OXFORD RESEARCH & POLICY

Report on Good Practice
for Trinity College Dublin

October 2012

Contents

Executive Summary

Data were collected from the School of Chemistry and the School of Natural Sciences using checklists which the Schools completed and discussion sessions with the Heads of School and small groups of staff held on 7 June 2012 and 14 June 2012, respectively. Recommendations for action were developed for both Schools based on the information in the checklists and that gathered from the discussions. This report sets out general findings from both Schools and set out actions to be carried out at College and/or Faculty level. The actions proposed are gender neutral since the evidence is that what is key for the recruitment, retention and progression of women in academic careers is high quality support for all staff. Clearly improved support will benefit men as well as women, but evidence suggests that, for example, proactive approaches to recruitment and promotion are effective in increasing the proportions of women who apply and are successful.

Although the atmospheres in the two Schools visited differed from one another, when the data collected from the checklists and discussion groups were considered objectively, there were many common issues to be tackled, a number of which derived from College processes and procedures.

Key areas for action by the College are:

Data

The College should work with Schools to ensure that data provided by the College meets Schools' needs and also that the College and WiSER provide guidance as to the analyses that Schools should undertake (Benchmark 1).

Support for Early Careers Researchers

The College needs to support Schools in improving their approach to the support of early career researchers (ECRs), both post docs and academic staff, by understanding better the needs of ECRs for induction (Benchmark 16) and more general development (Benchmark 17), including the need for mentoring (Benchmark 19).

Appointment and promotion

College should require Schools to use panel interviews for post doc appointments (Benchmark 11).

The College should support Schools in monitoring the proportions of women who apply for and are shortlisted for posts, and are appointed (Benchmark 12).

The College should review the promotion criteria to ensure that they are clear and transparent, and the requirement to compete a 40+ page form with a view to streamline the information required to be provided by candidates (Benchmark 11).

It is important for the College to support Schools in providing improving support for the early career researchers (Benchmark 17), and College should consider adopting a version of the UK's Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers (Benchmark 8).

Appraisal

It is important to prepare staff for and encourage them to apply for promotion and therefore, in the absence of a College-wide appraisal scheme, the College supports Schools in regularly reviewing the career development of academics and post docs (Benchmark 18). School reviews should cover staff members' preparation and readiness for promotion.

Support for flexible working and career breaks

The College needs to improve its support for flexible working. Training should be provided to line managers in the management of flexible working. College also needs to allow easier transition between full-time and part-time working, and the reverse. College also needs to review its approach to staff taking career breaks, including maternity leave, and the support given to staff returning from breaks (Benchmarks 24, 25 and 26).

Introduction

1 Commissioned by the Centre for Women in Science & Engineering Research (WiSER), this independent report by Oxford Research and Policy (ORP) is based on Good Practice Checklists completed by the Schools of Chemistry and Natural Sciences and short visits to the Schools in June 2012. The completed checklists (which included information on Schools' policies, practices and procedures) provided background information for the visitors, Mrs. Caroline Fox and Dr. Sean McWhinnie. The purpose of the visits was to explore and assess (through discussions with different groups of staff, and PhD students) the working practices and culture of the Schools, in order to:

  1.1 Assess how effectively the Schools' good practice policies and procedures (as identified in their checklists and in discussion with the heads of School) were implemented, and their impact on staff at different career levels;

  1.2 Make suggestions on the content of School Gender Action Plans;

  1.3 Identify issues for the College to address within INTEGER.

2 The methodology used is based on work by the Royal Society of Chemistry, the Athena Project and the Institute of Physics. This work identified strong evidence to support the view that actions to improve working practices, should, for the most part, be gender neutral (and would benefit all staff and students both male and female).

3 The good practice included in the recommendations for action (by the Schools and by the College) is based on current levels of good practice, evidenced by the Schools' good practice checklists, and the issues identified during the visits. The good practice is drawn from work in a wide range of UK universities.

The Report

4 There are ten sections in the report:

  1 Evidence Base for Action
  2 Effective Management
  3 Workplace Culture
  4 Appointment and Promotion Processes
  5 Levelling the Appointment & Promotion Playing Fields
  6 Career Development Provision
  7 Developmental Activities
  8 Flexibility and Sustained Careers
  9 Career Breaks and Interrupted Careers
  10 Organisation for Action

5 There are three benchmarks in each of the sections above. For each of the 30 Benchmarks there is a short statement of what is good practice. All the good practice 'advocated' in the statement is in place in one or more UK universities.

6 The statement of good practice is followed by observations and comments based on the Schools' checklists and discussions during the visits. This is followed by recommendations for action by the College. The actions are also listed separately in Annexe A.

7   The report ends with a "Next Steps" summary.

8   Annexe B provides some background on good practice and draws on UK experience in improving the representation of women in academic science.

9   Our thanks are due to the School of Chemistry, the School of Natural Sciences and WiSER for hosting the visits, in particular to the Heads of School, Professor David Grayson and Professor Celia Holland, and to Caroline Roughneen.

General Observations and Comments

10   The general atmosphere in the two Schools visited appeared to be very different, and the participation of staff and students in the discussion groups also varied between the two Schools. However, when the data collected from the checklists and discussion groups were considered objectively, there were many common issues to be tackled, many of which derived from College processes and procedures. For example, to pick two issues at random, frustrations surrounding promotion were common to both Schools visited and both Schools appeared to provide little general support for post docs.

11   In consequence, many actions recommended at School level are common to both Schools, and will probably by equally applicable to other Schools within FEMS and very probably the whole College.

12   A balance needs to be struck between local actions at School level and College level actions. Some recommended actions if adopted, such as revising the promotion application form, clearly need to be at College level, but others, such as providing support to staff preparing for promotion should be implemented at School level. The College, nonetheless might publish its expectations in respect of the support Schools should offer to those preparing for promotion.

1   Evidence Base for Action

How the University collects quantitative and qualitative data and makes it available to Schools, and how the University uses data as the basis for University planning, action, and measuring progress in relation to the underrepresentation of women in STEM

Benchmark 1: Student data

Good Practice

To ensure that their Schools have the data they need, the University:

- Provides and makes easily accessible to Schools F/M UG and PG data (by course of study, student progression offers, acceptances, drop outs and outcomes);

- Makes clear its expectation that Schools will benchmark their data with national, Faculty and like Schools elsewhere.

Observations and comments about TCD

1.1   Although Schools have data on their students they do not discuss or report the gender profile**.**

Actions

1a   College to ensure that the Equality Monitoring Report meets the needs of Schools and supports the INTEGER action plans.

1b   College to review its staff data and statistics and to make recommendations to its Schools and Faculties on what data they expect them to collect, to use (for example in their action plans) and to provide to College.

1c   College Equality Committee to continue to decide what staff data should be provided to Schools and Faculties (for example gender disaggregated data on representation on College and Faculty committees).

1d   WiSER to make clear to College, FEMS and its Schools what data comparisons they should make, internal and external.

Benchmark 2: Staff data

Good Practice

To make sure that their Schools have the data they need, the University:

- Collects, monitors and makes available to Schools staff data disaggregated by gender, grade and staff group (at University, Faculty and School levels);

- Provides data on representation by gender on management and on committees (at School, Faculty and University levels);

- Makes clear its expectation that Schools use the data provided for planning action, and measuring progress (including making internal and external comparisons).

