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Athena SWAN Silver Department awards recognise that in addition to university-wide policies the department is working to promote gender equality and to address challenges particular to the discipline.

Not all institutions use the term ‘department’ and there are many equivalent academic groupings with different names, sizes and compositions. The definition of a ‘department’ for SWAN purposes can be found on the Athena SWAN website. If in doubt, contact the Athena SWAN Officer well in advance to check eligibility.

It is essential that the contact person for the application is based in the department.

Sections to be included

At the end of each section state the number of words used. Click here for additional guidance on completing the template.
1. Letter of endorsement from the head of department: maximum 500 words

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

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

I am delighted to write to confirm my own, and the School of Bioscience’s, absolute commitment to this Silver Award application, to the Athena SWAN process and to gender equality in the higher education and academic sectors.

Since my appointment in May 2015, on a platform which included a strong commitment to Athena SWAN, I have had the opportunity to accelerate the progress made under our 2012 Bronze Award action plan. That plan was strongly focused on equality and diversity training tailored to specific roles (e.g. admissions tutors, recruitment panel chairs) and also equipping women for successful career progression/promotion, through mentoring schemes and new approaches to appraisal/review. The impact of these measures is shown by the increase in women promoted to Professorial levels, which enabled wide-ranging changes in our senior management team. The Deputy Head of School (Daniela Riccardi), two of our four Heads of Division (Rosalind John and Helen White-Cooper) are now female. In 2013, female representation on the wider Management Team was 18%; it is now 44%. Not only have these changes rebalanced perspectives on gender equality within the School but they are a very visible sign of progress made since gaining our Bronze Award.

Particular mention should be made of Professors Riccardi, John and White-Cooper for their strong leadership and examples they set to all women across the School. Indeed, there have been outstanding contributions made to the School by women at all career stages. For example, Dr Hannah Shaw (Senior Lecturer) has been exemplary in her organisation and leadership of the School anatomy courses (as well as receiving a University ‘Rising Star’ award) and Dr Maddy Young (Postdoctoral Research Assistant) has been very active in representing the research staff community. Female staff continue to achieve success in the wider academic environment. For example, Dr Kelly Bérubé (Reader) recently won the Pioneer Award category of the new Womenspire Awards, which recognises women providing strong role models in STEMM, and Professor Paola Borri who holds an EPSRC Leadership Fellowship.

We have also seen improvement in a key stage of the pipeline where we have previously experienced drop-out of female staff – the researcher/lecturer transition. We will ensure this is sustained and further support the career progression success of all staff, using our new Action Plan to implement a number of changes in policy/practice, including a new promotion-focused performance appraisal system combined with a new workload model. Furthermore, the School will be committing resources to ensure the Action Plan is successful.

In summary, a combination of actions implemented since 2012 and opportunities provided by changes in leadership have had a dramatic impact in the culture of gender attitudes and the wider equality agenda within the School. We fully recognise that there is more to be done; however, I am proud of the impact the policy/practice changes we have made so far have had and I am personally committed to build on the momentum we have generated to drive forward further change.

Professor Jim Murray, Head of School

(Word count 497)
2. The self-assessment process: maximum 1000 words

Describe the self-assessment process. This should include:

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

The Cardiff School of Biosciences (BIOSI) Athena SWAN Self-Assessment Team (SAT), which includes the Head and Deputy Head of School, is detailed in Table 1. SAT members have a three-year term of office with a staggered turnover to ensure continuity. Replacements are found through advertising vacancies across the school followed by a short interview process by the SAT to ascertain suitability and role shadowing opportunities.

The BIOSI SAT reports to the Staff and Working Environment Committee and through its chair, the Deputy Head of School, to School Management and the Head of School. Links to the College of Biological and Life Sciences are through the Co-Chairs. Links to the University SAT are though Hayley Beckett and to University management through the Head of School.

A position on the SAT is reflected in workload allocations in the staff activity profile (chairing a school committee = 100 hours and committee membership = 30 hours in the activity profile).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member (Gender)</th>
<th>Career/Study Path</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Charter role</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Smalley(M)</td>
<td>Career/Study Path</td>
<td>SAT Co-Chair and liaison with College E&amp;D team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ros John(F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAT Co-Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Murray(M)</td>
<td>Career/Study Path</td>
<td>Head of School and liaison with University Senior Management Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela Riccardi(F)</td>
<td>Career/Study Path</td>
<td>Deputy Head of School and liaison with Staff and Working Environment Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Amici-Dargan(F)</td>
<td>Career/Study Path</td>
<td>Division Lead (Neuroscience)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Cable (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Division Lead (Organisms and Environment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Taylor (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Division Lead (Molecular Biosciences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emyr Lloyd-Evans (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Division Lead (Pathophysiology and Repair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Reed (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Experience as ECR panel member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddy Young (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>BIOSI Research Staff Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayley Beckett (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>E&amp;D Lead; liaison with University SAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Fitzgibbon (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>HR Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David McGonigle (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>External member / critical friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harleen Kaur Mandla (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bev Plummer (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Services Lead and Admin Support to SAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvin Kwan (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Kirkham (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>PGR Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1:** The BIOSI Athena SWAN Self-Assessment Team. F/M indicates Female or Male. FT/PT indicates full- or part-time.
b) an account of the self-assessment process: details of the self-assessment team meetings, including any consultation with staff or individuals outside of the university, and how these have fed into the submission

In May 2015, Professor Jim Murray took over as new head of school and instigated extensive changes in school management, leadership roles and teaching portfolio aimed at improving efficiency and work-life balance (Sections 3 and 4 and Figures 1 and 2). The SAT was reconstituted to cover a full spectrum of diversity with respect to gender, age, career stage and roles now including undergraduate and postgraduate representatives. The SAT reports to the newly established Staff and Working Environment (SWE) Committee, chaired by Professor Daniela Riccardi, Deputy Head of School, which has overall responsibility for E&D issues, HR-related matters, and wider issues relating to the working environment. Five SAT members, including the co-chairs, are members of the SWE Committee.

Since September 2015 the SAT has met monthly. Consultation has taken place with other SAT teams within Cardiff University and externally. The SAT co-chairs are part of a forum within the College of Biological and Life Sciences which meets to discuss best practice. External individuals (e.g. Professor Karen Holford, Engineering) have presented on best practice, SAT members have visited SAT at Oxford Brookes and Athena SWAN Champions at Queen’s University Belfast. Quantitative data have been extracted from recent staff surveys and results of the Athena SWAN survey from 2012 have been analysed quantitatively to identify key areas of concern (Section 5), then explored in one-to-one semi-structured interviews with members of staff.

Student data for the assessment process were provided by Cardiff University Planning Department. Staff data were provided by Cardiff University Management Information Services as a cumulative report based on the Annual period ending each year on the 30th September. Recruitment information was based on applications received within 12 monthly periods ending each year on the 30th September. Maternity/paternity data were based on reporting between 1st October and 30th September for each period. Cumulative data enabled staff numbers to be benchmarked across the University. To supplement this, a point-in-time analysis of staff numbers was carried out on the 31st of August annually from 2013 – 2016.

Sector benchmarking data for staff and students were obtained from the ECU website. UCAS annual reports were used for benchmarking undergraduate application and acceptance data. Postgraduate sector benchmarking data were not available.

c) Plans for the future of the self-assessment team, such as how often the team will continue to meet, any reporting mechanisms and in particular how the self-assessment team intends to review implementation of the action plan.

From May 2016, the SAT will meet every two months (Action 2.1) to review implementation of the Action Plan, and implement new initiatives / examples of best practice. Regular consultation with internal and external partners will be continued, including the College of Biological and Life Sciences Equality and Diversity forum, the GW4 Athena SWAN group and the South West regional meeting for Athena SWAN (Action 2.2). The SAT will annually review its own membership to ensure balanced representation and where necessary recruit new members in addition to those replaced through turnover on the committee (Action 2.3).
Athena SWAN has been made a standing item on all School committee agendas with discussions fed back to the SAT (Action 2.4). The SAT will collect and analyse staff and student data annually (Actions 2.5 – 2.7).

