SOES awards a range of prizes across its degree programmes for exceptional academic performance and, over the last 3 years (2009-2012), 31 students have been awarded individual prizes, of which 15 have been female.
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#### 3.1.7 Postgraduate

See sections (iii) and (iv) for completion rates.

(8 words)
3.2 Staff data

3.2.1 Female:male ratio of academic staff and research staff

For the following sections, pay grade (level) has been used for comparison of career progression:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Research-only</th>
<th>Teach-only</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>Research fellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>Senior research fellow</td>
<td>Teaching fellow</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>Senior teaching fellow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior lecturer and Reader (research-led)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professor (Grade 7)

3.2.2 Female:male ratio of academic staff and research staff

SOES has seen a significant rise in numbers of female staff (from 20 to 29) over the last 3 years, mostly (7 individuals) at Grade 4, reflecting improvements in attention to equality during our recruitment process since the renewal of the University’s Bronze award in 2009. This indicates that there is little attrition at the transition from Postgraduate to Lecturer/Grade 5 over the recent period (2009-2011), and shows that the proportion of females starting an academic career is rising, but it is too early to know whether this represents a substantial change. When expressed in terms of pay grade, recent patterns show an improvement in the progression of females from Grade 4 to 5 (2009-2011: 26.3% to 35.3% females at Grade 5), although this does not fully account for the fall in the proportion of women at Grade 4 (reflecting recent recruitment patterns, mostly male, but reasons for this are not clear). Nevertheless, we are encouraged that the gender balance shows some support for the retention of women at the same rate as men.

SOES : Female:Male ratio for academic research staff by pay grade
At Grades 6 and 7, however, there is a concern that there is a higher leakage of females. This partly reflects the historical context (less women progressed a decade ago than do now), which should improve over the next few years as the present cohort of females advance. The recent appointment of Rachel Mills (2011) to a Professorship, alongside her continuing role as Associate Dean in the Faculty, is noteworthy in this regard. Nevertheless, anticipated future improvements in progression cannot be a source of complacency, as women remain under-represented at higher grades (2011: Grade 6, $\frac{1}{19} = 5.3\%$; Grade 7, $\frac{1}{23} = 4.3\%$) and the overall proportion of women in SOES remains low (all grades, $\frac{29}{112} = 25.9\%$ in 2011). Further, rates of attrition are greater and more rapid for research only staff relative to mixed and/or teaching staff:

![Percentage of research only staff within SOES by gender and year](image1)

![Percentage of mixed and teaching staff within SOES by gender and year](image2)
3.2.3 Part-time working

Part-time working has increased over the last 3 years, from 8 individuals (3 male, 5 female) in 2009 to 16 individuals (8 male, 8 female) in 2011. The upturn in part-time working, particularly for males, reflects increased staff numbers as a whole and clearer articulation of paternity policy since 2009.

Of those that have worked part-time, the amount of time they spent working has been increasingly equitable (from 33:67 in 2009 to 50:50 in 2011), but there is some indication that males may reduce their working hours by a larger proportion than females.

(93 words)

3.2.4 Turnover by grade and gender

SOES has very low turn-over in permanent academic staff (grades 5 -7). In the past 3 years, 2 male members of staff have taken up posts overseas (Germany and Australia) and 1 female member of staff has transferred to the NERC component of NOCS. There were no distinguishable differences in attrition, either between gender or between fixed-term versus permanent members of staff.
3.2.5 Female participation in REF submissions

As of July 2012, 19.7% of individuals selected in the draft REF submission are female, and account for 11.1 FTE equivalents (SOES total = 56.4 FTE). When comparing present positioning for the REF with the RAE submission in 2008, the proportion of women has increased (from 18.1 to 19.7%) and is closer to gender mix of the overall research staff population in SOES (23.7% female in July 2012).
4. Supporting and advancing women’s careers

4.1 Key career transition points

4.1.1 Job application and success rates by gender and grade

Applications (2009 – 2012) reflect the national trend of a declining proportion of female applicants with advancing career. At levels 4 and 5 in particular, the proportion of women that are long-listed (29.8 and 31.3% respectively) is low but is close to the proportion of female applicants (31.4 and 26.7% respectively). There is some evidence that leakage does not occur at the interview-appointment stage; at Levels 6 and 7, applicants are predominantly male, yet females are more likely to go through to interview once on the long-list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
<th>Level 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>%F</td>
<td>Fem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longlist</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appointments at Level 4 are close to the proportional representation of Postgraduates (~40%), indicating no notable female attrition but improvement is required at higher levels. For new academic appointments, we will emphasise the importance of gender equality during the advertising and recruitment and actively encourage a greater number of female applicants.
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4.1.2 Applications for promotion and success rates by gender and grade