Observations and comments about TCD

2.1   The College provides staff data to Heads of School Equality Monitoring Report but it does not monitor what use is made of the data within Schools.

Actions

See actions for Benchmark 1.

Benchmark 3: Qualitative data

Good Practice

To make sure its Schools have the data they need, the University:

- Makes available gender disaggregated data from internally and externally run staff and student surveys;

- Uses qualitative data, and benchmark data from external reports, to measure its progress, and for action planning;

- Makes clear its expectation that Schools use qualitative data and data from their own surveys to raise awareness, to identify areas where action is needed, and to assess the effectiveness and impact of changes they have made.

Observations and comments about TCD

3.1   Data from the recent INTEGER opinion survey were not available at the time of the visits.

Actions

3a   School and Faculty Data from the recent INTEGER opinion survey should be used as a basis for the College INTEGER action plan.

3b   College to run a staff opinion survey towards the end of INTEGER (Note: this is already part of INTEGER).

3c   College to run the Good Practice Checklist (at School and College levels) towards the end of INTEGER to measure change. This exercise could include other Schools for comparison. The results to be shared with the School INTEGER action committees.

2 Effective Management

How the University ensures that the administrative and academic contributions of staff to their Schools are effectively and fairly managed and resourced.

Benchmark 4: Management systems

Good Practice

To ensure that its Schools have effective management systems, the University**:**

- Provides guidance on Heads of Schools' accountabilities, reporting and communication responsibilities;

- Expects Schools to demonstrate that their accountability, reporting and communication arrangements are clear, effective, open, and well regarded by staff at all levels;

- Expects the membership and chairs of committees, heads of sections and functions (heads of discipline) to reflect the School staff and student gender profile.

Observations and comments about TCD

4.1 There was a general perception that College management was top down, and that this combined with the perceived autonomy of Disciplines, meant that the management role of the School was unclear. The less 'established' staff had a clearer view of what their School could do and its potential value. Academics generally felt they had no forum within their School.

Actions

4a College to make sure that its guidance, on the roles of Head of School and Head of Discipline, is clear and that their respective roles are clearly differentiated.

4b College to clarify its expectations on the rotation of School roles and responsibilities.

4c The administrative staff role in pastoral care to be formally recognised as part of their role, and appropriate training to be provided.

Benchmark 5: Resource allocations

Good Practice

To ensure its Schools have effective, fair and open resource allocations systems, the University:

- Requires Schools to demonstrate that its systems for allocating (funding, offices, space, equipment and technical support) are fair, open and well understood;

- Expects Schools to check the views of all staff on their systems;

- Expects Schools to take action and make changes if they find the majority of staff perceptions do not reflect the management view.

Observations and comments about TCD

5.1   The overall impression was that staff had concerns about what they saw as the arcane, bureaucratic and time and people heavy processes and systems of the College. Staff seemed not to have a clear picture of College, Faculty and School funding. At School level there were significant concerns on the difficulties for new staff of getting themselves set up to do their teaching and research, and the respective finance allocations to Schools and disciplines.

Actions

5a   College to review the administration requirements it places on Schools in relation to their size and their administrative and financial resources.

5b   College to review, and where necessary rebalance, the funding allocations between Schools and Disciplines.

Benchmark 6: Workload roles and responsibilities

Good Practice

To ensure that the workload and responsibilities of academic staff is equitable, the University:

- Requires Schools to have a regular rotation of management roles and committee memberships;

- Expects Schools (in making their rotations) to take account of individuals' management experience, the gender balance, continuity and succession planning;

- Expects Schools to check staff's perceptions, and take action where necessary.

Observations and comments about TCD

6.1   A fair reduced teaching load is ensured for new academics. Teaching loads are seen as heavy and staff feel overstretched, which they attribute to the inability to appoint replacements when people leave. It is understood that the College is introducing a workload allocation system in the new academic year, but little was known about it. The three year rotation of HoS at different time periods, coupled with the apparently complex College administrative systems does not allow them to get to grips with significant academic challenges.

Actions

6a   College to survey staff after the first year of the workload allocation system, to ensure that the system is workable, simple, clear and that staff perceive it to be transparent and fair, and to act on the feedback.

3   Culture and Ethos

How the University ensures that Schools' working environments responds to the ambitions and expectation of staff, recognises their contributions and enables them to enjoy the rewards of a career in science.

Benchmark 7: Workplace environment

Good Practice

To ensure that its Schools encourage good behaviour, the University:

- Sets high standards for the behaviour expected of staff (towards other staff and students);

- Requires Schools to make sure that all staff are aware of, and respect these standards, and would expect timely and effective action to be taken over any reported 'breach';

- Expects Schools to check staff perceptions on the openness, friendliness and co-operativeness of their working environment and where necessary to take action.

Observations and comments

7.1   There were differences between the two Schools. In one it seemed that staff did look out for each other. In one the view was that some staff were overly competitive, but not in the other.

Actions

7a   WiSER to access data from the INTEGER survey (together with the ORP reports) as a basis for Faculty discussion and focus groups to explore and make suggestions on improving the workplace environment. Based on the results, the College to formulate actions and communicate to Schools any actions that need implementing at School level.

Benchmark 8: Collegiality

Good Practice

To make sure that staff are well supported by their Schools, the University:

- Expects Schools to check regularly if their academics and post docs feel that they (and other members of their group) feel they are supported and encouraged by colleagues (junior, peers, senior, and line manager) and if they feel they 'belong', and are included in the work and social activities of the School/their group;

- Expects that where necessary the Schools take action;

- Expects Schools to 'manage' the potential conflict of interest between 'supervisors' and those they supervise, and ensures that individuals can access unbiased career advice, in a way that does not damage their career prospects.

Observations and comments about TCD

8.1   There were no formal mechanisms for dealing with potential conflicts of interest between PIs and their post docs. Most senior staff saw their allegiance to their Discipline rather than to their School.

Actions

8a   WiSER to access data from the INTEGER survey (together with the ORP reports) as a basis for Faculty discussion/focus groups to explore and make suggestions on developing a strong sense of community.

8b   Based on the results, the College to make clear to Schools what it expects of them in developing and maintaining both a feeling of community and good standards of behaviours towards colleagues and students.

8c   College to establish points of contact to oversee post doc development and to act as an arbiter on cases of conflict between PIs and post docs.

8d   College to adapt and adopt its own version of the UK Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers (see http://www.vitae.ac.uk/policy-practice/505181/Concordat-to-Support-the-Career-Development-of-Researchers.html).

Benchmark 9: Individual contributions valued

Good Practice

To make sure that individuals feel their contributions to their Schools are valued, the University:

- Expects Schools to make sure that all contributions (teaching, research, management/administrative and external/professional) are recognised and valued;

- Expects Schools to check regularly the views on this of their academics and post docs;

- Expects that where necessary Schools take action.

Observations and comments about TCD

9.1   Neither School had a structured approach and it seemed that at School level administrative and management contributions were not seen as valuable.

Actions

9a   WiSER to access data from the INTEGER survey (together with the ORP reports) as a basis for Faculty discussion to explore and make suggestions on ways to recognise and 'reward' individuals' contributions to their School. Based on the results, the College to make clear to Schools what it expects of them. (Individuals' contributions can be recognised in a number of ways, for example: emails from the HoS to staff informing them of individual staff members who have won grants, been promoted, won prizes, etc.; highlighting of achievements on School and College websites and publications; School and College prizes for teaching, research, general high performance in their job.)