The SAT will implement an Athena SWAN communications strategy, which will be both ‘inward facing’, to inform staff and students about our activities and to encourage a positive environment, as well as ‘outward facing’ to encourage underrepresented groups to apply for jobs within BIOSI (Action 2.8).

Finally, the Athena SWAN Action Plan will be incorporated into the School forward plan to ensure that equality of opportunity with STEM subjects remains central to the ethos of the school (Action 2.9). The school has committed funds and resources to the SAT and to implement the Action Plan going forward. These include workload allocations for time spent on the SAT; paying for a postgraduate student to assist with data analysis; costs of unconscious bias training delivered by an external provider; money for seedcorn funding of a grant application pilot scheme for early career researchers (ECRs); contributing substantial funds for fellowship positions to help postdoctoral researchers establish their independence and become more competitive for Lecturer positions.

(Word count 815)
3. A picture of the department: maximum 2000 words

a) Provide a pen-picture of the department to set the context for the application, outlining in particular any significant and relevant features.

**Figure 1**: New committee structure of the School of Biosciences at January 2016.
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Figure 3: Academic Team Leaders (ATLs) and their Teams. 19 (76%) of ATLs are male, 6 (24%) are female. This is discussed further below (Section 4).
Cardiff School of Biosciences is one of the largest UK Biosciences departments, pursuing a wide range of internationally competitive research. In REF2014, the School achieved an overall grade point average of 3.23* and a UK ranking of 13th.

The School comprises 111 academic staff (32% female), 142 Research staff (56% female), 106 Support staff (59% female), 164 postgraduate students (53% female) and 1488 undergraduates (59% female). BSc degrees are offered alongside MPhil, PhD and MRes postgraduate degrees. In the 2015 National Student Survey, the School had an 88% satisfaction rate for its Biology degree schemes.

The School has four research divisions, Organisms and the Environment, Pathophysiology and Repair, Molecular Biosciences and Neuroscience. The School also leads two research institutes: The European Cancer Stem Cell Research Institute (ECSCRI) and WATER University Research Institute. Since our previous Athena SWAN application, the School has been incorporated into the College of Biological and Life Sciences, one of the three colleges at Cardiff University.

School activities are based at four sites on one city-centre campus: ‘Main Building’ and the Life Sciences Building, both primarily for research, the adjacent Sir Martin Evans Building, where both research and the majority of teaching takes place, and the European Cancer Stem Cell Research Institute which is housed within the new Hadyn Ellis Building, approximately 10 minutes’ walk from the Sir Martin Evans Building. The data presented here include BIOSI staff at all locations including the Research Institutes. All locations are represented on the SAT.

The School’s committee structure changed in 2015. The new structure is shown in Figure 1, the clerical and administrative staff structure in Figure 2 and the new Academic Team Leader structure in Figure 3. E&D remain fundamental considerations of all School processes and activities. Under the new committee structure, the SWE committee, chaired by the Deputy Head of School, has scrutiny of E&D matters and reports directly to the School Management Team. The Deputy Head of School also reports on Athena SWAN/E&D issues weekly at the Executive Team meetings and monthly at the Management Team (the School’s main decision body).

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

Student data
Consistent with our ambitions from our 2012 application and as stated as a success measure in our 2012 Action Plan, we meet or exceed national figures for female participation in biological degree schemes. In order to ensure we maintain our excellent record, all admissions tutors have received E&D training specifically tailor-made for admissions, we have continued to review annually levels of female recruitment to our undergraduate and postgraduate courses (both offers and acceptances, as well as outcomes) and to ensure success of our postgraduate students, we have ensured all supervisors have appropriate training. All these initiatives were taken under the 2012 Action Plan and their impact is shown by the high level of female participation we continue to have in our undergraduate and postgraduate courses. For more detailed comments and discussion of new actions, see below and also Section 4.
(i) Numbers of males and females on access or foundation courses – comment on the data and describe any initiatives taken to attract women to the courses.

The School offers a preliminary year as part of some undergraduate degree schemes. These attract small numbers of students, typically more females than males. For the years in which comparative data are available, the numbers show BIOSI had more female students on such courses than national sector averages (2011/2012: proportion of female students on full time foundation courses in BIOSI was 54%, nationally 28.2%; 2012/2013 in BIOSI 64%, nationally 29.1%) (Figure 4).

Figure 4: Proportions and numbers of male and female students enrolled on a preliminary year in BIOSI, for the academic sessions 2011/12 – 2015/16.

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

The data on undergraduate numbers (Figure 5) show that we continue to attract males and females to our courses in proportions equivalent with the national sector average.
Figure 5: Proportions and numbers of male and female undergraduate students (full and part-time) in BIOSI, compared to the sector average, for the academic sessions 2009/10 – 2013/14.

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

We do not have any students classed as postgraduate (taught).

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

The data (Figure 6) show that we continue to attract full-time postgraduate research students in proportions equivalent with the national sector average, one of the success measures identified in our 2012 Action Plan. There are, however, more male than female part time students. The reasons for this are unclear. One possibility is that it may be easier to do part time PGR study in some disciplines and not others and entry of postgraduate students to the different disciplines may be gender biased. We will investigate the data further to understand the underlying causes and identify any further actions that might be taken (Action 3.1).
Figure 6: Proportions and numbers of male and female postgraduate (research) students (full and part time) in BIOSI, compared to the sector average, for the academic sessions 2009/10 – 2013/14.

(v) Ratio of course applications to offers and acceptances by gender for undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research degrees – comment on the differences between male and female application and success rates and describe any initiatives taken to address any imbalance and their effect to date. Comment upon any plans for the future.

The data on applications, offers and acceptances for undergraduate and postgraduate research degrees (Figures 7 – 10) show we continue to attract applications from prospective undergraduates in line with national sector benchmarks and that offers and acceptances show no gender biases. Similarly, postgraduate applications, offers and acceptances show no gender biases and this gives us confidence in our current practices. We will continue to review these numbers (Action 2.5 and 2.6).

The 2012 Action Plan included a programme of enhanced E&D Training for Admissions Tutors tailor-made specifically for admissions. This had the desired impact of maintaining our excellent, sector-comparable, gender balance in admissions. This will be continued under the new plan (Action 3.2). Furthermore, to maintain the continued levels of female applications to postgraduate research courses, final year tutors and students are being informed of postgraduate research opportunities through emails, posters, digital display screens, announcements on Learning Central and Postgraduate open day talks are embedded in the final year undergraduate timetable.
Figure 7: Applications by gender for undergraduate degrees 2011/12 – 2015/16 with University and sector comparator data.

Figure 8: Course offers as a percentage of applications and acceptances as a percentage of offers by gender for undergraduate degrees. Note sector benchmarking data are only available for acceptances.
Figure 9: Applications by gender for postgraduate research (PGR) degrees 2011/12 – 2015/16 with University comparator data. Note sector benchmarking data are not available.

Figure 10: Course offers as a percentage of applications and acceptances as a percentage of offers by gender for postgraduate research degrees. Note sector benchmarking data are not available.
Degree classification by gender – comment on any differences in degree attainment between males and females and describe what actions are being taken to address any imbalance.

**Figure 11:** Degree class by gender (bars) compared to sector average (dots).

Degree class data (Figure 11) demonstrate that BIOSI students continue to perform at least as well as, if not better, than the national average. Female students consistently achieve a higher proportion of first class degrees than male students and in the last two academic sessions have also outperformed males in obtaining upper second class degrees. Considered as a whole therefore, BIOSI student data show that the School compares favourably with national comparator data and there is no gender bias against females. We will continue to review these data on an annual basis (Action 2.5).

The key data from above are summarised in Figure 12 below, which shows the pipeline from undergraduate applications though to postgraduate student. This demonstrates that the proportion of females at the undergraduate application/offer/acceptance stages is remarkably consistent, at just below 60%. The overall proportion of female undergraduates is higher than this, at approximately 65%; however, the application/offer/acceptance data are for the five years to 2015/16, whereas the available data for total student numbers are for the five years to 2013/14, so they are not necessarily directly comparable.

