Athena SWAN Assessment Team Meeting
Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting Held on
20th November 2013

Agenda

1. **Apologies**
2. **Minutes of previous meeting**
3. **Update on the application for the Bronze Award – Referee's comments (attached to Agenda)**
4. **Action Plan implementation – timescale and responsibilities**
5. **Regularity of future meetings**
6. **Any other business**

Minutes

1. **Attendance**
   Prof. Duc pham
   Dr. R. K. AL-Dadah
   Ms Sharon Green
   Ms Judith Sutcliff
   Ms Isaline Lefort

   Apologies:
   Dr. Robert Cripps
   Ms Vashti Bejai
   Ms Susan Squire
   Ms Satwinder Rana

2. **Minutes of previous meeting**
   The minutes of the last meeting were approved

3. **Update on the application for the Bronze Award – Referee's comments (attached to Agenda)**
   RAD informed the team that the application was sent to Ms Susan Squire who passed for review by volunteers from the Athena Swan active members in the University. The reviewers were Ms Lora Morris, the college head of HR and Dr Susana Gutierrez from School of Mathematics. Both reviewers thought the application is good and will have no problem of succeeding to get the Bronze award. Detailed and helpful comments were provided by Dr. Gutierrez which will be discussed in this meeting.

4. **Action Plan implementation – timescale and responsibilities**

One of the comments raised by Dr. Gutierrez that the timeline of actions in the action plan is not defined and that the responsibility for carrying out the actions is on the Athena SWAN Lead.

The team discussed this issue and Prof. Pham suggested distributing the responsibility of carrying out the action plan on the various members of the School Athena SWAN Assessment Team. Also RAD agreed to define the timeline for carrying out the action plan.

5. **Regularity of future meetings**

Prof. Pham suggested holding the Athena SWAN Assessment Team Meeting on the days of the School Staff Meetings so that actions are reported to the Staff meeting.

6. **Any other business**

No other Business was discussed.

Dr. Susana Gutierrez Comments

The application is easy to read, and the self-assessment of the School is good.

Some more specific comments are included below.

1- Self-assessment group includes a good group of people with representation of the different levels/roles within the school. The reporting mechanisms through the different Committees and School Athena SWAN webpage, is also good.

2- On page 5, in the first paragraph, we also included the average age of the teaching and research staff. Maybe the second paragraph is a bit too long and can be shorten to be replaced by a brief description of the structure of the department mentioning the Head of the School and the different Committees within the School (though this has been included later in the application).

3- On page 9, in the paragraph before (iv) it is said: "Even though the current female population is higher than the national HESA…" but these numbers have not been included In Figure 2 and Table 5 (see also Figure 3 and Table 6).

4- In the section Student data, and although this has been included in the Action plan, maybe it is a good idea to explicitly mention that you will monitor the numbers in subsections (i)-(iv).

5- There are a number of places where (see for example at the end of the first paragraph on page 15 and end of second paragraph on page 18) you say something along the lines "introducing various means to support them"….it would be good if you could give an example of this, or how to plan to support them.

6- On page 21, Table 16 the data from 2012/2013 is missing! Is it available?
At the beginning of page 21 you say that "there have been no female applicants during the last three years" but the data for last year is missing.

7- On page 21, first paragraph and in part (b)-(ii)…. Maybe is a good idea to introduce some mentoring system to encourage people to apply for promotions and to identify possible candidates.

8- There seems to be a different font size on page 25.

Concerns:

1- The female staff and female researcher (1+1) seem to be overloaded in their representation in the different Committees. Maybe it is a good idea to mention ways of addressing this problem (page 27).
2- The letter of endorsement by the Head of the School has not been included yet in the application.

Action Plan: Comments

The Action plan is well structured and easy to read and follow. There are only a couple of things that I suggest would improve the presentation of the Action Plan:

1- Start date column: As it is written, most of the Action (all but one of the actions) have a Start date of: Nov. 2013 onwards. I think the panel would like to see **a more defined/streamlined time-line** for the Start Date and Finish Date (where possible) for the different actions, that is different actions starting at different times and distributed through three years. As it is now it seems like you have not thought too much about this and all the Actions start in November which gives the impression of a not very clear and structured time-line for the different things your team propose to do.
2- There are a good number of actions whose responsibility is assigned to the Athena Swan Lead. I wonder if the panel will not have the impression that the Athena SWAN Leader is overloaded. It would be good to see that there **are more people/committees involved in some of the Actions** (such as in the actions involving monitoring of numbers).