Promotion opportunities are widely advertised and we encourage staff to develop a case for support (with assistance from their mentor and HR). Staff can independently apply for promotion, however this is unusual. Over the past 3 years, SOES has received 71 requests (62 male, 9 female) for an incremental rise (31, 13 % female), promotion (35, 14 % female) or re-grading (5, 0% female), although applications have declined over the period.
Requests from females have increased from 10% in 2009 to 13% in 2010 and to 19% in 2011. This compares with 23%, 24% and 24% of females respectively in Grades 4-7 at these dates\(^8\). The number of male applicants, however, reduced over the same time period (from 28 individuals in 2009, to 21 and 13 individuals in 2010 and 2011 respectively), inflating the apparent growth in female applications. Nevertheless, the proportion of females being granted increments, promotion or regrading is a concern, because the numbers decline considerably with increasing grade (\(^2/3\) at Grade 4, \(^3/19\) at Grade 5, \(^4/29\) at Grade 6 and \(^2/20\) at Grade 7). These data indicate that our internal process for identifying and preparing candidates needs to do more to encourage females to apply. To support this, we will develop an individual career progression action plan and support actions that enhance career development [Action AP4i], with particular emphasis on preventing leakage at key points of career transition.

---

\(^8\) Professorial (Level 7) is included as promotional increments are available within this grade.
The increase in female promotions reflect the present (2011-2012) age structure of Researcher and Lecturer grades in SOES. There is a similar pattern for both male and females for younger age groups, but a disproportionate number of males at the oldest age groups. These differences are interpreted to reflect change (increased support of women) away from historical recruitment and promotion legacy. However, we cannot be complacent as this trend will also reflect the increasing number of women entering tertiary education, irrespective of any support for women.
4.1.3 Recruitment of staff

The principle challenge for SOES is to increase the number of female candidates, primarily at Grades 5 and above. Present procedures use a Recruitment Search Committee (6-8 members) to actively seek and approach potential candidates, including searches of L’Oreal-UNESCO Women in Science, Dorothy Hodgkin Fellowship and female NERC and Royal Society recipients. At least 1 woman is included on each search committee. The increasing number of females at shortlisting and interview is very positive, but numbers remain low and may be insufficient to bolster female success rates. As such we will put procedures in place that require that both males and females are long-listed during selection and issue a statement outlining the process to all academic staff [Action AP9i]. All job specification literature, short-listing, selection and interview procedures are checked by Human Resources to ensure compliance with UoS diversity and equality policy, but we will investigate the wording and format of application forms to ensure that they do not unintentionally discourage or otherwise bias against female applicants [Action AP8]. Candidates are hosted for 2 days during the interview process, and meet with staff from a range of lifestyles to ensure that information on lifestyle matters within Southampton can be aired. Presently, there is no formal University requirement for female participation in shortlisting or interviewing, but SOES insist on female representation at all stages. Recruitment focus is on scientific excellence but, where information is provided, periods of part-time or absence from work or other lifestyle commitments are taken into account when evaluating applications. Such information is not formally requested, however, and the application form does not offer opportunity to provide notification or detail. This omission is a specific area of concern. We will investigate how to modify job application forms so that the applicant has the opportunity to identify any circumstances that may have affected previous levels of achievement, the proportion of their capacity that was reduced, and the length of time they were affected. [Action AP7i]. We will also identify criteria for making objective comparisons between candidates with and without declared circumstances [Action AP7ii].
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4.1.4 Support for staff at key career transition points

The importance of mentoring, and the matching of appropriate Senior Mentors with Mentees, is an effective way of boosting confidence and generating clear career goals and highlighting achievement through the recognition of talent. Presently, mentoring is provided to all new staff for up to 3 years. However, completion of annual appraisals has been problematic (49%, 79% and 85% completed in 2010, 2011 and to date in 2012), but we are on track to achieve 100% completion this year. Postgraduate students do not have appraisals, but they do have formal assessments and are assigned an independent mentor. Presently, Postdoctoral staff are not appraised beyond their 12-month probation period, but they are required to report to their line manager. This is an area we need to improve, so we will establish a mentoring scheme for all staff that goes beyond the probation period and which will have a formal requirement for a career progression plan. [Action AP4]. As key career transition points often coincide with lifestyle transitions, such as parental commitments, we will support staff by considering individual circumstances [see Action AP7i and AP7ii]. We already provide support to Postdoctoral women in assisting with childcare, and student parents are eligible to receive up to 8 weeks ‘free’ cover during the summer vacation to provide continuity of care.
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4.1.5 Career development