In contrast to the relatively consistent progression for females, the PGR data show that males outnumber females in PGR applications. However, offers and acceptances are more gender balanced with female applicants more likely to get offers (see Figure 11). Similar considerations relating to the time period being analysed apply to the PGR application/offer/acceptance and total student number data.

The difference in the gender balance between undergraduates and applications for PGR positions indicates that female undergraduates are less likely to apply to PGR positions than males. Females may perceive a PGR career less favourably than males. To address this, we will take actions to promote postgraduate research in BIOSI to our undergraduate students (see Section 4).
**Figure 12**: The student pipeline from undergraduate applications through to postgraduate research student numbers by gender. Figure shows mean annual proportion of male and female students, and actual numbers, at each stage. Means are averages of the most recent five years for which numbers are available. Acceptances and offers are shown as gender break downs of the total number of acceptances and offers (in contrast to Figures 8 and 10). Only full time student data are shown.
Staff data

(vii) **Female: male ratio of academic staff and research staff** – researcher, lecturer, senior lecturer, reader, professor (or equivalent). Comment on any differences in numbers between males and females and say what action is being taken to address any underrepresentation at particular grades/levels.

BIOSI is a large and complex school delivering high quality research and teaching across a broad range of biological/biomedical sciences. In order to effectively deal with our responsibilities and functions, academic career paths follow one of three career paths – Research, Teaching and Research (T&R) or Teaching and Scholarship (T&S). Research assistants, post-doctoral research associates and research fellows are employed on the research career pathway, with main responsibilities being research, applications for research funding, where appropriate for career stage, and supervision of undergraduates where appropriate (e.g. on final year projects). At the transition from researcher to Lecturer, individuals can be appointed to the T&R or T&S pathways. Progression from Lecturer through Senior Lecturer and Reader to Professor is possible on both pathways. T&R staff can also apply for promotion on the basis of excellence in teaching or innovation and engagement. Expectations of T&R staff are clearly articulated in the Cardiff Academic framework and include research, high-quality publications, achieving external grant income, undergraduate and postgraduate education, public engagement and administration. T&S staff expectations include undergraduate and postgraduate education, pedagogic research (and associated publications, income and impact), public engagement and administration.

**Figure 13:** Gender proportions and numbers of academic staff in BIOSI, other STEMM schools within Cardiff University and across Cardiff University as a whole by academic year from 2009/10 to 2014/15 using cumulative head count data.
Figure 14: Proportion of female (solid line) and male (dashed line) academic staff in BIOSI expressed as line graphs, with percentages and actual numbers below. The narrowing of the gap between the lines demonstrates that staff numbers are converging towards gender balance.
Figures 13 and 14 show the gender balance of BIOSI academic staff compared to other STEMM schools in the University and the University as a whole, benchmarked using cumulative staff headcount data (see above Section 2). ECU sector benchmarks are not shown as they are provided as pay bands and therefore not comparable. Data are presented both as bar charts with the comparators and as line graphs which illustrate how gaps between male and female representation have changed over time.

Figures 15 - 19 show point-of-time staff numbers from 2013 – 2016, broken down by gender and career path where appropriate.

Figure 15: Point-of-time Research staff numbers as censored at 31st of August 2013 – 2016 by gender (proportions and actual numbers).

Figure 16: Point-of-time Lecturer numbers as censored at 31st of August 2013 – 2016 by gender. Numbers are provided as total staff numbers as well as broken down by career path.
Figure 17: Point-of-time Senior Lecturer numbers as censored at 31st of August 2013 – 2016 by gender. Numbers are provided as total staff numbers as well as broken down by career path.

Figure 18: Point-of-time Reader numbers as censored at 31st of August 2013 – 2016 by gender. Numbers are provided as total staff numbers as well as broken down by career path.
A key impact of our 2012 Action Plan is the remarkable improvement in the proportion of female Professors within the school. This has more than doubled and is now comparable to University benchmarks. We are also seeing a modest rise in the proportion of female Senior Lecturers and Readers, which are also at comparable levels to University benchmarks. Sustaining and improving this progress requires suitable numbers of eligible staff coming through in the pipeline. We are also pleased to see, therefore, that the point-of-time analysis of staff numbers demonstrates that we have a much improved proportion of male and female lecturers (equal ratios). However, it is important to note that female lecturers are biased to T&S contracts. T&S staff are less likely to get promoted (see Section 4). Consequently, we have now put systems in place to address this inequality (see Section 4).

It is important to note that there are differences in the data collected cumulatively and the point-of-time data, with conflicting pictures for the Lecturer grade. The cumulative data are necessary to permit benchmarking across other STEM schools and the University. However, because of the way they are collected (counting all contracted staff over the year) they can lead to statistical anomalies. For instance, an individual promoted from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer would be counted twice, once at each grade. Equally, an individual on a fixed term contract who has their contract renewed would be counted twice, once for each contract. Point-of-time and cumulative data need to be considered together and, going forward, we will collect both annually (Action 2.7). It is still important to note, however, that while the equal gender ratio of Lecturers is an important milestone, it is still below University benchmarks according to the cumulative data measure and also does not reflect the gender balance of BIOSI Researchers, which is comparable to University benchmarks (or possibly even more skewed to females). We therefore need to continue to strive to achieve a gender balance in our academic staff, which reflects the pipeline below and benchmarks (see staff pipeline Figure 20).

We are committed to further increasing the proportion of female Professors and the number of women in very senior management roles. To do this we must achieve an appropriate gender balance at each stage to increase the pool of individuals available to apply for Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Reader and then Professor, with a particular focus on the challenging step of attaining a lectureship position. The Actions we will take to achieve these goals are detailed in Section 4.
Figure 20: BIOSI Staff pipeline from 2016 point-in-time data by gender showing proportions of staff at each grade and actual numbers.
(viii) **Turnover by grade and gender** – comment on any differences between men and women in turnover and say what is being done to address this. Where the number of staff leaving is small, comment on the reasons why particular individuals left.

Staff turnover data for BIOSI is presented in Figures 21 and 22 and Table 2. Due to the small number of staff turnover at Lecturer level and above, data for all female academic staff have been combined in the figures. Individual numbers are given in Table 2.

![Figure 21: Turnover of female academic staff (of grade lecturer and above) expressed as a proportion of total staff turnover in BIOSI by academic year from 2010/11 to 2014/15 and compared to other STEMM schools within Cardiff University, across Cardiff University as a whole and with available Sector data.](image-url)
Figure 22: Staff turnover as a percentage of total staff of each gender by academic year from 2010/11 to 2014/15.

Table 2: Actual numbers of staff of leaving BIOSI by academic session, grade and gender. Averages are average number of leavers per annum over the five year period, rounded to the nearest whole number. Percentages are average annual proportions of staff leaving by gender.
The gender balance of BIOSI staff turnover overall is similar to the University and STEMM averages (44% female v 56% male). The data suggest that BIOSI is good at retaining staff, particularly female staff, at these grades and that there is no apparent issue with staff turnover, male or female.

Overall turnover at the level of Researcher is higher, as might be expected from a large proportion of staff on fixed-term contracts associated with Research Council and charity awards (Section 4). However, Researcher turnover is gender balanced and consistent with other STEMM schools and University data. The SAT will continue to review staff turnover on an annual basis (Action 2.7). We will also implement exit interviews for staff to capture reasons for leaving (Action 3.3).

**KEY IMPACTS SECTION 3**

Summary of key impacts since 2012

- Proportion of female Professors doubled
- Improving gender balance of Lecturers

Key challenges going forwards

- Provide greater opportunities for promotion of female academic staff at senior levels
- Ensure T&S and T&R staff have equal chances of successful promotion
- Achieve gender balance at Lecturer grade which reflects both benchmarks and pipeline

(Word count 2096 consisting of 1908 words of section allowance plus 188 words of the additional 1000 allowance for departmental complexities, specifically the complexities of career pathways and differences in promotion between them, page 18 lines 6 - 20, pre-approved by ECU in attached e-mail)
4. Supporting and advancing women’s careers: maximum 5000 words

Key career transition points

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

   (i) **Job application and success rates by gender and grade** – comment on any differences in recruitment between men and women at any level and say what action is being taken to address this.
Figure 23: Percentage of applications (top) for Researcher and Lecturer positions, percentage success rates (middle) and overall rates of successful job applications compared to other Cardiff STEMM schools and the University as a whole (bottom) by gender from 2010/11 to 2014/15. NK indicates gender not known.