4   Appointment and Promotion Processes

How the University ensures that University, Faculty and School systems, processes, practices, and the decisions taken, are open transparent and fair for all staff.

Benchmark 10: Decision Making

Good Practice

To ensure that selection decisions are fair, the University**:**

- Requires that appointment and promotion panels (for academics and post docs) include at least one man and one woman;

- Provides training for panel members and requires panel chairs to be trained;

- Expects that the individuals who participate in appointment and promotion selection processes are representative of the F/M staff profile of the School.

Observations and comments about TCD

10.1   The College requires that appointment and promotion panels for academics include at least one man and one woman.

10.2   The Dean of FEMS has introduced a requirement that two women are required on selection panels, but this does mean that some senior women are overburdened with requests to serve on panels.

10.2   College provides training for selection panels members but it appears that not many people are aware of the training.

10.3   It appeared that the appointment of post docs was left to individual grant holders and not subject to University or School requirements. It was not clear whether appointment and promotion panel chairs for academics were 'trained'.

Actions

10a   College to monitor the uptake of training.

10b   College to Review the requirement in FEMS for two women members of the selection panels as this practice places a significant burden on more senior female staff (possibilities to consider – that one of the women would be a lay member, that if there was only one women member she would chair the panel, or that one of the two women present could be an HR representative).

10c   College to ensure that arrangements are in place to "look after" candidates during the selection process.

Benchmark 11: Appointment and promotion criteria, processes and information provided

Good Practice

To ensure that selection processes are fair, the University:

- Requires that the information on appointment and promotion processes and criteria which is provided (for candidates and panels) by faculties and Schools is clear, fair, and appropriate;

- Ensures that its own communications on promotion are timely and effective;

- Expects Schools to provide information on posts that is up to date, useful, inclusive, and reflects the School (its members and activities) as a whole.

Observations and comments about TCD

11.1   There was a clear distrust of Trinity's approach to promotion. Individuals' experiences of appointment and promotion, and the 'rules' surrounding them, were not good.

Actions

11a   College to introduce panel interviews for the appointment post docs.

11b   College to clarify the promotion process for all staff groups (including information available to staff and Schools) and the criteria. It is not clear whether the problem was one of reality or perception: in either case it needs to be addressed.

11c   College to confirm, to HoS and HoD, the system for short term appointments and arrangements for staff on short term contracts to 'become' permanent staff, and to ensure that staff on short term contracts were aware of the arrangements. College also to consider whether it was necessary for staff on fixed term contracts to go through a full competitive selection process to gain a permanent position.

11d   College to review the need for a 40+ page application form for academic promotions with a view to streamline the information required to be provided by candidates.

Benchmark 12: Monitor Appointments and promotions

Good Practice

The University monitors academic appointments, and:

- Monitors appointment and promotion outcomes (to measure progress on female representation and compare with the national picture/position in like universities);

- Expects Schools to monitor applications for appointments against the proportion of women in the recruitment 'pool';

- Expects Schools to monitor lists of candidates they put forward for promotion.

Observations and comments about TCD

12.1   It was not clear what female/male monitoring took place.

Actions

12a   College to ensure that there is gender monitoring and reporting of applicants/short listed candidates and appointments made.

5   Levelling the Playing Field

How the University ensures that men and women are equally likely to apply for appointments and promotion and are equally likely to be successful.

Benchmark 13: Encourage candidates

Good Practice

To make sure that men and women are equally likely to apply for appointments and promotion, the University:

- Promotion process allows for personal applications but does not rely solely on self nomination;

- Expects Schools to encourage their senior staff to identify potential candidates and inform them of job opportunities as they arise;

- Expects Schools to review all academics positively for their promotion potential, at the beginning of each promotion round.

Observations and comments about TCD

13.1   Neither School had a structured system to identify candidates for promotion; it was left to individual discipline heads or the head of School.

Actions

13a   College to review its promotion processes and specifically:

- Ask schools to undertake a review of all staff at the beginning of each promotion round and invite staff who are ready for promotion to apply thereby eliminating the reliance on self nomination that effectively 'discriminates' against women;

- Offer open information and advice sessions for potential promotion candidates.

Benchmark 14: Support promotion candidates

Good Practice

The University offers information, training, and support for potential candidates for promotion. and:

- Offers regular training courses on promotion and preparing a case for promotion;

- Monitors the take up of these courses;

- Expects Schools to offer help (on presenting their case for promotion) and personal support to individuals preparing for promotion.

Observations and comment about TCD

14.1   School, Faculty and College processes do little to encourage applications for promotion. There is no faith in the fairness of the system and its outcomes.

14.2   Schools' arrangements for supporting and advising candidates rely on individuals. Some senior staff clearly do provide support.

Actions

14a   College to offer training on preparing promotion cases.

14b   College to specify what it expects of Schools and senior staff, for example the school identifying potential candidates and senior staff providing active encouragement, support. and coaching.

Benchmark 15: Feedback and follow up for promotion candidates

Good Practice

The University expects feedback to be offered to all staff who have applied for appointment and promotion, whether or not their application was successful, and:

- Provides regular training on 'giving positive feedback';

- Monitors the take up of the training;

- Expects Schools to offer positive feedback to all candidates.

Observations and comments about TCD

15.1   There was a general concern about low promotion success rates with one School [NS] pushing for better feedback, and improved feedback arrangements for all candidates.

Actions

15a   College to offer training on how to give positive feedback.

15b   College to consider the respective roles of the School and the Dean in providing positive feedback to candidates.

6   Career Development Provision

How the University ensures the quality and effectiveness of the career development provided at University, Faculty and School levels.

Benchmark 16: Development needs and take up

Good Practice

To meet staff development and training needs the University:

- Provides regular induction programmes for all new staff and monitors take up of those induction programmes;

- Expects Schools to provide a comprehensive School induction;

- Checks the usefulness of its central training and development provision for academics and post docs with faculties/Schools;

- Expects Schools to encourage staff to take up the training that is offered and to recommend courses known to be useful.

Observations and comments about TCD

16.1   Schools do not have structured induction programmes. Some relatively new staff were critical of their start up arrangements. Some staff had benefitted from training and development opportunities**.**

Actions

16a   College to identify good practice in the provision of independent careers advice and guidance across FEMS Schools and disseminate that information to Schools.

16b   College to provide regular induction programmes for new staff and to monitor take up.

16c   College to make clear to Faculties and Schools its expectation on comprehensive local induction programmes.

16d   College to make sure that opportunities for administrative staff to move within College to expand their experience are actively promoted, for example by an internal jobs page on the web.

16e   College/Faculty to introduce Faculty meetings for administrative and technical staff to encourage networking and sharing good practice.

Benchmark 17: Early Career Researchers' (ECR) development

Good Practice

To meet its responsibilities for the career progression of its ECRs the University:

- Provides transferable skills training. It monitors its take up by ECRs and checks its usefulness with Schools;

- Offers (and monitors the take up of) careers advice and guidance by ECRs;

- Expects Schools to have arrangements which ensure that ECRs can and do access impartial careers advice and guidance.

Observations and comments about TCD

17.1 It appeared that for career advice and guidance post docs relied on their supervisor. There did not appear to be any provision of transferable skills training. It seemed that Schools were more alert to the development needs of the PhD students.