(i) Promotion and career development

Career development and promotion take into account responsibilities for teaching, research, administration and pastoral work but, as SOES is a research-led Academic Unit, emphasis is placed on research quality over quantity. In support of this philosophy, and with the best of intentions, recent practice aimed to reduce or eliminate administration, pastoral and teaching loads for part-time members of staff to enable their research profile. We now recognise that this policy can adversely affect part-time members of staff seeking promotion because they are unable to achieve a balanced portfolio of achievement within the Academic Unit. **We will remove the part-time bias in promotion by investigating how to change procedure and policy to ensure candidates gain proportionate experience (administration, teaching, research, pastoral care) within SOES and across the University. [Action AP5i].** To achieve these goals, we will look at experiences and best practice from elsewhere within the University where part-time workers are more common (e.g. nursing) and we will **support part-time workers by providing mechanisms to increase or decrease their hours if they feel the need to do so [Action AP5ii].**

We have identified a need to increase the number of female applicants, particularly at higher grades. At lower grades, annual appraisal of performance, feedback and career development sessions incentivise and encourage progression and are an Academic Unit requirement (appraisal and training obligatory, enforced by the Head of Academic Unit, and necessary for the appraisers own progression). We evaluate performance and development around a structured discussion that reviews past performance, achievements and learning, before providing constructive feedback, clarification of expectations and identification and agreement on future developmental needs in line with career aspirations. This process results in an action plan that is continually refined. However, **more emphasis must be placed at appraisal on ensuring that individuals can achieve an appropriate balance of roles, commensurate with grade, to achieve the eligibility criteria for career advancement [Action AP5iii].** For females at higher grades, the UoS has set up Action Learning Sets to provide support in the development and application for level 7. This approach was rolled out through WiSET and led to significant shift in the number of women applying for, and achieving, level 7 positions. Further, learning from the findings of a recent internal study\(^9\), we now provide **Building on Potential (BOP)** training (at the time of writing, 3 courses, 2 modules per course), which has attracted a high proportion of women participants from NOC. The future promotion of BOP features within the HR Business Plan for 2013 and will extend to University scientific staff. Senior staff also benefit from the Ashridge Senior Managers programme, which involves a range of opportunities for development, peer mentoring, and networking. For example, Prof. Mills received 6 x 3 hour personal coaching sessions from Ashridge, funded by the Dean of FESM to support her in her Associate Dean role and develop her skill-set for University-wide project management and leadership.

Promotions are considered on an individual basis (incorporating individual circumstances [Actions AP7i and AP7ii]). Calls for promotion applications are made annually with an extended notification period to allow staff sufficient time to prepare their case. Candidates are identified through the

---

appraisal process and are encouraged by the Head of Academic Unit to apply. Advisory sessions with HR are offered. Acknowledging that females are less likely to apply, SOES goes to great lengths to make it clear to part-time and Early Career Researchers that assessment criteria, such as the REF or administration/teaching workloads, do include a number of allowances that level the playing field. This removes anxiety about the impact of recent or imminent career breaks (e.g. maternity), or any misguided notions based on inability or levels of attainment at a given grade, which are common feelings in the female population. We will make completion of gender and equality e-training mandatory for all members of recruitment and promotion panels to reinforce a positive and supporting culture. [AP5iv and AP9ii].
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4.1.6 Induction and training

All members of SOES undergo an induction process, which includes all aspects of working (safety, administration, teaching and research), information on how the Academic Unit runs and introductions to key personnel. University policy on a variety of issues, including flexible working and various forms of leave of absence, are highlighted from the outset but in practice are administered on an ad hoc basis. We aim to improve this situation by seeking examples of good practice and initiatives that support flexible working in place at other institutions in the UK, and elsewhere, with a view to emulating flexible working capabilities within SOES. [Action AP3i]. Training possibilities are actively promoted, but presently we do not specifically highlight gender and equality training despite the availability of computer based tutorials, short taught courses and more advanced training which is made available to members of staff with managerial responsibilities. We will ensure that gender, diversity and wellbeing matters are wholly incorporated into the standard induction process and documentation [Action AP11i] and we will make mandatory the completion of e-learning training for all new starters [Action AP11ii].

Arrival of new staff is announced, details of their research interests and location are circulated, and an informal welcoming event is hosted by the Head of Academic Unit during the working day. In addition, a variety of optional events for groups of newcomers are available and designed to integrate them in the social aspects of the Academic Unit. These events are timed to maximise participation and all relevant staff from all grades are invited. The provision of a variety of social spaces encourage networking and form the setting for regular interaction and more structured, but informal, themed meetings on teaching, grant opportunities or research. Weekly social events, organised by the Postgraduate students, consist of seminars from guest speakers followed by a reception. Other opportunities for networking include informal weekly coffee mornings, and miscellaneous ad hoc celebration events. Similar activities across the wider University are communicated on a regular basis, are available to all, and staff are actively encouraged to attend. Despite a variety of opportunities, the focus groups reported that many events clash with the school run (morning or evening) and caring duties during lunchtimes. Hence, we will investigate the possibility of ensuring that important networking events or discussions are held between 10am and 4pm and, where possible, avoid the lunch time period. [Action AP3ii].