Applications and success rates for Researcher positions have been just above 50% for female applicants. In contrast, applications for lectureships over the last 5 years have been predominantly from men (62±8%; 5 year mean of percentage of total applications from males ± SD). A reduced number of applicants contributes to the drop-off in the pipeline of women achieving the Researcher-Lecturer transition. Measures to address this, including ways of encouraging and helping both internal BIOSI Researchers and external applicants apply for Lecturer positions, are discussed more fully below (Recruitment and Support for staff at key career transition points below). While the data for Lecturer appointees are limited, appointments have been gender-balanced. This indicates that we must focus on attracting more female applicants (see Recruitment).

The lack of bias in appointment panels is evidence that our 2012 Action Plan commitments to E&D training have had impact. As part of our continued commitment to ensuring that short-listing and appointments panels are unbiased, all staff undergo E&D training (Action 4.1). All staff acting as panel chairs for recruitment and selection and promotion panels will have tailored E&D training, including understanding unconscious bias and how to avoid bias in the work environment (Action 4.2). This training covers all aspects of diversity and will be of value in achieving a full and appropriate spectrum of diversity in the workplace which, while not discussed in this application, is a clear priority of the School. We will continue to review applications and turnover to ensure that the measures we have taken are successful (Action 2.7).

Increases in the numbers of Senior Lecturer (SL), Reader and Professor since 2009/2010 have been primarily by promotion (discussed further below) rather than external recruitment. However, between 2009 and 2014, there were 18 external applications SL positions and above. Of these, 12 were male, 4 were female and 2 were unknown gender. One male and one female SL were
appointed, and one male Professor. Given that no females applied externally for a Professorship, these data support that picture that women are less likely to apply for senior jobs but just as likely or more likely to be successful.

We will continue to review Lecturer appointments and promotion to higher grades (Action 2.7). We will act to increase the proportion of women applying for Lecturer posts through mentoring within the school and clearer processes. External applicants will be encouraged through improved language in documentation and highlighting our Athena SWAN status. Front-loading the pipeline over time will increase the proportion of women at more senior grades. We will put in place measures to ensure a culture, work-life balance and workload which will continue to retain female Lecturers. Actions are discussed more fully under Recruitment and Support for staff at key career transition points below.

(ii) Applications for promotion and success rates by gender and grade – comment on whether these differ for men and women and if they do explain what action may be taken. Where the number of women is small applicants may comment on specific examples of where women have been through the promotion process. Explain how potential candidates are identified.

Promotion opportunities are available for Research staff on project-specific time-limited contracts. Outstanding Contributions Awards for Service can be a one-off pay bonus or a sustained increase in pay grade equivalent to promotion/regrading. In 2015, there were four OCAS applications, three from females and one from a male. Two of the applications from women and the one application from a man were successful.

Fellowship opportunities are also available. The European Cancer Stem Cell Research Institute, for which BIOSI is the home school, has a fellowship programme which currently has three female and four male fellows with one female and one male internally appointed from BIOSI. BIOSI has just committed funds to support a new joint Welsh government-led initiative with the European Union, COFUND, to support researchers looking to become independent. Application outcomes are awaited but BIOSI is currently supporting 8 applications, 4 from males and 4 from females (a potential investment of >£600,000; assuming only 3 or 4 are supported, >£250,000 over the next three years).

We will take action to further support the career development of our researchers by introducing fellowship application workshops for Research staff (Action 4.3), ensuring Researchers receive career progression mentoring (Action 4.4) and coaching Research staff on achieving appointment criteria for Lectureships (Action 4.5).
### Table 3. Total numbers of applicants for promotion, withdrawn applications and successful applications by gender for academic years since 2012/13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Total Applicants</th>
<th>Withdrawn</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Awaiting outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>Personal Chair (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Chair (T&amp;S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader (T&amp;S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer (T&amp;S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Year totals</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>Personal Chair (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer (T&amp;S)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Year totals</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>Personal Chair (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer (T&amp;S)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Year totals</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>Personal Chair (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer (T&amp;S)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Year totals</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals by Grade 2012 - 2016</td>
<td>Personal Chair*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer (T&amp;R)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer (T&amp;S)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand totals</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By career path 2012 - 2016</td>
<td>Teaching and Research</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching and Scholarship</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For Personal Chair and Reader, T&S and T&R data have been combined for ‘Totals by Grade’ as T&S applications to this grade have only occurred in the most current (2015/16) round of applications.
Promotions data for academic staff seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer, Reader and Professor are provided in Table 3 (actual number and percentage breakdowns of numbers of applicants, withdrawn applications and successful applications).

Year on year numbers are small so we have considered the aggregate data in particular (highlighted in green in Table 3). These show that, when considered just by grade, there is no evidence of gender bias in applications, withdrawals or successful applications since 2012. Furthermore, when each career path is considered separately, there is no evidence of gender bias against females within each pathway. In fact, women on T&S contracts are more likely to be successful in promotions than men.

However, when considering the T&S and T&R career paths against each other, it is clear that T&R staff, both male and female, are more likely to apply, and to be successful in applications, than T&S staff. This is supported by one-to-one staff interviews conducted by the SAT. Historically, it has been difficult for T&S staff to be promoted above Senior Lecturer. One of the key reasons we have identified behind this issue is that T&S staff focus on teaching duties at the expense of scholarship activities, a key benchmark for promotion.

The gender issue is relevant because more T&S Lecturers/Senior Lecturers are women - from the 2016 point-of-time data the ratio is approximately 1.5:1. Conversely, more T&R Lecturers/Senior Lecturers are men - from the 2016 point-of-time data the ratio approximately 2:1.

Women are therefore disadvantaged in promotion to senior ranks as they are more likely to be on T&S contracts. We will continue to review this situation going forward (Action 4.6). However, we have already begun to take immediate action to address this inequality. We are using the staff activity profile and workload model to identify which T&S staff need to rebalance their workload to devote more time scholarship and achieve the benchmarks for promotion. The Performance Development Review system will focus on promotion with T&S staff being reviewed by a T&S line manager guiding them through process with pathway-specific advice. Furthermore, T&S promotion mentors have been identified both inside and outside the School who will advise T&S staff on how to reach the criteria for academic promotion (Action 4.7).

Our actions are already having an significant impact – in the current round of promotions we have had two applications from T&S Lecturers (one male, one female) for promotion to Senior Lecturer and three applications (two male and one female T&S Senior Lecturers) for promotion to Reader. Increased numbers at Reader level will form a platform for promotion to Professor.

A key aspect of promotion is the application process. If females are less likely to apply for promotion, on whichever career track, their progression to senior levels will be hindered. In our 2012 Action Plan, we identified this as an issue and successfully introduced training for appraisers encouraging staff to review promotions criteria prior to appraisal. The impact of this has been the very welcome increase in female staff holding personal chairs. However, while the system led to a more in-depth discussion of promotion at appraisal, it also resulted in increased workload for managers of academic staff (with Heads of Division appraising 20 – 30 individuals at Lecturer level and above in addition to their own research teams). Consequently, these meetings only happened annually. We have addressed this by revising the process with a new Performance Development Review (PDR) system in combination with the introduction of a new academic team structure and appointment of Academic Team Leaders. Academic Team Leaders (Action 4.8) are now responsible for an annual detailed review of no more than 8 individuals (in addition to their own research teams) together with regular ‘light touch’ follow-up meetings 3 times per annum. PDR
meeting specifically address readiness for promotion, and areas considered under the PDR system
directly map on to benchmarks for promotion for both T&R and T&S staff (Action 4.9). We will
continue to provide and promote annual in-house training sessions on academic promotion
procedures as implemented under the 2012 Action Plan (Action 4.10). In the 2013/14 session, 62%
of attendees were female; in the 2014/15 session, 45% were female.