Actions

17a College to review the utility and uptake of training and development courses by ECRs, in particular the provision of transferable skills training.

Benchmark 18: Appraisal

The University is aware of the importance of regular appraisal and:

- Ensures that Schools have appropriate appraisal schemes for academics and post docs (regular and automatic, which identify development needs and cover the career development support offered by the Faculty/University);

- Provides training for appraisers, and specific training for appraisers of ECRs;

- Expects Schools to monitor participation and follow up on training needs.

Observations and comments about TCD

18.1 It is understood that there is no appraisal scheme currently in operation.

Actions

18a College to ensure that at College, Faculty and School level it has arrangements (in the absence of appraisal) for the regular review of the career development of academics and post docs.

7   Career Development Activities

How the University ensures that staff engage in activities, internal and external which contribute to their career progression/professional profile.

Benchmark 19: Mentoring

Good Practice

To ensure effective mentoring schemes are available, the University:

- Provides training and support for mentors and mentees;

- Offers and supports mentoring schemes for academics, post docs and post graduates;

- Expects Schools to publicise information on schemes (internal and external) and to encourage their staff to act as mentors.

Observations and comments about TCD

19.1   It is understood that mentoring is not available to post docs or PhD students. References were made to the 'Momentum' programme provided through staff development. However it was not clear what the focus of the programme was, and what level of participation there was.

Actions

19a   College to provide training and support networks for mentors and mentees.

Benchmark 20: Networks and role models

Good Practice

To ensure that female academics and post docs have role models and networking opportunities, the University:

- Supports and encourages networks (University and Faculty) and monitors their impact;

- Expects Schools to encourage staff to contribute to internal, external, professional, and special interest networks;

- Expects Schools to encourage their female academics to act as role models.

Observations and comments about TCD

20.1   WiSER acts to encourage networking and to identify and encourage female academics to act as role models. It was not clear what the participation of women was in these activities.

20.2   WiSER has established a mentoring scheme for female ECRs, from lecturers down to, and including, post docs.

Actions

20a   College to set up on a year's pilot basis one or more of the following at Faculty or College level (a judgement needs to be made as to the number of potential members and whether Faculty level networks will be sustainable):

  -    A women's network of academic staff;

  -    A network of post docs (male and female);

  -    A network of PhD students (male and female).

20b   College to ask or suggest to each network one or two of the issues identified in the ORP reports and ask them to undertake a Faculty review to identify good practice and to make recommendations for changes to be adopted (at College, Faculty and School level).

Benchmark 21: Internal and external activities

Good Practice

To make sure that its Schools encourage staff to participate in activities which raise their profile, the University:

- Monitors School and Faculty female/male nominations for roles and positions at Faculty and University levels;

- Expects Schools to encourage staff to become involved in professional/learned societies;

- Expects Schools to monitor the female/male nominations and recommendations they make for professional, representative, management roles and for prizes, awards, and marks of esteem.

Observations and comments about TCD

21.1   It appeared that HoS and some HoDs encouraged their staff to undertake activities internal and external to raise their profile. There was no formal monitoring of School nominations to roles and positions at Faculty and University levels or for prizes, awards, and marks of esteem. It was not clear whether the University monitored female/male nominations to Trinity Fellowships or specifically encouraged women to apply.

Actions

21a   College to monitor and report the gender balance of the Schools' nominations to the Fellowship and the awards of Fellowships, against the gender balance of the 'pool' from which potential candidates are drawn. If problems are identified College to ensure that Schools are taking corrective action.

21b   Female College Fellows to be encouraged to recognise their status as role models, and to actively encourage women to consider becoming Fellows.

21c   College to request the Fellowship to change its regulations to allow part time staff to become College Fellows.

8   Flexibility and Sustainable Careers

How the University ensures the flexibility that underpins successful careers.

Benchmark 22: Approaches to flexible working

Good Practice

To make sure that staff can benefit from flexible working, the University:

- Has in place policies and practices on flexible working for academics and post docs, which provide practical guidance on managing flexible arrangements;

- Expects Schools to be aware of statutory requirements and what is good practice, and to know where they/their staff can get advice and information;

- Expects Schools to discourage a long hours culture, to check staff perceptions about this, and where necessary takes action.

Observations and comments about TCD

22.1   Schools were aware of and responded to individuals' needs for flexibility, but no formal arrangements were in place.

Actions

22a   College to review the uptake of both formal and informal flexible working and, depending on the outcome, to review the information, practical advice and guidance on flexibility it provides for Schools.

22b   College to provide training for managers in managing flexible working, and in encouraging flexibility (to develop a culture in which managers are aware of the individual needs of their staff and themselves take advantage of opportunities to work flexibly, and in which staff that do work less than full-time hours are not thought of as inferior by their colleagues).

22c   College to provide and publicise the availability of the advice, information and expertise on managing flexibility which Schools need.

22d   College to change its 'regulations' to allow technical and administrative staff to move between full-time and part-time working more easily.

Benchmark 23: Take up of flexibility

Good Practice

To make sure that there is a good take up of flexible working, the University:

- Expects Schools to check that their disciplines, sections and groups make it easy for staff to take advantage of flexibility;

- Expects Schools to encourage senior staff to lead by example in their own working arrangements;

- Expects Schools to check uptake, and the extent to which staff feel they are encouraged to work flexibly.

Observations and comments about TCD

23.1   Schools seem to regard flexibility for academics as a discipline, rather than a School responsibility. Flexibility for post docs is dependent on their PIs.

Actions

See actions for Benchmark 22.

Benchmark 24: Flexibility built into arrangements

Good Practice

The University encourages Schools to build flexibility into their arrangements, and:

- Expects Schools to timetable meetings and events so as make sure as many staff as possible can attend;

- Expects Schools to make sure that its disciplines, sections and groups take individuals' needs for flexibility and circumstances into account when teaching is timetabled;

- Expects Schools to check regularly academics' and post docs' perceptions on this and where necessary takes action.

Observations and comments about TCD

24.1   It appeared that School meetings were arranged so that as many people as possible can attend. However, other timetabling was left to disciplines.

Actions

See actions for Benchmark 22.

9 Career Breaks and Interrupted Careers

How the University ensures that the arrangements made for career breaks can enable individuals to maintain a career trajectory which meets their circumstances, abilities and ambitions.

Benchmark 25: Supportive approaches to career breaks

Good Practice

The University makes sure that staff receives the guidance and support that they need, and:

- Provides practical guidance on support for staff;

- Expects Schools to demonstrate their ability and willingness to support staff to cope with the practicalities before, during and after a career break or unplanned career interruption. Expects Schools to provide easily accessible advice and information, and to check that disciplines and sections are aware of what the School and the University can and does provide.

Observations and comments about TCD

25.1 School arrangements are informal and the provision of advice is a College responsibility.

Actions

25a College to make sure that Schools are aware of what is expected of them, of what support and advice College can provide.

Benchmark 26: Career breaks-before and during

Good Practice

The University makes sure that staff receives the support and advice they need, and:

- Expects Schools to arrange meetings to check that individuals are getting the support, advice and information they want;

- Expects Schools to help with, advise on, and make the support arrangements (for administration/teaching/research responsibilities) before, during and after the career break.

Observations and comments about TCD

26.1 It seems that Schools approach is *ad hoc*, with support provided when it is needed.

Actions

See actions for Benchmark 25.

