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## 1. LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT FROM THE HEAD OF INSTITUTION

Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words ( 543 words)
Note: Please insert the endorsement letter immediately after this cover page.


## University of Reading

## Vice-Chancellor's Office

Whiteknights House
Whiteknights. PO Box 217
Reading RG6 1AP
phone +44 (0)118 3786226
email vc@reading.ac.uk

Dr Ruth Gilligan<br>Athena SWAN Manager<br>Advance HE<br>First floor<br>Napier House<br>24 High Holborn<br>London WC1V 6AZ

04 December 2019

Dear Dr Gilligan,
On behalf of the University of Reading, I write this letter in support of our submission for a Silver Athena SWAN Award with pride in the achievements delivered in relation to diversity and inclusion over the last four years, and in the ambition of the current submission.

I joined the University as Pro-Vice-Chancellor in 2014 and was appointed Vice-Chancellor in February this year. Throughout my time at Reading, work on gender equality and Athena SWAN has been an important part of my life. Soon after appointment I took on the role of University Executive Board (UEB) Gender Champion. I led the appointment in 2015 of our first Dean for Diversity \& Inclusion, appointing our first Leadership Grouplevel job-share. I line-managed the D\&I Deans until September 2018, when I was appointed Acting Vice-Chancellor. I have retained, as Vice-Chancellor, the URB Gender Champion role.

As UEB Gender Champion I supported the development of challenging D\&I targets through to 2020, which we announced in February 2016, and have been part of our 20152016 and 2019 Athena SWAN Self-Assessment Teams, and our 2016-2018 Implementation Team, playing roles in the delivery of key actions. I chaired our 2016 Gender Pay Gap Working Group, which led to an external review of Grade 9 Professional and Support salaries and a reduction in our Grade 9 gender pay gap. In March 2017, as an action to promote job-share, I spoke at our Leadership Group about my positive experiences of managing job-shares in academia and with the Environment Agency. The University has since appointed two job-share Heads of Schools, and two UEB job-shares as Pro-Vice-Chancellor.

The D\&I 2020 targets on gender announced in 2016 were challenging, but we've made substantial progress. Examples include:

- an increase from $30 \%$ to $35 \%$ female professors, well ahead of the sector, largely as an impact of new academic promotions processes;
- at our 2016 Athena SWAN application, our UEB was all white and male. From 1 January 2020, UEB will be $37.5 \%$ female and we will have our first female Deputy Vice-Chancellor in Professor Parveen Yaqoob.

Importantly, as an institution we also play a substantial gender-champion role externally, for example through:

- an annual public lecture named after Edith Morley (the first woman professor in the UK, appointed to a chair at Reading in 1908), the 2019 edition featuring Laura Bates;
- an annual pubic lecture named after the author of the 1957 Wolfenden Report (and a predecessor as Vice-Chancellor). In 2019 we welcomed the Stonewall Trans Role Model Captain Hannah Graf and her husband Jake;
- our current national leadership of the Astor100 Project, through Dr Jacqui Turner (History), and of equality and diversity for REF2021, through Prof Dianne Berry OBE.

Past successes should not lead to complacency, and there is very much more to do. Captured in the Action Plan below, and our associated commitment to the required resources, are many concrete steps - for example a doubling of paternity leave, moves to equalise salaries between externally appointed and internally promoted professors which aim to take us closer to becoming an institution that realises full gender equality.

On my appointment in February I made clear that revising our University strategy, in consultation with staff and students, was my top priority. This work is in train, but at its heart will be the principle that the University will be a diverse and inclusive community.

Yours sincerely,


PROFESSOR ROBERT VAN DE NOORT FSA


Front side of postcard advertising 2019 Edith Morley Lecture (left); big-screen advert for the Astor100 project, Reading Station 28/11/19 (right)

| AHSSBL | Arts, humanities, social sciences, business and law |
| :---: | :---: |
| AIT | Athena Implementation Team (overseeing AS Action Plan 2016-19) |
| A\&R | Academic and Research |
| AP | Action Plan |
| APP | Academic Practice Programme |
| AS | Athena SWAN |
| ASIG | Athena SWAN Implementation Group (that will oversee AS Action Plan 2019-23) |
| ASPSG | Athena SWAN Professional Services Group |
| CPD | Continuing Professional Development |
| CQSD | Centre for Quality Support and Development |
| D\&I | Diversity and Inclusion |
| AS2016AP | (Our UoR) Athena SWAN 2016 Action Plan |
| DICOP | D\&I Community of Practice (all School/Function/AS leads) |
| D\&IAB | Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Board (Fig 2.2) |
| ECR | Early Career Researcher |
| ES | Executive Support |
| ESCOP | Executive Support Community of Practice |
| F, \%F, ... | Female, percentage female, ... |
| F\%WU | Percentage female as a proportion of the total pool without unknowns |
| FLAIR | Facilitating Learning, Teaching Achievement and Individual Recognition (our internal route to HEA accreditation) |
| FPE | Full-person equivalent |
| FTE | Full-time equivalent |
| G1, G2, ... | (University of Reading) Grade 1, Grade 2, ... |
| HBS | Henley Business School |
| HEA | Higher Education Academy |
| HESA | Higher Education Statistical Agency |
| HoF | Head of Function |
| HOP | HESA Offshore Provision |
| HoS | Head of School |
| HUM | School of Humanities |
| ILM | Institute of Leadership and Management |
| IoE | Institute of Education |
| ISLI | International Study and Language Institute |
| L\&D | Learning and Development |
| LAW | School of Law |
| LG | Leadership Group (staff in Fig 2.1) |
| $\mathrm{M}, \% \mathrm{M}, \ldots$ | Male, percentage male, ... |
| MCE | Marketing, Communications and Engagement |
| NEBOSH | National Examination Board in Occupational Safety and Health |
| NERC | Natural Environment Research Council |
| OH | Occupational Health |
| p.p. | Percentage point(s) |
| PD | People Development (section of HR) |
| PDRA | Postdoctoral Research Associate |
| P\&S | Professional and Support |
| PVC | Pro-Vice-Chancellor |
| RE-ACT | Race Equality Action Team |
| RDL | Research Division Lead |
| REF | Research Excellence Framework |
| RSC | Research Staff Committee |
| RUSU | Reading University Students' Union |
| S\&FC | Strategy and Finance Committee |