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

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

Increasing equality across all groups within our school requires an unbiased advertising process
making it clear that we welcome diversity. All adverts include a statement of commitment to equal
opportunities and highlight the commitment of the School to flexible working (including
consideration of job share arrangements for all posts) and other family-friendly policies. These
statements are reproduced on the homepage of the School website. Application packs will be also
be assessed to ensure that language used is gender neutral in light of recent studies suggesting
certain terms act as a deterrent to specific groups (Action 4.11). Both our job application website
and the school website homepage include the Athena SWAN award logo, information on our
current award and a link to our 2012 application (Actions 4.11 and 4.12). We will also ensure that
recruitment and promotion panels are gender balanced (Action 4.13).

Senior members of School management, plus other staff involved in short-listing, recruitment and
promotion panels, have undertaken unconscious bias training. Panel Chair Training was
implemented under the 2012 Action Plan and chairs of interview panels are now required to have
undergone this training, which includes awareness of statutory requirements for interviews,
unconscious bias awareness and the understanding the importance of diversity in interview panels
as a way of diffusing perceived biases (Action 4.2). All panel chairs have now undergone this
training. All staff will undergo mandatory E&D training (Action 4.1) (current uptake is 53%) and the
new Academic Team Leaders will, as part of their training, have a refresher E&D course including
unconscious bias awareness (Action 4.8). All ATLs have undergone training.

We will continue to review applications and success rates broken down by gender (Action 2.7). We
will gather feedback on the application and interview process from interviewees to assess the
effectiveness of the steps we have implemented (Action 4.14).

(ii) Support for staff at key career transition points – having identified key areas of
attrition of female staff in the department, comment on any interventions,
programmes and activities that support women at the crucial stages, such as
personal development training, opportunities for networking, mentoring
programmes and leadership training. Identify which have been found to work best
at the different career stages.

Actions taken since 2012 have had a significant impact on the gender balance of staff, helping
improve the Lecturer gender balance and significantly increasing the proportions of female
Professors. Nonetheless, while BIOSI Research staff are predominantly female, lecturers are
gender balanced and Senior Lecturers, Readers and Professors are predominantly male (Figures 15 – 19). This indicates a barrier to women making the Researcher – Lecturer transition. Addressing this issue is key issue to the progression of women to the most senior roles. Our strategy must have two strands. First, we must encourage more women, both from Cardiff and externally, to apply for Lecturer posts. Within the School we can support this by equipping all staff for success in their applications both internally and externally. Second, once appointed we must ensure women are supported in their career progression and take a future-focussed, strategic approach to promotion, i.e. a clearly defined development plan and mentoring support.

Lecturer positions are externally advertised and appointment is from a pool of local, national and international candidates. We will ensure that the wording of adverts is gender neutral and clearly encourages the full range of applicants. To address any internal barriers, we will foster a strategic approach to planning careers and promotions among staff early in their careers. To improve representation amongst researchers, BIOSI established the Research Staff Group (RSG), represented on the SAT by Dr Maddy Young and Professor Ros John. We will take a stronger role in career planning for individual staff through PDRs, a fair and open promotions process, with mentorship specifically to support staff in writing promotions applications. In addition, promotion and career development workshops and professional development, leadership and training programmes shape an individual’s career in a way that gives them the confidence to make applications. BIOSI is already providing workshops ranging from training in confidence building, specifically aimed at women (Action 4.15), workshops for all staff on how to write grants (Action 4.16) and on upskilling staff to apply for academic positions (Action 4.17). In addition there are University-led initiatives like the “Cardiff Futures” programme, a leadership and development programme run by the Vice-Chancellor’s office. Four BIOSI staff (three male, one female) have volunteered for the programme since it was established in 2012/13. It is important that this opportunity is widely offered by senior management through a targeted process in dialogue with SAT to exclude biases.

All staff with management responsibilities undergo performance development training (Action 4.18). A strong emphasis has been placed on promotions workshops (Action 4.10) and career planning in PDR meetings (Action 4.9). Additional support is available through the BIOSI Careers Advice Service and a recently instituted Careers Café, which provides a monthly careers clinic (Action 4.19).

All our processes are supported by a strong mentoring programme, as set out in the 2012 Action Plan. Mentoring in the School is achieved through both formal and informal mechanisms. Informally, many senior staff offer an open door policy to junior staff seeking career advice outside of normal line management. Formally, all new starters are also offered an official mentor on joining. Anecdotally, many staff will attend a first meeting with their assigned mentor but not pursue the contacts, preferring instead to find a mentor through informal contacts. The College of Biological and Life Sciences have now established a new mentoring scheme (Action 4.20) based on a platform hosted by an external partner (IBM). This allows individuals to sign up as both mentors and mentees, and to receive mentoring training. The strength of the platform is that it enables mentees to match their mentoring needs to the life experience and skills offered by the mentors. Currently, 22 BIOSI Staff have been trained as mentors and received mentor training under this scheme. The School also encourages participating in external mentoring schemes, for example the scheme run by the British Ecology Society.
The RSG set up and ran the School’s first internal grant application round for Researchers in 2015. Research staff wrote short grant proposals which were assessed by the RSG panel which then ranked and allocated £4000 between 5 proposals (four female and one male). In addition to providing opportunities to develop research independence and gain experience of grant writing, this exercise had the dual function of providing the RSG group, primarily populated by researchers, with the opportunity to review and rank grant proposals using a mock ‘BBSRC-style’ process under the guidance of Prof Ros John (BBSRC pool member). Unsuccessful applicants were given extensive feedback on their application. Successful applicants have stated that this exercise was valuable in developing their grant writing skills and gave them the confidence to seek out and apply for other small grants. Data from two of the funded seedcorn projects have now been incorporated into external grant applications. Participants of the funding panel (two female chairs, four female members, three male members) found the experience interesting and useful, giving them real insight into the decision-making process, and would feel more confident in applying for grants in the future.

**Career development**

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

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

Under the new PDR system, led by the Academic Team Leaders (ATLs), teaching (and pastoral work), research and administration progress of the individuals, as well as outreach work, will be directly mapped onto benchmarks for promotion (**Action 4.9**). All ATLs have been fully trained to ensure maximum benefit for staff in capturing all areas of activity, forward planning and a strategic approach to career development. Quality of work is emphasised over quantity. Personal circumstances such as Maternity Leave and career breaks are considered. Under an action from the 2012 Action Plan, REF-specific E&D training was introduced for staff involved in REF2014 decision making. Of 61 staff returned to REF2014 by BIOSI, 17 were female (28%). At that time, 35 of 121 academic staff (29%) were female, therefore our return reflected the gender split of our academic staff population as a whole.

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

Staff attend University induction and a New Starters meeting in the School. Both meetings provide the opportunity to network with other staff, information on work-life balance policies, career development activities and the Positive Working Environment. For line managers, the School provides an Induction Pack plus guidance, alongside a Welcome Pack for new starters. The Welcome Pack includes the School handbook, developed in consultation with staff and which highlights opportunities for development activities and intranet resources which provide
additional support and information about flexible working, the positive working environment and staff counselling.

As stated in the 2012 Action Plan and now fully implemented, all staff undertake E&D training (online) to highlight their legal and ethical rights and responsibilities. Other development activities are provided through the Staff Development programme. Bespoke training sessions are arranged as required. The University’s family-friendly policies such as the Work-Life Balance policy and Dignity at Work and Study policy are promoted and supported within the School through dissemination by email, links from the School’s health and wellbeing webpage, and discussion at staff meetings such as the Staff and Working Environment (SWE) committee. Utilising ideas from staff, the weekly BioConnect seminar series provides bespoke, condensed training opportunities in-house for staff and postgraduates followed by a weekly networking opportunity with free lunch provided by the school. Staff and students are able to attend School seminars delivered by internal and external speakers (speaker gender balance discussed below). The School also regularly hosts national research meetings/symposia which allow free attendance by staff and students, providing opportunities to network with a national audience.