Benchmark 27: Career breaks – on and after return

Good Practice

The University makes sure that returners get the support they need, and:

- Provides good quality childcare for academics and post docs;

- Expects Schools to recognise returners' needs (flexibility, personal support ,mentoring, training and development) to facilitate a smooth return;

- Expects HoS/HoDs to holds a meeting some weeks after their return, to discuss with the individual what is needed to get their career back on track, and over what time scale.

Observations and comments about TCD

27.1 It seemed that support and flexibility was a matter of luck. It was understood that if a woman opted to work part time on her return from a career break she was not allowed to return to full time at a later date. (Part time academics are not eligible for College Fellowships).

Actions

27a College to review the information, practical advice and guidance on career breaks and returning it provides for Schools and staff.

27b College to ask WiSER to provide case studies on women and men in STEMM who have successfully continued their academic careers after a career break.

27c College to allow part time staff to be eligible for College Fellowships.

27d College to allow staff working part-time following a career break to return to full-time working in the future.

10 Organisation for Action on Women And Science

How established and robust the University's organisational framework is to deliver equality of opportunity and reward across its STEMM faculties and Schools.

Benchmark 28: Leadership and engagement

Good Practice

Experience shows the importance (for developing and sustaining good practice by Schools) of:

- University senior management who support, encourage and champion women and science/good practice activities and programmes in Schools;

- Academics in senior University, Faculty and School positions who engage with and participate in activities;

- A clear University expectations that Schools will be aware of their staffs' participation in, and benefit from University, Faculty and School initiatives and activities.

Observations and comments about TCD

28.1 The level of awareness of INTEGER was low. Most staff had recently heard about it, in relation to the visit to their School. Staff generally were interested, and it seemed likely that School senior staff would be supportive of "Women in Science" Good Practice Programme introduced by the INTEGER programme.

Actions

28a Establish a Schools' INTEGER champions network to enable sharing and dissemination of good practice.

Benchmark 29: Accountability for women's career progression and good working practices

Good Practice

For university good practice programmes to succeed, they need:

- A University "Women in Science" Good Practice Programme committee which is responsible to the University senior management team;

- A network of School committees to share and disseminate good practice;

- A clear statement by the university of its expectation that Schools will identify individual post holders to be accountable for specific School tasks, projects, programmes and activities.

Observations and comments about TCD

29.1 Neither School had, at the time of their visits, yet set up a committee.

Actions

29a   The INTEGER committee to agree the College action plan and receive regular reports on progress.

29b   The membership, of the INTEGER committee, to include senior male and female Trinity Fellows.

Benchmark 30: Resources for "Women in Science" Good Practice Programmes

Good Practice

For good practice programme activities to succeed, the University needs to:

- Allocate and earmark funding at University and School levels for "Women in Science" Good Practice Programme;

- Provide expertise and administrative support to Schools;

- Expect Schools to make time available to staff who manage and lead activities, initiatives and programmes.

Observations and comments about TCD

30.1   It was not clear how much administrative and expert support Schools can currently access from WiSER or from the Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science (FEMS) . The ORP visit and the ORP reports to the two Schools should provide a good steer.

Actions

30a   College to agree an INTEGER resource strategy, to include :

-   A budget to meet the needs of the College and School INTEGER action plans;

-   The expert and administrative support needed by the Faculty and Schools, for the duration of their plans;

-   The training needs of individuals in the Schools who are responsible for delivering the plan.

Next Steps: Getting started on the action plan

Step 1

Check the findings in this report for errors of fact and/or interpretations. Agree the correct wording/terminology with ORP. Then, use this report (together with the reports on the Schools of Chemistry and Natural Science) as a baseline against which progress by Trinity College and its two schools will be measured, as evidence of the need for change, and as the source of good practice.

Step 2

Identify the key individuals and post holders at Faculty and College level to whom this report should be sent. Make a start on framing the TCD action plan, based on the recommendations in this report and in the School reports. WiSER, the Heads of Chemistry and Natural Science, the Dean of FEMS, and the College INTEGER action committee should be involved in this. If there isn't an INTEGER committee, likely members of the committee might include representatives of the Chemistry and Natural Sciences committees as well as representatives of other interested Schools, plus anyone else the Dean and WiSER think might be useful. A decision will be needed on how far, with whom and when to share the report. In terms of deciding when to start the action the answer is - as soon as possible. This should retain momentum after the visit, and help deflect interest away from the areas where the report suggests the College/its school don't shine, and to focus the interest on what is happening.

In terms of how to prioritise action, focus initially on actions where:

- There is a good fit with existing College (and or WiSER) initiatives/plans/ strategy;
- Immediate action is essential to making change at school level;
- It can support the priorities for action identified by the two Schools;
- Changes can make a difference in the short term, for individuals and for the Schools;
- The change is easy and low cost to deliver;
- What is developed is sustainable and can relatively easily be adopted/adapted by other schools.

Schedule later areas where:

- Action at College level is not important to the implementation/success of changes at School level;
- Action is going to be complicated and there is likely to be a long time before the action has much effect;
- Significant resources are needed (staff time is usually a major component of any action and budgets can take time to get sorted out);
- It is necessary to get the 'right people' on board and/or where a lot of preliminary discussion and/or consultation is anticipated;
- Vested interests are strongly entrenched;
- The success of the action and or the ability to deliver it is in doubt.

Before the plan is opened up to general discussion, make sure that:

- College champions are in place and briefed, and the individuals who are to lead the initial programmes know in broad terms what is expected of them;
- The necessary resources at College, Faculty and School level have been identified and earmarked for the duration of INTEGER and the College action timetable has been agreed (at least for year one activities);
- Communication, dissemination and reporting arrangements to cover FEMS (and all FEMS Schools) are agreed and in place for the initial actions;

- College has an understanding of how initial successes will provide the foundation for the next round of action;
- Thought has been given to what success will look like at College, Faculty and School levels, how to celebrate it, and how the impact of the changes will be measured.

Step 4

Share the plans with the FEMS and its Schools, and make a start on the quick wins and initiatives that can be piloted in, say, the next nine months. While these are running there is time to plan the more complicated and ambitious actions, in particular those where College, Faculty and School input has to be co-ordinated. In some cases the time scale for change will be long. It is useful to leave some space and some spare resources to pick up on ideas and initiatives that emerge from the actions that are already in train.

Step 5

Review and celebrate progress at the end of year one, and tweak the action plan to take account of what was learnt/achieved in year one (at College, Faculty and School levels). It may well be that by then, changes that in the beginning looked difficult, or nearly impossible, to make look rather easier.

Annexe A: List of Actions Recommended to Trinity College

Benchmark 1: Student data

1a   College to ensure that the Equality Monitoring Report meets the needs of Schools and supports the INTEGER action plans.

1b   College to review its staff data and statistics and to make recommendations to its Schools and Faculties on what data they expect them to collect, to use (for example in their action plans) and to provide to College.

1c   College Equality Committee to continue to decide what staff data should be provided to Schools and Faculties (for example gender disaggregated data on representation on College and Faculty committees).

1d   WiSER to make clear to College, FEMS and its Schools what data comparisons they should make, internal and external.

Benchmark 2: Staff data

See actions for Benchmark 1.

Benchmark 3: Qualitative data

3a   School and Faculty Data from the recent INTEGER opinion survey should be used as a basis for the College INTEGER action plan.

3b   College to run a staff opinion survey towards the end of INTEGER (Note: this is already part of INTEGER).