All new Academic staff are provided with an appropriate mentor, whose role is to oversee the settling-in period and provide informal advice on professional development and performance, in addition to a formal annual appraisal. Postgraduate and Postdoctoral members of the Academic
Unit are also mentored in this way, however Postgraduates are also given an independent point of contact outside of their immediate supervisory team. However, most mentoring initiatives conclude at the end of the probationary period, leaving individuals without on-going pastoral and career development support. We will address this omission by establishing a mentoring scheme for all staff beyond their probation period and, in recognising the diversity of advice likely to be sought, will prepare a pool of willing mentors (trained in gender and equality, [Action AP4ii]) that cover different aspects of pastoral care and career progression that individuals can draw upon as required. [Action AP4i].
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4.1.7 Support for female students

Academic support and pastoral care is administrated via a Supervisor or Tutor. All Undergraduate students have 2 tutors responsible for their academic progress and pastoral care, and they meet regularly at scheduled tutorials. Females have the right to request, and would be granted subject to workload distribution, a female mentor, which is made clear as an available option. Recognising that the mentor is critically important, a newly established mentoring scheme [Action 4i] will be required to provide a pool of female mentors. This scheme will be extended to Postgraduate students and Postdoctoral staff, as well as more Senior staff. We recognise, however, that a single mentor is likely to result in mixed experiences and quality of advice across the pool of mentees. To redress this imbalance and maximise the quality and timeliness of advice provided, we will provide training to those acting as a mentor [Action AP4ii]. For Undergraduates, additional support is provided through Postgraduate and Postdoctoral fellows, who provide guidance on scientific writing and feedback on assignments through demonstrating duties \( \left\{ \text{Postgraduates are also given an independent point of contact outside of their immediate supervisory team. However, most mentoring initiatives conclude at the end of the probationary period, leaving individuals without on-going pastoral and career development support. We will address this omission by establishing a mentoring scheme for all staff beyond their probation period and, in recognising the diversity of advice likely to be sought, will prepare a pool of willing mentors (trained in gender and equality, [Action AP4ii]) that cover different aspects of pastoral care and career progression that individuals can draw upon as required. [Action AP4i].} \right\} 
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4.1.8 Support for female staff

Career breaks associated with having children are a particularly critical stage in a female career, with absence from work prior to, during and after maternity leave leading to isolation from colleagues, unfamiliarity with the leading edge of research and a requirement for extended periods of time to re-establish a competitive stature following the return to work. In many cases, Postgraduate students and Early Career Postdoctoral Researchers require absences of leave for maternity and/or parental responsibilities and it is at these times support is particularly needed. For Academic staff employing these fixed-term staff on grants or contracts, bouts of extended leave can cause considerable disruption to the project. This can deter fixed-term staff from taking extended parental leave and may lead to subconscious gender bias when selecting fixed-term staff for projects. We wish to reverse this downturn in capability by providing continuity of career during periods of planned absence (i.e. paternity, maternity, caring responsibilities etc.). We will investigate employing career support personnel, who will follow a research and/or teaching plan developed in advance by the absentee, to maintain activity prior to, during and after a leave of absence. [Action AP6i]. Under this scheme, individuals will be able to request funding to cover the cost of hiring an individual to continue laboratory work on specific research projects. Alternatively, small grants could pump-prime resumption of research activity and include an element for child care costs following the good practice of the L’Oreal Women in Science programme. As it is very important that such a scheme provides the appropriate level of support, we will pilot the process with a representative candidate and closely monitor service delivery.
against expected outcomes. [Action AP6ii]. Allocation of such support will be made by the Head of Academic Unit in consultation with the Dean and Associate Deans, with decisions made quickly (within 4 weeks). As such, we will commit to the development of appropriate and transparent merit criteria [Action AP6iii] to ensure allocation is fairly administered. If recent levels of leave requests are maintained, we anticipate that all applications will be granted.