All new and existing staff are provided with appropriate internal and external mentoring opportunities. As proposed in our 2012 Action plan, all new Postgraduate Supervisors (of whom 26% are female currently, comparable to the overall proportion of female staff at Lecturer and above although the two groups do not map exactly on to each other) must now attend centrally-based preparation sessions for supervisors; experienced supervisors also attend regular refresher courses (Action 4.21). The majority of new Lecturing staff undertake the Postgraduate Certificate in Teaching & Lecturing (PCUTL), which is included in the workload model. Leadership and Management training is provided for staff taking on line management responsibilities (Action 4.18) and discussed with staff at PDR meetings and/or key career transition points.

Postdoctoral researchers and fellows can request the opportunity to become more involved in teaching to gain experience. In response, we are rolling out an expertise database for those researchers who want to be involved in teaching and teaching-related activities within the School.

(iii) Support for female students – describe the support (formal and informal) provided for female students to enable them to make the transition to a sustainable academic career, particularly from postgraduate to researcher, such as mentoring, seminars and pastoral support and the right to request a female personal tutor. Comment on whether these activities are run by female staff and how this work is formally recognised by the department.

For undergraduates, the personal tutor is a key point of contact both for pastoral and career advice; for postgraduates the supervisor provides this role. Students have the right to request alternative tutors /supervisors without needing to provide a reason.

The BIOSI Employability Advisor (appointed following an Action from the 2012 plan) works with undergraduate students to address questions relating to work experience and improving their employability during their time at university. Regular drop-in sessions and individual appointments are offered as well as signposting to events organised by the University such as ‘Exploring Career Options Beyond Academia (Biomedical & Life Sciences)’ held in February of this year. Sessions include advice on CVs, and applications for placements. BIOSI runs employability fairs, networking
events, host talks by guest speakers and provide tours of relevant partner organisations. The Employability Advisor is responsible for embedding employability into the curriculum with sessions as part of the year one Skills for Science module relating to employability and a session on LinkedIn that is delivered in final year, along with additional optional sessions provided by the Careers and Employability service. This service not only provides face-to-face career advice and online resources but also acts a hub for work opportunities and organises events such as STEMM careers fairs.

The School has a robust PhD reviewing system designed to provide support throughout and encourage self-reflection. Each supervisory team includes a minimum of a main and second supervisor and an independent assessor. Often a third supervisor, typically a postdoc who can provide specialist technical supervision (and also gains supervisory experience in the process), is also included. To improve the quality of postgraduate student supervision, all supervisors must regularly attend centrally-based training sessions (Action 4.21). Postgraduates are trained on the transition from Postgraduate student to Researcher, including (following on from an action in the 2012 Action Plan) talks from female Researchers (Action 4.22). Events such as mini-symposia intended for, and run by, postgraduate and junior postdoctoral Researchers also give students a chance to develop presentation skills in a ‘low-pressure’ environment. Such events have also included career talks from junior and senior PIs, and talks that addressed work-life balance in STEMM fields. In addition to School support, the Graduate Centre provides employability and transferable skills training to equip PhD students for the transition to employment.

These services are run by both males and females. Tutors and supervisors are of both genders; currently the Director of Postgraduate Studies and Employability advisor are both female. Activities which provide support for students are captured through the Performance Development Reviews and by the workload model.
**Organisation and culture**

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

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

![Figure 24: Percentage representation of men and women on school committees over the past three years together with percentage change in female representation on each committee since 2013-4. Actual numbers are show below the chart. *Committees with female chairs or co-chairs. **Committees new in 2015/16.](image-url)
One of the major impacts of our Actions since 2012, and one of which we are most proud, is the change in the proportion of women on school committees, especially key decision making committees like the Management Team (now 44% female; was 18%) and Promotions Panel (now 38% female; was 12%) (Figure 24). This was made possible by our actions to improve rates of promotion of women to senior positions, making them available for senior management roles. Administrative responsibilities are a benchmark for such promotions and we have ensured that women seeking promotion have the opportunity to gain experience on committees including the Research committee and the postgraduate board of studies.

Overall, female representation on School committees is 48%. We will continue to act to improve this (Action 4.23).

Committee members are identified on the basis of their roles and previous experience as well as the constituency they represent and with reference to the workload model. For the new management structure, individuals were identified on the basis of upward trajectory and inherent abilities including experience of recent promotion and potential leadership qualities as evidenced by research council funding and experience of research committees. Commitment to committee work is now captured by the new workload model, enabling duties to be redistributed (discussed further below under workload model). In addition, a programme of role-shadowing and secondment is being instituted both to ease any potential cases of ‘committee overload’ and ensure succession of posts.

(ii) **Female:male ratio of academic and research staff on fixed-term contracts and open-ended (permanent) contracts** — comment on any differences between male and female staff representation on fixed-term contracts and say what is being done to address them.

There is no evidence for gender bias in the use of fixed-term contracts for Research Staff (Figure 25). The apparent recent steep increase in the proportion of female research staff on regular contracts is a statistical anomaly resulting from a steep drop in the overall numbers of Research staff on these contracts. For Academic Staff (Figure 26), while there is a clear bias against females in terms of proportions of staff on both fixed and open-ended contracts, this actually reflects well the overall proportions of female Academic Staff. Therefore, once in post female academic staff are not being additionally disadvantaged by being more likely to be on fixed-term rather than open-ended contracts. Nevertheless, we will continue to review these data annually to flag any biases which may arise (Action 2.7).
Figure 25: Proportions and numbers of Research Staff by gender, on fixed-term and regular (open-ended) contracts in BIOSI, other SET schools within Cardiff University and across Cardiff University as a whole by academic year from 2009/10 to 2013/14.

Figure 26: Proportions and numbers of Research Staff by gender, on fixed-term and regular (open-ended) contracts in BIOSI, other SET schools within Cardiff University and across Cardiff University as a whole by academic year from 2009/10 to 2013/14.
b) For each of the areas below, explain what the key issues are in the department, what steps have been taken to address any imbalances, what success/impact has been achieved so far and what additional steps may be needed.

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

Female members of staff are members of numerous internal and external committees. Externally, women from BIOSI are members of a number of panels, e.g. BBSRC grant review panel and ECU Athena SWAN panel.

‘Committee overload’ for staff members was an issue, particularly for female staff; this was due primarily to small numbers of senior female academic staff (who tended to be asked to sit on many committees) as well as a lack of representation by more junior staff. However, the actions taken as a result of the 2012 Action Plan (in particular on appraisals and promotions) have led to the promotion of more women to senior academic posts. The re-organisation of school management and the broadening of committee membership to more junior staff has enabled female committee membership to be drawn from a wider pool of individuals, with average representation on school committees rising to 48% currently. Particularly notable is the increase in female representation on the management team, one of the key decision-making bodies in the school. **In 2013/14 it was 18% - it is now 44%**. Furthermore, as noted above, the staff activity profile/workload model combined with the flatter line management structure and introduction of Academic Team Leaders **(Action 4.8)** helps to ease pressure of committee overload on individuals and ensure succession of posts. For instance, the co-chairs of the SAT alternate their attendance on the SWE committee.

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

As proposed under the 2012 Action Plan, a staff activity profile/workload model was rolled out in January 2016 within the School (with tariffs set by the University) to ensure transparency and fairness in the distribution of responsibilities and duties, including pastoral and administrative responsibilities and the rotation of responsibilities which have a heavy workload **(Action 4.24)**. Furthermore, the introduction of the new system of Academic Team Leaders will ease the burden of PDRs, ensure that PDRs and career development discussions can happen more frequently, as well as distributing responsibilities for management more widely, strengthening the CVs of individuals seeking promotion. The staff activity profile is being used to inform ATL/PDR reviews. For instance, Dr Matthew Smalley, the Co-Chair of the SAT took on a heavy additional workload as a result of the sad loss of Professor Alan Clarke in December 2015. This was flagged and quantified by the activity profile and enabled some of his teaching and administration duties to be redistributed to staff whose activity profile was below average for the division. Thus the activity profile combined with PDRs are the tools which will enable responsibilities which carry a heavy workload and those which benefit a career to be rotated.
(iii) **Timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings** – provide evidence of
consideration for those with family responsibilities, for example what the
department considers to be core hours and whether there is a more flexible system
in place.