3c   College to run the Good Practice Checklist (at School and College levels) towards the end of INTEGER to measure change. This exercise could include other Schools for comparison. The results to be shared with the School INTEGER action committees.

Benchmark 4: Management systems

4a   College to make sure that its guidance, on the roles of Head of School and Head of Discipline, is clear and that their respective roles are clearly differentiated.

4b   College to clarify its expectations on the rotation of School roles and responsibilities.

4c   The administrative staff role in pastoral care to be formally recognised as part of their role, and appropriate training to be provided.

Benchmark 5: Resource allocations

5a   College to review the administration requirements it places on Schools in relation to their size and their administrative and financial resources.

5b   College to review, and where necessary rebalance, the funding allocations between Schools and Disciplines.

Benchmark 6: Workload roles and responsibilities

6a   College to survey staff after the first year of the workload allocation system, to ensure that the system is workable, simple, clear and that staff perceive it to be transparent and fair, and to act on the feedback.

Benchmark 7: Workplace environment

7a   WiSER to access data from the INTEGER survey (together with the ORP reports) as a basis for Faculty discussion and focus groups to explore and make suggestions on improving the workplace environment. Based on the results, the College to formulate actions and communicate to Schools any actions that need implementing at School level.

Benchmark 8: Collegiality

8a   WiSER to access data from the INTEGER survey (together with the ORP reports) as a basis for Faculty discussion/focus groups to explore and make suggestions on developing a strong sense of community.

8b   Based on the results, the College to make clear to Schools what it expects of them in developing and maintaining both a feeling of community and good standards of behaviours towards colleagues and students.

8c   College to establish points of contact to oversee post doc development and to act as an arbiter on cases of conflict between PIs and post docs.

8d   College to adapt and adopt its own version of the UK Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers (see http://www.vitae.ac.uk/policy-practice/505181/Concordat-to-Support-the-Career-Development-of-Researchers.html).

Benchmark 9: Individual contributions valued

9a   WiSER to access data from the INTEGER survey (together with the ORP reports) as a basis for Faculty discussion/focus groups to explore and make suggestions on ways to recognise and 'reward' individuals' contributions to their School. Based on the results, the College to make clear to Schools what it expects of them. (Individuals' contributions can be recognised in a number of ways, for example: emails from the HoS to staff informing them of individual staff members who have won grants, been promoted, won prizes, etc.; highlighting of achievements on School and College websites and publications; School and College prizes for teaching, research, general high performance in their job.)

Benchmark 10: Decision Making

10a   College to monitor the uptake of training.

10b   College to Review the requirement in FEMS for two women members of the selection panels as this practice places a significant burden on more senior female staff (possibilities to consider – that one of the women would be a lay member, that if there was only one women member she would chair the panel, or that one of the two women present could be an HR representative).

10c   College to ensure that arrangements are in place to "look after" candidates during the selection process.

Benchmark 11: Appointment and promotion criteria, processes and information provided

11a   College to introduce panel interviews for the appointment post docs.

11b   College to clarify the promotion process for all staff groups (including information available to staff and Schools) and the criteria. It is not clear whether the problem was one of reality or perception: in either case it needs to be addressed.

11c   College to confirm, to HoS and HoD, the system for short term appointments and arrangements for staff on short term contracts to 'become' permanent staff, and to ensure that staff on short term contracts were aware of the arrangements. College also to consider whether it was necessary for staff on fixed term contracts to go through a full competitive selection process to gain a permanent position.

11d   College to review the need for a 40+ page application form for academic promotions with a view to streamline the information required to be provided by candidates.

Benchmark 12: Monitor Appointments and promotions

12a   College to ensure that there is gender monitoring of applicants/short listed candidates and appointments made.

Benchmark 13: Encourage candidates

13a   College to review its promotion processes and specifically:

- Ask schools to undertake a review of all staff at the beginning of each promotion round and invite staff who are ready for promotion to apply thereby eliminating the reliance on self nomination that effectively 'discriminates' against women;

- Offer open information and advice sessions for potential promotion candidates.

Benchmark 14: Support promotion candidates

14a   College to offer training on preparing promotion cases.

14b   College to specify what it expects of Schools and senior staff, for example the school identifying potential candidates and senior staff providing active encouragement, support. and/or coaching.

Benchmark 15: Feedback and follow up for promotion candidates

15a   College to offer training on how to give positive feedback.

15b   College to consider the respective roles of the School and the Dean in providing positive feedback to candidates.

Benchmark 16: Development needs and take up

16a   College to identify good practice in the provision of independent careers advice and guidance across FEMS Schools and disseminate that information to Schools.

16b   College to provide regular induction programmes for new staff and to monitor take up.

16c   College to make clear to Faculties and Schools its expectation on comprehensive local induction programmes.

16d   College to make sure that opportunities for administrative staff to move within College to expand their experience are actively promoted, for example by an internal jobs page on the web.

16e   College/Faculty to introduce Faculty meetings for administrative and technical staff to encourage networking and sharing good practice.

Benchmark 17: Early Career Researchers' (ECR) development

17a   College to review the utility and uptake of training and development courses by ECRs, in particular the provision of transferable skills training.

Benchmark 18: Appraisal

18a   College to ensure that at College, Faculty and School level it has arrangements (in the absence of appraisal) for the regular review of the career development of academics and post docs.

Benchmark 19: Mentoring

19b   College to provide training and support networks for mentors and mentees.

Benchmark 20: Networks and role models

20a   College to set up on a year's pilot basis one or more of the following at Faculty or College level (a judgement needs to be made as to the number of potential members and whether Faculty level networks will be sustainable):

-    A women's network of academic staff;

-    A network of post docs (male and female);

-    A network of PhD students (male and female).

20b   College to ask or suggest to each network one or two of the issues identified in the ORP reports and ask them to undertake a Faculty review to identify good practice and to make recommendations for changes to be adopted (at College, Faculty and/or School level).

Benchmark 21: Internal and external activities

21a   College to monitor and report the gender balance of the Schools' nominations to the Fellowship and the awards of Fellowships, against the gender balance of the 'pool' from which potential candidates are drawn. If problems are identified College to ensure that Schools are taking corrective action.

21b   Female College Fellows to be encouraged to recognise their status as role models, and to actively encourage women to consider becoming Fellows.

21c   College to request the Fellowship to change its regulations to allow part time staff to become College Fellows.

Benchmark 22: Approaches to flexible working

22a   College to review the uptake of both formal and informal flexible working and, depending on the outcome, to review the information, practical advice and guidance on flexibility it provides for Schools.

22b   College to provide training for managers in managing flexible working, and in encouraging flexibility (to develop a culture in which managers are aware of the individual needs of their staff and themselves take advantage of opportunities to work flexibly, and in which staff that do work less than full-time hours are not thought of as inferior by their colleagues).

22c   College to provide and publicise the availability of the advice, information and expertise on managing flexibility which Schools need.

22d   College to change its 'regulations' to allow technical and administrative staff to move between full-time and part-time working more easily.

Benchmark 23: Take up of flexibility

See actions for Benchmark 22.

Benchmark 24: Flexibility built into arrangements

See actions for Benchmark 22.

Benchmark 25: Supportive approaches to career breaks

25a   College to make sure that Schools are aware of what is expected of them, of what support and advice College can provide.