| SAGES | School of Archaeology, Geography and Environmental Sciences |
| :--- | :--- |
| SAPD | School of Agriculture, Policy and Development |
| SBE | School of the Built Environment |
| SBS | School of Biological Sciences |
| SCFP | School of Chemistry, Food and Pharmacy |
| SLL | School of Literature and Languages |
| SMPCS | School of Mathematical, Physical and Computational Sciences |
| SPCLS | School of Psychology and Clinical Language Sciences |
| SPEIR | School of Politics, Economics and International Relations |
| STEMM | Science, technology, engineering, mathematics and medicine |
| T\&L | Teaching and Learning |
| TEF | Teaching Excellence Framework |
| U | Unknown |
| UB | Unconscious Bias |
| UBRI | University Board for Research \& Innovation |
| UBTLSE | University Board for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience |
| UEB | University Executive Board |
| UoR | University of Reading |
| VC | Vice-Chancellor |
| WEI | (Stonewall) Workplace Equality Index |

## Notes on Data (77 words)

Staff data focuses on headcount (count of records in Trent HR database).
Sector comparisons are whole HE sector, reflecting (§2) that we are typical university: mid-ranked, T\&L/Researchfocussed, balanced between AHSSBL/STEMM.

Our internal staff census date switched from $1 / 10$ to $31 / 3$ part-way through assessment period. Table ND1 gives meaning of 2016,...,2019 in tables: snapshot at census date, or total over census period ending in that year. Period ending in 2018, because of census change, is only 6 months.

Table ND1.

| Year shown in table | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Census date for <br> snapshot staff numbers | $1 / 10 / 16$ | $1 / 10 / 17$ | $31 / 3 / 18$ | $31 / 3 / 19$ |
| Census period, e.g. for <br> staff leavers, staff <br> leave, staff training | $1 / 10 / 15-30 / 9 / 16$ <br> (12 months) | $1 / 10 / 16-30 / 9 / 17$ <br> (12 months) | $1 / 10 / 17-31 / 3 / 18$ <br> (6 months) | $1 / 4 / 18-31 / 3 / 19$ <br> $(12$ months) |

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTITUTION

Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words ( 716 words, total of (i)-(v))
Please provide a brief description of the institution, including any relevant contextual information. This should include:
(i) information on where the institution is in the Athena SWAN process ( 380 words)

An early supporter of the AS charter (established 2005), UoR has held an institutional Bronze award since 2008, renewed 2012 and 2016. Our academic organisational unit is the School (we have no Faculties). UoR received its first School-level award (Silver level) in 2009: our School-level award status at last institutional AS submission and currently is as Tables 2.1-2.2.

Table 2.1. STEMM Schools

| STEMM School | AS award at April 2016 (date of <br> last UoR AS submission) | AS award at November 2019 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Archaeology, Geography and <br> Environmental Science (SAGES) | Silver | Silver (renewed October 2019) |
| Agriculture, Policy and <br> Development (SAPD) | No award | Bronze (awarded October 2019) |
| Chemistry, Food and Pharmacy <br> (SCFP) | Bronze | Silver (awarded October 2019) |
| Mathematical, Physical, and <br> Computational Sciences (SMPCS) | Silver | Silver (renewed November 2017) |
| Psychology and Clinical Language <br> Sciences (SPCLS) | Bronze | Silver (renewed April 2018) |
| Built Environment (SBE) | Silver | Bronze (awarded April 2017) |
| Biological Sciences (SBS) | No award | 4 Silver, 3 Bronze |
| Total | 3 Silver, 2 Bronze |  |



The School SAT in SCFP, which has just received their first Silver Award.