Following the return to work, women in particular face challenges associated with access to appropriate child care facilities in the vicinity of SOES. It would be short-sighted to cease support when women return to work following maternity leave, so we have recently scoped the need for child care facilities and we are in the process of consulting on how to achieve better access to such facilities within a short-distance of the NOCS building. [Action AP2]. As part of this exercise, we will investigate onsite provision of care facilities and business deals with local nurseries [Action AP2i], and will produce an accessible and comprehensive list of care options (to be provided in the staff handbook) in the local vicinity. [Action AP2ii].
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4.2 Organisation and culture

Part A

4.2.1 Male and female representation on committees

The gender composition of the 3 main committees provides a mixed picture. Relative to the proportional representation of women within SOES (23.8% in 2009, 27.7% in 2010 and 25.9% in 2011), women remain under-represented in the Policy and Resources committee, whilst progressive increases have taken place in the GSNOCS and SOES Board of Studies committees over the last 3 years. For the latter, the proportion of female members has been on par, and then exceeded, the proportional representation of females in SOES in 2010 and 2011 respectively. Positions are for a finite period (reviewed annually), allowing experience of committee work to be gained by other members of staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Female # (%)</th>
<th>Male # (%)</th>
<th>Total membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Policy and Resources</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
<td>14 (88)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSNOCS Committee</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>9 (82)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOES Board of Studies</td>
<td>4 (36)</td>
<td>7 (64)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Policy and Resources</td>
<td>3 (18)</td>
<td>14 (82)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSNOCS Committee</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
<td>18 (90)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOES Board of Studies</td>
<td>4 (27)</td>
<td>11 (73)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Policy and Resources</td>
<td>3 (19)</td>
<td>13 (81)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSNOCS Committee</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
<td>18 (90)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOES Board of Studies</td>
<td>3 (20)</td>
<td>12 (80)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Female:male ratio of academic and research staff on fixed-term contracts and open-ended (permanent) contracts

The female:male ratio across all SOES staff over the last 3 years was 0.66:1 (= 49:62 individuals), indicating an improved gender balance relative to the 0.4:1 balance achieved at Undergraduate and Early Career level. When contract type is taken into account, the overall picture reveals a female:male ratio of 0.85:1 (= 57:67 individuals) for staff on fixed-term contracts and 0.46:1 (= 6:13 individuals) for staff on permanent contracts over the same period, but these figures do mask differences in gender balance between grades (grade 4: fixed, 0.79:1, permanent, 0.78:1; grade 5: fixed, 1.6:1; permanent, 0.24:1). The annual variation in these figures is shown below, and range from gender parity (grades 4 and 5 for fixed-term contracts in 2009, and for grade 4 for permanent contracts in 2011), to under-representation (particular for permanent contracts) or overrepresentation (particularly for fixed-term contracts) of females. These figures reflect favourable recruitment rates of women in recent recruitment against a backdrop of historically higher rates of female attrition, but we will continue to monitor this closely to ensure that women are as likely as men to be on fixed/open ended contracts. In December 2011, 88.7% of all Grade 4 positions in SOES are fixed-term. There are no fixed-term posts at Grade 6, but currently 6 at Grade 7. Overall, the number of researchers on fixed-term contracts is in line with the major benchmarks (82%, Russell Group, all disciplines, as recorded by the CROS 2011 survey; 85% in STEMM disciplines, as recorded by the Athena Survey of Science, Engineering and Technology [ASSET] 2010), but our goal is to reduce the number of fixed-term contracts in the long term.

![Gender ratio for SOES staff on fixed term and open ended (permanent) contracts](image)
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Part B

4.2.3 Representation on decision-making committees

The membership of committees in SOES is driven by roles commensurate with appointment level. Committee overload has not emerged as a problem to date as roles of individuals are defined from the outset. In general, senior positions are preferentially loaded with committee membership and are balanced against other administrative and research commitments. Use of female representatives from elsewhere in the faculty is common practice, providing a means for overload relief for female staff within SOES. Women are encouraged to sit on influential committees, including Senate (currently 10 individuals, 3 females [1 from SOES], represent the Faculty). Senate membership is subject to guidance, "When you seek nominations it would be appreciated if you could have an eye to the diversity of representation from within your Faculty, in line with the key objective in the Equality Plan to increase the diversity in the University’s Governance Structures”, and attention to equality is also highlighted in the ordinances of the charter rule.
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4.2.4 Workload model

All members of staff are expected to contribute to administrative, teaching, research and pastoral duties within SOES. The total amount of contact time is closely monitored, and ordinarily the total burden does not exceed 100 hours per annum plus a residential field course. Full-time members of staff typically coordinate 2 modules. Marking of assignments are shared across the full span of staff, rather than limited to the tutors within a course, as are the allocation of student projects. The Head of Academic Unit closely monitors and periodically reviews overall teaching, administration and research workload. More senior staff are expected to be more efficient and, therefore, carry heavier loads, but otherwise such monitoring aims to ensure that workload is balanced across all staff (see section 4.1.5) and redistributed where necessary. Particularly heavy administrative duties are periodically rotated and may be split between individuals. Reduced teaching loads are provided for staff with the most burdensome administrative responsibilities. Teaching timetables are designed to ensure that individuals are not continuously teaching throughout the year to facilitate a reasonable research-teaching balance. This is supplemented by asking staff to provide preferred teaching schedules at a meeting prior to the start of the academic year to enable the balancing of other commitments, whether personal or work related (e.g. conference attendance or research cruise participation). From time to time, additional duties may arise at Faculty level and temporary relief from other duties is ordinarily arranged. There is a sabbatical system in place within SOES, where members of staff can receive relief from teaching and administration duties in order to pursue research or other agreed activity by agreement with the Head of Academic Unit. In the last 3 years, 10 academic staff (2 female; in proportion to the number of female academic staff) have taken sabbatical. Cover for courses and other administrative duties are provided either by Teaching Fellows or by other members of staff subject to workload. Overall, we try to provide an enabling environment that allows staff to vary the balance between research, administration and teaching whilst achieving a reasonable home-work life balance.
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4.2.4 Timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings

Wherever possible, meetings are arranged within 10:00-16:00hrs, avoiding lunch time, to accommodate caring and family responsibilities. If individuals cannot make a meeting, they are invited to provide input prior to the meeting and are given feedback and minutes of the meeting after the event. Timings are emailed to all staff well in advance of the meeting to allow sufficient time for arranging child care or any other arrangements. Both social gatherings and meetings are scheduled across a range of days and times to avoid selective exclusion and all gatherings are designed to be fully inclusive of gender, belief and culture. All of our main staff meetings (Informal staff, GSNOCs and SOES forum) over the last 3 years have been within our friendly policy timings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal staff meeting</td>
<td>once a month in term time (always same time)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSNOCs</td>
<td>Mar-10</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-10</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-10</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-11</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-11</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-11</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-12</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-12</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOES Forum</td>
<td>Mar-10</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-10</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>16.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec-10</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-11</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-12</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May-12</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.2.5 Culture

The Academic Unit is open, welcoming and has a friendly atmosphere (confirmed by QuickCAT survey), which has been achieved through understanding the needs of individuals, including pastoral care, attention to workload and through provision of appropriate teaching and research support. We pay close attention to conflict (rare) and, in order to reinforce an inclusive culture, alternative views are heard and resolved. Staff, Postgraduate and Undergraduate students share social spaces, mix during break and meal times, and an open door policy is practised to reinforce accessibility. Both males and females are treated consistently (confirmed by QuickCAT survey), and the needs of family life and other responsibilities are given equal hearing and are balanced against work commitments. Individuals who wish to work unsociable hours (7pm – 8am and weekends) are required to submit a Request To Work form, which is checked by security. These requests are monitored by the Head of Academic Unit to ensure that excessive, or unnecessary, hours are not performed. We firmly believe that SOES can, and should, benefit from all life
experiences that each employee brings to the organization through interaction. **We will further promote gender equality and diversity through active participation in UoS events. [Action AP12].**
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### 4.2.6 Outreach activities

SOES has an extensive outreach programme. It established the largest Student Ambassadors Scheme in the UK putting Undergraduates into 20 schools for 15 days, from Primary to Tertiary, to support STEMM teaching and provide role models in areas that have had a low uptake in Higher Education. In addition to seasonal open days and visitor days, this year SOES ran its first series of residential summer schools, supported by Headstart and BG Group, with 120 AS students spending 4 days as Ocean Going Marine Scientists or Field Geologists. Unique amongst STEMM residential courses, the gender split was even and the BG funded students were all widening participation pupils. We have secured funding for these events to run for the next 3 years. Over 60 classes make visits to SOES each year with half spending the day on the teaching vessel *Callista*. Staff also take Ocean and Earth Science into schools and colleges, with over 80 visits every year, providing talks, workshops and careers advice. We emphasise use of media, and staff make regular contributions to internet blogs, live updates during fieldwork, as well as radio, television, newspaper, science interest magazines and other activities. We provide exhibits at Science festivals and participate in public outreach events at international conferences. All outreach, and subsequent impact, is admissible in applications for promotion and/or when assessing workload.
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### 4.3 Flexibility and managing career breaks

**Part A**

#### 4.3.1 Maternity return rate

Only a small number of staff (n = 6, all staff) have requested maternity leave in SOES between October 2008 – October 2012, and, of these, 100% have returned to work following an average of 226 days leave. These include women at levels 3, 4, 6 and a visiting staff member at level 7. Two women have since left the University after returning to work, one at the natural end of her contract and the other for unknown reasons. Despite the high return rate, however, our focus group highlighted the difficulty of managing family commitments because it was difficult to avail of part-time work. **We will address this inconsistency by following examples of good practice in other areas, such as Nursing, where there are a higher proportion of females working part-time to see how continuity is assured. [Action APSii].**
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4.3.2 Paternity, adoption and parental leave uptake