Benchmark 26: Career breaks-before and during

See actions for Benchmark 25.

Benchmark 27: Career breaks - on and after return

27a   College to review the information, practical advice and guidance on career breaks and returning it provides for Schools and staff.

27b   College to ask WiSER to provide case studies on women and men in STEMM who have successfully continued their academic careers after a career break.

27c   College to allow part time staff to be eligible for College Fellowships.

27d   College to allow staff working part-time following a career break to return to full-time working in the future.

Benchmark 28: Leadership and engagement

28a   Establish a Schools' INTEGER champ ions network to enable sharing and dissemination of good practice.

Benchmark 29: Accountability for women's career progression and good working practices

29a   The INTEGER committee to agree the College action plan and receive regular reports on progress.

29b   The membership, of the INTEGER committee, to include senior male and female Trinity Fellows.

Benchmark 30: Resources for "Women in Science" Good Practice Programmes

30a   College to agree an INTEGER resource strategy, to include :

- A budget to meet the needs of the College and School INTEGER action plans;

- The expert and administrative support needed by the Faculty and Schools, for the duration of their plans;

- The training needs of individuals in the Schools who are responsible for delivering the plan.

Annexe B: Key Learning From UK Experience

How Long will it Take?

Work with UK departments, who are leading the way, shows that it can take ten years of good practice and culture change, before there is measurable impact on the recruitment, retention and progression of women in the department. As a result of their work, and work by the Athena Project, the IOP and RSC there is now much more information about what to do and how to go about doing it.

A department beginning its work today could expect to progress more quickly than those pioneering departments, but even with the knowledge now available, it will still take years to see noticeable changes in the proportion so of women in senior positions.

Some departments, with a long track record of good practice, find that their changes are not sustainable, as people move on, departments and faculties are restructured, where complacency creeps in, or a new HoD has a different agenda. The keys to continuing success are to embed the culture change, and the good practice that supports it, firmly in the way the department works, and to get to a position where all the staff recognise the benefits, and consequently object if things slip.

Early work in the Athena Programme showed the importance of starting with the simple things where it was possible to make a difference easily, cheaply and quickly. The effect of making simple changes was that people started to feel that it was possible to change the way things worked. They also recognised that simple changes (often introduced specifically to improve the position and progression of women like for example, women's networks and women only mentoring schemes) actually improved the situation for department as a whole.

These early successes encouraged universities to tackle more difficult areas. Following the success of changes aimed towards individual women, several universities in the Athena Programme choose to address their culture through what they saw as their key processes (key in terms of academic progression). They variously reviewed, proposed and made changes to their appointment and promotion processes and in the way their committees operated (reviewing their membership, the representativeness their chairs, and the ways in which business was conducted including understanding the differences in the way man and women contributed and how their contributions were regarded).

Why so few References to Women in the Recommendations

Work in the UK showed clearly that whereas good practice benefits all, men and women, staff and students (the department and its work) bad practice incrementally damages women's career progression. This does not mean that actions aimed specifically towards women are not important. What it does mean is that major changes to processes and procedures, such as the introduction of a more open and transparent promotion system, will benefit both men and women.

The Importance of Early Career Researchers

Work in the UK has identified the importance of action at the early career stages. In the majority of disciplines, women are less likely, than men, to move on to the next stage; whether from bachelors degree to a doctorate, from a doctorate to post doctoral work, or into a permanent academic position.1 It is therefore important that students and post doctoral researchers have positive experiences, and that they receive the support they need. It is also important that those who supervise students and post doctoral researchers are aware of the barriers that women scientists in particular may face.

Working in Partnership

Early work in the Athena programme identified that partnership was important for success:

> Initially it was important to engage with and empower women, to give them a voice and to make clear that the problem was not the women, but that the loss of women was a significant one for the success of UK science.

> Scientists work in departments, they are loyal to their departments, their discipline and the professional bodies to which they belong. Departments and professional societies need to make a public commitment and an active contribution if change is to happen and to be sustained. Professional societies exercise a strong influence on the culture of their disciplines.[2]

> Departments cannot achieve a culture change on their own. The processes that present a higher barrier to women's career progression are usually centrally driven, and governed by university requirements.

> If a university wants to improve the representation of women in its departments and in university management, it has to recognise that although much of the work has to be at department level it will need to review and change its processes. It will also need to make staff and student data accessible to departments, and to make clear to departments what it expects of them.

Are the Recommendations Achievable?

All the good practice recommended for action are in place, or have been used by universities and departments in the UK. The wording has been varied to take account of local terminology practice. In the UK, the research intensive universities are most likely to be active members of the Athena SWAN Charter. It would seem that good practice and good science often go hand in hand.

---

[1] See for example, *The Molecular Bioscience PhD and Women's Retention: A Survey and Comparison with Chemistry*; *The chemistry PhD: the impact on women's retention*; *Change of Heart - Career intentions and the chemistry Ph*D, Reports are available at www.rsc.org/diversity

[2] Women in University Physics Departments: A Site Visit Scheme 2003–2005, (http://www.iop.org/publications/iop/archive/file_42616.pdf); *Project Juno: An introduction to Project Juno and the process involved*, (http://www.iop.org/publications/iop/2009/page_42647.html)

Action Area Specifics

1 Evidence Base for Action

Accurate data on female and male differences in representation and progression at all career stages, is fundamental to the development of effective plans to tackle inequalities in career progression. Data help to identify the need for action, and to persuade managers and staff of that need. Often departments make limited use of the data they supply to their university.

Academics, who are not aware of differential female and male representation, of the key attrition points for women in their discipline, or of how their department compares with others, may not realise why action is needed. However, in most departments, the turnover of academic staff is low; so in the short and medium term, changes in female staff numbers will not reflect changes in practices/processes. Measuring the representation of female applicants and short listed candidates, against the proportion of women in the recruitment pool does provides a useful indicator.

2 Effective Management

It is often the case that what is clear to those who take decisions, is often less clear to others. Junior staff are often not well informed on how the department's systems for workload and resource allocation are organised, or on the basis on which these allocations are made. Consequently, they may question their fairness. Uncertainties about who makes which decisions and on what basis, can give the appearance of a 'closed shop'. In contrast the best departments have transparent systems in place to ensure that all staff are informed. Minutes of management meetings are published and the basis on which resources are allocated are made clear, and staff workloads are available.

In the best departments there is a regular rotation of senior posts which provides opportunities for the membership of the senior management team, and membership of important committees. It is seen as beneficial for the department, if more staff acquire the management experience they need for promotion, as there are then more staff who have the experience necessary for more senior management positions.

Some departments appoint staff into assistant or deputy positions to enable then to gain experience prior to taking on major administrative roles. Staff who do take on major management or administrative roles have the work involved recognised in the workload model and in consequence have a reduction in their teaching load.

3 Workplace Culture

Work by the RSC and IOP showed that staff working in 'good practice' departments had clear view of how they and their colleagues, senior and junior, were expected to behave towards each other, and on the importance of looking out for each other. Some departments articulate their values in terms of a shared responsibility for the quality of the department's research, its teaching, and developing the potential of all its staff.

4 Appointment and Promotion Processes

In most departments the major turnover is of post docs. Here selection is often the responsibility of groups/sections, and not 'controlled' by the department. Departments, who monitor their data, have noted the relationship between the appointment of female candidates and the presence of women on the appointing committees.