A School calendar of meetings is available in advance of each Academic year. Departmental
meetings and seminars are often arranged for the lunchtime period, with a light lunch provided,
which is intended to encourage participation across all career pathways and create a more relaxed
atmosphere. Implemented following the 2012 Action Plan, BIOSI considers core hours for
departmental meetings to be 9.30 – 16.30, but these are often locally modified. This flexibility
within the system allows best working practices to be established and arranged locally for the
benefit of those individuals with particular responsibilities. Furthermore, there may be teaching
duties or symposia which occur outside of these hours due to constraints of timetabling. If staff
are unable to attend meetings, minutes, and more recently videos, are available on the School
intranet. Core working-hours policies will be regularly reviewed by the SWE committee (Action
4.25).

(iv) **Culture** – demonstrate how the department is female-friendly and inclusive.

‘Culture’ refers to the language, behaviours and other informal interactions that
characterise the atmosphere of the department, and includes all staff and students.

Feedback from the staff survey reveals a general consensus that there is good co-operation and
support between colleagues, staff feel trusted and line managers treat people fairly and
respectfully. The staff away-day (see below) questionnaire indicated a positive, and improving,
gender equality culture while overall feedback from the event was overwhelmingly positive, with
many staff requesting more social gatherings, e.g. a summer barbeque.

We will continue to improve the building, atmosphere and environment. A major refurbishment of
public areas in the Sir Martin Evans Building has just been started which will give more
comfortable and inviting social areas and relaxation spaces. Furthermore, plans are advanced for a
new staff common room together with weekly planned ‘coffee mornings’ where staff can meet
and interact and where senior management will be available for informal discussions. With respect
to documentation, with assistance from the newly appointed Communications & Marketing
Officer, as part of the communications strategy the SAT will review School documents and content
of the website to ensure that language used is not gender biased (Actions 2.8 and 4.11).

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

BIOSI has a strong culture of engagement and outreach activities such as school visits, open days,
public lectures, external industrial partnerships etc. Of current BIOSI members, 65 academic staff
(Lecturer and above; 37 male, 28 female; 57% vs 43%), 47 research staff (15 male, 32 female; 32%
vs 68%), 34 postgraduate students (10 male, 24 female; 29% vs 71%) and 3 technical staff (1 male,
2 female; 33% vs 67%) have taken part in such activities between November 2012 and November
2015. Engagement/outreach is captured as part of the staff activity profile. From March 2016, this
information is gathered more systematically and will be formally recognised as part of PDR
meetings (Action 4.9). As part of the promotions process, Innovation/Engagement is one of the
three areas of activity (alongside Research and Teaching) in which individuals must demonstrate
ability and effectiveness. Individuals can opt to apply for promotion on the basis of excellence in Innovation and Engagement. Indeed, one Senior Lecturer was promoted to Reader in 2013 on this basis.
Flexibility and managing career breaks

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

(i) Maternity return rate – comment on whether maternity return rate in the department has improved or deteriorated and any plans for further improvement. If the department is unable to provide a maternity return rate, please explain why.

![Maternity return rates - BIOSI](chart1)

![Maternity return rates - SET](chart2)

![Maternity return rates - University](chart3)

**Figure 27:** Maternity return rates as a percentage of staff taking maternity leave, by academic session since 2009/2010.

BIOSI continues to maintain an excellent record of staff returning to work from maternity leave, outperforming other SET schools and the University as a whole. Numbers of returners will be reviewed to ensure performance is maintained (Action 2.7).
(ii) **Paternity, adoption and parental leave uptake** – comment on the uptake of paternity leave by grade and parental and adoption leave by gender and grade. Has this improved or deteriorated and what plans are there to improve further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Totals (numbers/%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOSI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEMM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>805 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cardiff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2298 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4:** Number of staff taking paternity, adoption or parental leave by academic session since 2009/2010. Due to small numbers, data have been aggregated rather than being shown by grade and the totals over the five years provided.

As elsewhere, paternity leave has had low levels of uptake but numbers have remained reasonably steady over the last five years. One individual in BIOSI, a female Senior Lecturer, has taken adoption leave since 2009/2010 (in the most recent academic session for which we have data, 2013/2014). Cover was provided by the appointment of a fixed-term member of staff. The numbers are too small to draw firm conclusions but we will continue to review numbers (Action 2.7). Note males and females receive the same adjustments and levels of support.

The numbers of BIOSI staff taking dependents leave in the period from 2009/2010 to 2013/2014 are small. Over this time five female staff and eight male staff took advantage of this opportunity. We will continue to review numbers going forwards to determine if any action is required (Action 2.7).
(iii) Numbers of applications and success rates for flexible working by gender and grade – comment on any disparities. Where the number of women in the department is small applicants may wish to comment on specific examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female numbers</th>
<th>Male numbers</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Male %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-2012</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Number of formal applications by staff for flexible working. All applications were successful.

More females than males make formal applications for flexible working, although more men are making such applications in recent years. Many staff have informal or semi-formal arrangements (excluding working from home).

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

(i) Flexible working – comment on the numbers of staff working flexibly and their grades and gender, whether there is a formal or informal system, the support and training provided for managers in promoting and managing flexible working arrangements, and how the department raises awareness of the options available.

**Figure 28:** Staff working formal flexible or compressed hours as a proportion of the total numbers of staff on that grade, by gender, together with actual numbers of individuals.
Flexible working is available through both formal and informal arrangements. Information is provided on the intranet (and highlighted in the staff welcome pack) as well as being discussed with line managers. Proportions of staff working flexible hours formally are shown in Figure 28.

More female staff take advantage of formal flexible working arrangements. In the 2012 BIOSI Athena SWAN survey, 50% of respondents reported that they were able to work flexibly indicating that many individuals work flexibly through informal arrangements. In the 2014 staff survey, 80% of females and 79% of males responded positively to the statement ‘As long as I get the work done, I have the freedom to work in a way that suits me’ which is a positive indicator of a healthy working environment.

(ii) **Cover for maternity and adoption leave and support on return** – explain what the department does, beyond the university maternity policy package, to support female staff before they go on maternity leave, arrangements for covering work during absence, and to help them achieve a suitable work-life balance on their return.

In addition to University-specific policies implemented by the School, Research Divisions take a key role in supporting staff on maternity and adoption leave to ensure their work is covered during their absence and help them back into work. Meetings are conducted to determine needs prior to the absence. Contact is made again prior to the return to work. Return-to-work arrangements are founded on the School’s flexible working practices.

To strengthen on our current practice, going forward we will capture examples of best practice amongst the Research Divisions and incorporate them into School guidelines. We are also implementing an extended leave scheme modelled on the University of Sheffield Maternity Leave Planning Template which helps staff and managers plan for before, during and after periods of extended leave (Action 4.26).

**KEY IMPACTS SECTION 4**

Impact since 2012:

- Implementation of workload model / staff activity profiles
- Rebalancing gender representation on key school committees

Challenges going forward:

- Increasing numbers of female Research staff achieving Lecturer status
- Equal promotion opportunities for T&S and T&R staff

(Word count 5282 consisting of 4851 words of section allowance plus 431 words of the additional 1000 allowance for departmental complexities, specifically peculiarities of effect of different career pathways on promotion chances page 31, lines 1 - 31, pre-approved by ECU in attached e-mail)
5. Any other comments: maximum 500 words

Please comment here on any other elements which are relevant to the application, e.g. other STEM-specific initiatives of special interest that have not been covered in the previous sections. Include any other relevant data (e.g. results from staff surveys), provide a commentary on it and indicate how it is planned to address any gender disparities identified.

Seminar speakers

The gender balance of seminar speakers in BIOSI (2011/12-2014/15; Table 6) falls below the national average (43.8%; ECU HESA report 2013). To address this inequality, seminar organisers will co-ordinate the invitation process via the SAT including requests for representation from ECRs (more likely to be female) (Action 5.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female Total</th>
<th>Male Total</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>% Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Gender balance of BIOSI speakers.