There have been 10 requests for paternity leave in SOES (October 2008 – October 2012). Of these, all requests were for the statutory limit of 14 days and were received across the full pay grade spectrum (except Professorial level: 2 at level 3, 3 at level 4, 3 at level 5 and 1 at level 6). There have been no requests for parental leave or adoption leave within SOES over this time period. Adoption maternity and paternity requests are, however, treated in an identical manner in terms of pay and process. As highlighted in section 4.1.7 for periods of maternity leave, we will honour continuity of career during periods of paternity, adoption and parental leave. Hence, we will investigate employing career support personnel, under the pre-planned direction of the absentee, to maintain activity prior to, during and after leaves of absence. [Action AP6i]. Further, we will pilot the process with a representative candidate and closely monitor service delivery against expected outcomes. [Action AP6ii] and commit to the development of appropriate transparent merit criteria [Action AP6iii] to ensure allocation is fairly administered.
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4.3.3 Numbers of applications and success rates for flexible working by gender and grade

We are unable to report any statistics on flexible working, as there is no formal process. Generally speaking, there is no need for a member of staff to apply for flexible working. We will, however, identify examples of good practice that support flexible working at other institutions in the UK and elsewhere with a view to adopting any appropriate initiatives [Action AP3i].
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Part B

4.3.4 Flexible working

The Academic Unit relies on the honesty and integrity of employees and has given them freedom to work flexibly as required. Guidance on flexible working options is presently being incorporated into the staff handbook, and will facilitate discussions between managers and members of staff about flexible working patterns that meet both the needs of staff and the University. We are proud to offer opportunities for flexibility equally to both male and female members of staff.
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4.3.5 Cover for maternity and adoption leave and support on return

Prior to maternity, adoption or parental leave, teaching, administration and pastoral duties are redistributed by the Head of Academic Unit to other members of staff. Where redistribution of duties is compromised by workload restrictions, additional support is brought in to prevent overburdening of staff. Additional technical support may be allocated during pregnancy if work ordinarily includes exposure to chemicals, radiation or other potentially harmful substances. However, as highlighted earlier, we wish to extend such support to cover periods prior to, during and after leaves of absence [Action AP6i], pilot the process with a representative
candidate [Action AP6ii] and commit to the development of appropriate transparent merit criteria [Action AP6iii] to facilitate allocation procedures. Return after maternity leave is implied and 10 optional ‘Keep In Touch’ (KIT) days are available without loss of maternity pay. We wish to further assist families by examining how to improve access to child care facilities within a short-distance of the NOCS building. [Action AP2]. As part of this exercise, we will investigate business deals with local nurseries [Action AP2i], and produce an accessible and comprehensive list of care options in the local vicinity. [Action AP2ii]. For older children, there a precedent for children to attend work with their mother or father if they choose to come in to perform any duties. We encourage individuals to attend KIT days and provide information via email and newsletters during periods of absence. On return, staff are monitored on how they are coping with readjusting back to work and workloads are returned slowly and incrementally.
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(Section 4 subtotal: 4999 words)

5.0 Any other comments

To ensure that the Action Plan in support of our aspiration to address gender inequality, we will appoint a dedicated administrator within SOES with responsibility for staff development, monitoring of progress with respect to Athena Swan and to reconfigure faculty resource in support of progressive initiatives (described and future developments) that meet these objectives [Action AP10].