Universities who identify problems with academic promotion, sometimes find obstacles and systems at department level which restrict the value of the changes made at university level. In other cases,

department processes are transparent and well understood, but are a "black box" at faculty and university levels. Publicising successful promotion case studies can help to demystify the promotions process.

5 Levelling the Appointment and Promotion Playing Fields

Those staff who are not given information on their readiness for promotion, or who are not directly approach and encouraged to apply for promotion, may assume they are either not eligible for promotion, or not yet ready. Work by Athena suggested women were more likely than men to make such assumptions. Work also showed that heads of departments often found it difficult to provide positive feedback to candidates in particular to unsuccessful candidates. Anecdote suggests that women's confidence is knocked back more by failure than men's, and so it is particularly important that they receive positive feedback.

Departments, which monitor their data, have noted that women are likely to wait longer than men before they apply for promotion especially to senior positions. If staff are not made aware of new appointments/vacancies, they may assume the post is intended for a known candidate.

6 Career Development Provision

Across UK universities the provision of staff development and training, and the regard in which it is held is mixed. Some universities provide high quality, targeted training which is valued by their departments. In others, the perceived burdensome, inappropriate and poorly presented training courses required, for example for probationary lecturers makes it difficult to persuade the academic community of the value of other centrally provided training and development. It is therefore important that the take up and usefulness of training is monitored, and where problems are found solutions are put in place.

While individuals need to take responsibility for their own career development; the view held by some senior academics that individuals are intelligent enough to 'push' themselves, and to know what was needed, is unhelpful. Junior staff can feel that the need to ask/the need for support is an admission of ignorance and uncertainty which might reflect negatively on them.

Well managed appraisal systems, which are focused on career development rather than on formal assessment of staff, are important in giving staff the space to discuss their development needs and their readiness for promotion. The best departments monitor the take up of appraisal and periodically assess its effectiveness. Post docs require a different appraisal to permanent staff. For post docs the key questions to be answered are whether they have the potential for a permanent academic job, and what they need to do to improve their chances of gaining such a role.

7 Career Development Activities

Across UK universities the picture is mixed. Some departments recognise the need to ensure that their staff; particularly early career staff, engage in activities which are valuable for their career development. Many departments have mentoring schemes for new staff. A few departments also have mentors available for post docs. Again it is important to assess the effectiveness of mentoring schemes and to provide training for both mentors and mentees. Some departments also offer mentors for those preparing for promotion, or for those returning from maternity leave.

The absence of female role models is often cited as significant to women's career progression and retention. Departments often see networking and role models as external 'activities', which they encourage, rather than activities for which they are responsible. The best departments ensure that at least a representative proportion of seminar speakers are women and that amply opportunity is provided for, in particular early career researchers, to meet and network with the seminar speakers.

Departments often do not recognise networking across the university/outside their discipline as an important developmental activities for their early career staff. Universities and faculties have a role here in establishing opportunities for their staff to network among each other, and this may have the beneficial spin off may be that new research collaborations are formed.

8 Flexibility and Sustainable Careers

Individuals' needs and priorities change at different life stages. Staff with young families, living away from their family support network, will have different perspectives, from those who are more established, and different from those without family responsibilities. In some departments, staff feel that they would be 'letting the side down' by taking time out for family events. In others staff know that their contribution to the department is measured not by time in the lab, but by the quality of their output, and heads of departments actively discourage staff from overworking. Departments which have good flexible working practices and arrangements in place do, however, have to accept that in reality the take up is a matter for individuals and for research groups. It is not something which they control and much of it is self driven.

It has been noted that in departments where senior staff to take up opportunities for flexible working, flexible working is legitimised for all staff.

9 Career Breaks and Interrupted Careers

Good practice departments see managing maternity leave (and other planned and unplanned, career breaks), as a responsibility to be shared. They do not leave individuals to find their own cover and/or to make arrangements to catch up on their return. They have developed 'procedures' which can swing into action smoothly. There are significant differences in the ways departments approach keeping in touch with members of staff on a career break.

Some universities offer reduced teaching and/or administrative workloads on return. However, a few offer career development/professional updating and/or mentoring to returners, and others had formal progress reviews for returners to ensure that they receive the support they need to make a smooth transition back into work.

10 Organisation for Action

Women and science activities and programmes need to be embedded. Initiatives led by women, but not endorsed or encouraged by senior management, are unlikely to make any long-term difference to department culture, or key processes. Departments, with successful women and science programmes, recognise their value, and resource them by recognising the staff time involved and by providing administrative support. Success also require senior management buy in and involvement. The most successful departments often have the head of department heavily involved, and he or she often chairs the programme committee. In contrast, leaving one or two female academics to run women and science programmes with no administrative support, funding or any recognition of the time taken, does not generally lead to the success, and may be detrimental to the individuals' own career progression.

Oxford Research and Policy

This report was prepared for Trinity College Dublin by Sean McWhinnie and Caroline Fox of Oxford Research and Policy.

Oxford Research and Policy is a consultancy which carries out research and evaluation, and specialises in higher education, science policy, and equality and diversity.

t   +44 (0)1235 439188

e   info@oxfordresearchandpolicy.co.uk

w   www.oxfordresearchandpolicy.co.uk

"Good working practice benefits all - staff and students; however, research demonstrates that bad working practices adversely affect women more than men. There is a relationship between good practice and good science, individuals in "good practice" departments can contribute more. Departments with good working practices have fewer management problems." Dr. Sean McWhinnie

Sean McWhinnie and Caroline Fox have worked together since 2003. Their first joint project was a Royal Society of Chemistry/Athena Project initiative to identify, validate, encourage and disseminate good practice in the recruitment, retention and career progression of academic chemists. As part of this project they developed a good practice checklist for use by departments. This led to the development of the Athena Action Framework. Between them Sean McWhinnie and Caroline Fox have over 20 years of experience in working with STEMM departments on good practice including the Chemistry Department at the University of York.

Dr. Sean McWhinnie worked in science policy at the Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC) for 12 years. Before that Sean was a lecturer in the Chemistry Department at Brunel University for over 7 years. At the RSC Sean developed work in diversity and built partnerships with STEM stakeholders in particular the Athena Project, UK Resource Centre for Women in SET, and the Institute of Physics. Sean has commissioned, and carried out, research on the career intentions and experiences of PhD students in chemistry and molecular biosciences, and of research staff in chemistry and physics. In 2009, Sean set up Oxford Research and Policy and has since consulted for a number of clients including the Institute of Physics, the Royal Astronomical Society, the London Mathematical Society, Vitae, the UK Resource Centre for Women in Science, the Equality Challenge Unit, University of Oxford, University of Southampton, St Andrews University, University of Kent and the Science and Technology Funding Council.

Mrs Caroline Fox was Human Resources Director at Imperial College London for 6 years, and has for the last 15 years worked as consultant, mainly in the public sector. Caroline was one of the founders of the Athena Project in 1999. She was responsible for the development and launch of the Athena SWAN Charter in 2005 and ran the SWAN recognition award scheme in its first two years. Caroline acts as Advisor to Athena Forum, and is a member Athena SWAN Steering Committee. She has recently completed a joint Imperial College and Royal Society project funded by HEFCE to complete the development of the Athena Survey of Science, Engineering and Technology (ASSET).

Athena SWAN Award Scheme: http://www.athenaswan.org.uk

Athena Forum and ASSET: http://www.athenaforum.org.uk/