Analysis of 2015 Staff Survey results

The 2015 University-wide staff survey identified support systems and work-life balance as two key areas where improvements could be made (Table 7; Figure 29). In response, BIOSI developed a School strategy, Realising Potential, which incorporates the Athena SWAN Action Plan 2016 and uses the PDR process to identify individual strengths, training needs and career development opportunities and also balance staff workload. Alongside streamlining and improvements in efficiency of teaching and marking recently implemented by the school, this process supports a direct link between the individual’s potential and their workload.

Results of a more focused University-wide survey in 2016 (Table 8; data are not available by gender) indicate improvements in many issues identified in the previous survey (highlighted green) – particularly in work-life balance, the environment, support systems and staff view of management. One area that did not improve, however, is the view that extended hours are required to achieve work goals. The PDR process will address this with line managers reinforcing the message that quality of work is more important than quantity.
My line manager:
- Helps me to set and review clear objectives.
- Treats me fairly and with respect.
- Listens and takes appropriate account of my views and ideas.
- Provides me with help and support when needed.
- Recognizes and appreciates good performance.

Work-life balance:
- I am able to cope with the pressures I experience at work.
- I am able to take sufficient breaks during working hours.
- I can meet the requirements of my job without regularly working unreasonable hours.
- As long as I get the work done, I have the freedom to work in the way that suits me.

Work environment:
- There is good co-operation between my colleagues.
- I am treated with respect by my colleagues.
- My colleagues can be relied on to help when things get difficult at work.

Support system
- There are policies and practices in place to support me if I experience stress or pressure.
- The University demonstrates its commitment to supporting my well-being through the support services and events it offers.
- I would feel able to report bullying/harassment with feeling it would have a negative impact on me.

Table 7. SWAN-relevant questions analysed from 2015 staff survey.
Figure 29. Positive responses i.e. individuals who responded ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ to the questions in Table 6 (as a percentage of total responses) to SWAN-relevant questions from 2014 Staff Survey, by gender.
Table 8: Comparison of survey results from 2015 and 2016. 56% of staff responded in 2016 compared to 68% in 2015. Green shaded boxes indicate improving opinions; red shaded boxes indicate opinions which have not improved.

2015 Staff Away-Day survey

An important action taken by the SAT was the implementation of gender-specific survey at a staff away-day in December 2015 (Table 9; Figure 30). 132 of 173 attendees (66 male, 59 female, 7 prefer not to say) of all grades including Professional and Support Services, Research and Academic filled out questionnaires (76% response rate). Most staff strongly agreed, agreed or were neutral that BIOSI is actively promoting gender equality and that gender equality had improved. Just over 10% of both male and female staff felt that there were aspects of gender bias still within the School and approx. 30% that felt BIOSI could act further on gender equality. Most encouragingly, female staff in particular have the view that gender equality is improving.

To assess future progress, we will repeat the ‘Attitudes to Gender Equality’ survey towards the end of this Athena SWAN cycle to assess our continued progress (Action 5.2).
BIOSI ‘Attitudes to Gender Equality’ Survey

1) I would describe myself as: Male / Female / Prefer not to say

2) BIOSI is actively promoting gender equality

3) The culture in BIOSI is free from gender bias

4) Gender equality in BIOSI has improved since I joined the school

5) BIOSI does not need to act further on gender equality

Table 9: Survey questions from staff away-day. Available responses to statements 2 – 5 were ‘strongly agree’, ‘agree’, ‘neutral’, ‘disagree’, ‘strongly disagree’.

Figure 30: Responses to Staff Away-Day questions as a percentage of total responses, by gender.
Summary

Summary of improvements through last Action Plan:

- Two-fold increase in female Professors
- Improving gender balance of male and female Lecturers
- Implementation of workload model
- More appropriate gender representation on key school committees

Summary of future goals:

- Support ECRs to increase pool of women available to progress to senior ranks
- Equalise career progression opportunities on T&R and T&S pathways
- Further increase number of female Professors through mentoring and clarity of processes
- Increase female Professors in very senior management roles
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6. **Action plan**

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

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

7. **Case study: impacting on individuals: maximum 1000 words**

Describe how the department’s SWAN activities have benefitted two individuals working in the department. One of these case studies should be a member of the self-assessment team, the other someone else in the department. More information on case studies is available in the guidance.

**Case Study 1:**

[Blank space for case study content]

---

I started my career as an undergraduate student at Cardiff School of Biosciences and I've progressed through postgraduate studies, postdoctoral Research Associate, Research Fellow and now to Lecturer, all within the School. All of which challenges the widely held perception that mobility is a prerequisite for career progression. I'm pleased to say that the School recognised, through our previous Athena SWAN process, that individuals choosing not to relocate could be at a disadvantage during assessment because of this perception. Processes were put in place in the Athena SWAN Action Plan to assist individuals in my situation i.e. not wishing to relocate because of a partner and young family, in progressing my career. These processes included the Deputy Head of School identifying an individual Mentor with recent experience of Academic Promotion to help with my recent application for Senior Lecturer (pending); School-specific workshops focused on Promotion and developmental discussions with my line manager. Promotion was also discussed as part of my annual appraisal (now Performance Development Review), where I was given time to discuss my career aspirations and how my current activity mapped onto benchmarks for promotion. Together, we identified further areas that needed to be developed, including for example developing my leadership skills by attending a leadership and management development programme.

I recognise that another perceived barrier to career progression of women is parenthood. I had my first child in July 2013, and although the work-family life balance is very challenging it can be achieved. Whilst on maternity leave, I was actively encouraged to use the “Keep in Touch Days” to facilitate regular contact with my research team and colleagues during this leave period. This was instrumental in keeping me up-to-date with progress, inclusion in future research plans and maintaining essential links to ensure a smooth return to work. I also benefitted from a phased return to work with an extended period of part-time working which allowed me to gradually build up my research programme whilst balancing caring responsibilities for my family. Support from my research team, other colleagues and the School (in terms of structures and processes and senior management) were instrumental in this transition following maternity leave. Due to the support and encouragement received, I am now more aware of the procedures for promotion and the key achievements I will need to make in order to further my career. I have received advice on enhancing my international profile through collaborations and short visits to...
international laboratories, and received advice on potential sources of funding that would allow me to travel with my young family for longer visits, should that be something I wish to pursue. As a result of these supportive systems, I have had the confidence to apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer, the outcome of which will be known in summer 2016.

Case Study 2: Professor Ros John (co-Chair of SAT)

I was recruited to Cardiff University and appointed Senior Lecturer in 2003 with extensive experience both nationally and internationally. My mobility at these early stages (London-San Francisco-Cambridge-London-Cardiff) was advantageous, giving me the opportunity to acquire a unique and valuable skill set and experience several distinct research environments.

The School of Biosciences has changed considerably in the last 6 years since our Athena SWAN bronze award. When I first arrived 12 years ago, there was a presumption by some senior staff that female staff were more suited to teaching and minor administrative roles with a lack of expectation of their research success. There was no formal support for grant writing or career progression and it was a challenging time. My prior experience, independence and relative seniority were critical in ensuring that I was successful in obtaining funding from a number of sources, including Wellcome Trust, Royal Society, DiabetesUK and BBSRC, as well as undertaking additional roles in teaching and administration as requested.

Despite these early successes, progress from Senior Lecturer to Reader was unexpectedly challenging. I applied for promotion to Reader in 2009. With a solid grant portfolio and high impact publications, I felt that this was the appropriate time. However, the process of application and the criteria for success were unclear. I was unsuccessful and the feedback I was given was particularly vague and unhelpful. This was quite a setback and I waited two years before reapplying in 2011. At that time we had a new head of School, Ole Peterson, and a clearer process for application and criteria for success. I was able to discuss my application with my head of division and also with a recently promoted female colleague, and was promoted in 2012. In 2014, I applied for promotion to Professor based on further BBSRC funding, a high value MRC grant, my inclusion in the REF and a stronger publication record. Again, I found the process straightforward with a clear idea of the benchmarks for success. With my teaching load, public engagement activities, committee membership within the school and external activities, I ensured I met all the criteria. I was promoted in 2015 and am now one of four women in senior academic management positions within the School of Biosciences where previously there were none. I have clearly benefitted from the structured and transparent system for promotion introduced after our last Athena SWAN application, a process that will be further supported by the new personal development review process.
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