(Section 5 subtotal: 56 words)
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### 6. Action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Action</th>
<th>Action Taken Already</th>
<th>Further Action Required</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AP1. Well-being No 1</strong></td>
<td>Discussions with NERC National Oceanography Centre Human Resources</td>
<td>Survey (late 2012) and Workshops (first half 2013)</td>
<td>Debbie Buck in University and Jessica Ritson (NERC HR). check with Janice Donaldson (HR) on university wide intentions.</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>Review results and form action plan with workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AP2. Well-being No 2.** | Initial discussions with University nursery and University of Southampton and NERC staff at NOCS | i. Investigate business deals with local nurseries  
ii. Produce an accessible list for all staff of what care is provided in the local area. | Kim Rickard | On-going – late 2012 | We need to establish whether there is a real-issue of provision, and cost-effectiveness of private provision |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Action</th>
<th>Action Taken Already</th>
<th>Further Action Required</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **AP3. Well-being No 3.**  
Flexible working hours | Focus groups raised this as an issue | i. Seek examples of good practice and initiatives which support flexible working at other institutions in the UK and elsewhere  
ii. Investigate possibility for meetings and seminars to be held between 10 am and 4pm, and avoiding lunchtime, so parents can do school run. | 1. Kim Rickard and Dr. Martin Solan.  
2. Head of Academic Unit and NOCS management board. | Late 2012 | Follow up meetings with Focus Groups  
Attendance at meetings by staff with care or other lifestyle commitments |
| **AP4. Well-being No 4.**  
Establish a mentoring scheme for all staff beyond probation period, including career progression plans. | Discussions with Rachel Mills | i. Prepare a list of all willing mentors for staff to choose from – staff will simultaneously be connected with multiple mentors to cover different aspects when needed as career progression dictates.  
ii. Provide training, including equality and diversity, to those wishing to act as mentors | Prof Rachel Mills | 2013 | Gain feedback from Mentors how many mentees they have.  
Evaluate promotion applications and rate of progression |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Action</th>
<th>Action Taken Already</th>
<th>Further Action Required</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AP5. Career development No 1. | Focus groups raised this as an issue | i. Investigate how to change procedure and/or policy relating to proportionate experience needed in research, administration and teaching, for promotion and recruitment.  
ii. Look at best practice internally, e.g. nursing where part-time workers are common.  
iii. Add proportionate representation requirement for teaching, admin and research to appraisal scheme  
v. Make completion of gender and equality e-training mandatory for all members of promotion panels | Debbie Buck and HR | 2013 | Assess inclusion of part-time workers in SOES activity (admin, teaching, research, other roles)  
Meet with Head of Units that offer good practice.  
Monitor appraisal process for compliance  
Monitor completion of courses and add as requirement for completing probation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Action</th>
<th>Action Taken Already</th>
<th>Further Action Required</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AP6. Career Development No 2. Maternity/Paternity cover – continuity of career during period of absence. | Proposal written and agreed by Faculty | i. Implementation of scheme that is fair and transparent to maintain activity prior to, during and after leaves of absence, such as maternity leave  
ii. Pilot process with representative candidate.  
iii. Set up mechanism to allocate awards applications based on transparent merit criteria. | Head of Academic Unit and Dean of Natural and Environmental Sciences | Early 2013 | This has been agreed by University leadership and implementation will proceed.  
Need clear costing, may include redeployment of existing capacity in technical support.  
Assess by comparison of pre- versus post-productivity and whether activity maintained despite period of absence and/or re-establishment of activity hastened |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Action</th>
<th>Action Taken Already</th>
<th>Further Action Required</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **AP7. Recruitment No. 1** | Informal instruction given to provide opportunity in interview | i. Initiate formal request for inclusion on job application forms.  
ii. Identify criteria and process for making objective comparisons between candidates with and without declared individual circumstances. | Debbie Buck and HR | Early 2013 | Assess the success rate of candidates with versus without individual circumstances |

Incorporate opportunity to identify the nature of any individual circumstances that may have affected performance on job application forms in order to understand the overall effect on the individual's capacity to carry out their duties, the proportion of their capacity that was reduced, and the length of time affected.

| **AP8. Recruitment No 2:** | Feedback from focus groups inputted in to changes for standardised questions for recruitment | Investigate what we can do locally and influence the University as a whole to remove bias. | Debbie Buck  
Local implementation via ‘Essential criteria’ enforced by Head of Academic Unit | 2013 | Evaluate any change in employment rate of previously biased groups. |

Modify wording in Recruitment form and Promotional material under Essential Criteria to remove bias.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Action</th>
<th>Action Taken Already</th>
<th>Further Action Required</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AP9. Recruitment No 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During application process include male and female applicants on long-listing for permanent academic positions</td>
<td>Initial discussion with HR</td>
<td>i. Issue statement outlining process to all academic staff</td>
<td>Head of Academic unit</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Summer 2013. Check that all long-lists have male and female candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Check that all panel members have completed gender and equality e-learning training course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Make completion of gender and equality e-training mandatory for all members of recruitment panels</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AP10. Overarching No 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Single Administrator in SOES with responsibility for staff development and monitoring of progress with Athena Swan</td>
<td>Discussions with Faculty Operating Officer</td>
<td>Reconfiguration of Faculty resource</td>
<td>Faculty Operating Officer</td>
<td>Late 2012</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role to take responsibility for ensuring actions are in place, continuous evaluation of best practice, and recommendations for further improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Action</td>
<td>Action Taken Already</td>
<td>Further Action Required</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AP11. Overarching No 2:**  
Staff induction |              | i. Incorporate gender, diversity and wellbeing into standard induction process and documentation | Head of Academic Unit | Late 2012 | Check that material is included in documentation – talk to new staff - Spring 2013 |
|                       |              | ii. Make completion of gender and equality e-training mandatory for new starters |                | Early 2013 | Check that all panel members have completed gender and equality e-learning training course |
| **AP12. Overarching No 3:**  
Participation in Gender equality conference run by the University | Should take part and provide specific activities at NOCS to increase accessibility. |                | University Diversity unit, HR Manager and Diversity Officer | March/April 2013 | That events took place at the National Oceanography Centre Southampton – March/April 2013 |