Table 2.2 AHSSBL Schools

| AHSSBL School | AS Award Status |
| :--- | :--- |
| Arts, Communication and Design (SACD) | N/A currently - awaiting feedback from national Athena <br> SWAN review. |
| Institute of Education (IoE) | N/A currently - awaiting feedback from national Athena <br> SWAN review. |
| Henley Business School (HBS) | Bronze submission, notified unsuccessful October 2019. <br> New submission planned April 2020. |
| Humanities (HUM) | Bronze submission planned November 2020. |
| International Study \& Language Institute (ISLI) | Bronze submission planned November 2020. |
| Law | Bronze submission planned November 2020. |
| Literature and Languages (SLL) | N/A currently - awaiting feedback from national Athena <br> SWAN review. |
| Politics, Economics and International Relations <br> (SPEIR) | Bronze submission (from Economics only), notified <br> unsuccessful October 2019. Taking stock of next steps. |

Most Professional and Support (P\&S) staff are in our 17 Functions or the Graduate School, a few associated to our Thames Valley Science Park (see Table 2.3 and Table 2.7 below).

Table 2.3 Our Professional and Support Functions, and the lumping together of smaller Functions into broader areas for later data analysis.

| Function name/Graduate School/Thames Valley <br> Science Park | Broader P\&S Area used in this report for data |
| :--- | :--- |
| analysis |  |$|$| Alumni and Supporter Engagement | Alumni \& Supporter Engagement |
| :--- | :--- |
| Campus Commerce | Campus Commerce |
| Centre for Quality Support \& Development (CQSD) | Academic \& Governance Services |
| Commercial (includes Research and Enterprise <br> Services, Knowledge Transfer Centre) | Research and Enterprise and Business Incubation |
| Estates | Estates |
| Finance | Finance \& Corporate Services |
| Global Recruitment \& Admissions | Global Recruitment \& Admissions |
| Governance | Academic \& Governance Services |
| Graduate School (Academic head + P\&S staff) | Graduate School |
| HR | HR |
| IT | IT |
| Legal Services | Academic \& Governance Services |
| Marketing, Communication and Engagement (MCE) | MCE |
| Planning \& Strategy Office (PSO) | Academic \& Governance Services |
| Procurement | Finance \& Corporate Services |
| Student Services | Student Services |
| Technical Services | Technical Services |
| Thames Valley Science Park | Research and Enterprise and Business Incubation |
| University Library \& Collections Service | Academic \& Governance Services |

UoR is located across three local campuses. Its main Whiteknights campus, slightly away from Reading town centre in 130 Hectares of parkland, has received nine consecutive Green-Flag awards as one of Britain's top green spaces. The historic London Road campus in central Reading has recently undergone a $£ 30$-million transformation. The spectacular Greenlands campus, eight miles away near Henley-on-Thames, hosts a large part of HBS.


The 12-Acre Harris Garden on the Whiteknights Campus. "One of Reading's hidden treasures": Sarah Fleming, a visitor to the Garden, quoted in the Reading Chronicle.


The Great Hall on the London Road Campus, used for our graduation ceremonies, concerts, and many other events.


Henley Business School at Greenlands Campus on the Thames near Henley.

Fig 2.1 shows the organisational structure. The VC and 6 staff in green comprise the University Executive Board (UEB) ( $28.6 \% \mathrm{~F}$ ). UEB, the Heads of Schools/Functions, the Deans for D\&I/Research/T\&L, and Director of the Science Park (staff in Fig 2.1) comprise the Leadership Group (LG) (headcount 53, 43.3\%F). Outside Schools/Functions there are small interdisciplinary research centres, with a handful of staff.

## Impact from 2016 AS Action Plan (AP2016)

AP2016:E2 $\quad$ The VC brought proposals to LG in 2017 for diversifying UEB, including use of job-share, to achieve target $30 \%$ either gender by 2020. Has led to increase from $0 \%$ F on UEB at $4 / 16$ to $28.3 \%$ F at $11 / 19$ ( $37.5 \%$ from $1 / 1 / 20$ ) plus first UEB job-shares (PVC for Research and Innovation, PVC Education).

## New action

AP2019 I1.1 $\quad$ Work to diversify UEB, and other key committees, to achieve 35\% of either gender by 2026.

Parveen Yaqoob appointed Deputy VC; Elizabeth McCrum and Julian Park Pro-VC (Education)
wednesday, 04 December 2019


Staff Portal announcement 4/12/19 of appointment from 1/1/20 of Job-Share PVC Education, 1st female Deputy VC


Fig 2.1. University Organisational Structure and Leadership Group (LG), November 2019.

Figure 2.2 details D\&I leadership/organisation. Key features: UEB members act as protected-characteristic champions; University established Dean for D\&I in 2015; Dean D\&I reports into D\&I Advisory Board (D\&IAB); D\&I leads and teams across all our Schools and many of our functions; five Equality and Diversity Networks (§5.6(i)(xii) for detail).


Fig 2.2. Leadership and Governance of Diversity and Inclusion

The University submitted, unsuccessfully, for a Bronze Race Equality Charter Mark in 2018. Feedback led to action plan taken forwards by our Race Equality Action Team (REACT) chaired by Dean D\&I. The University submits to the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index (WEI), and has moved from 204 ranking in 2016 to 80 in 2019.

## Impact from actions

The University established staff-student LGBT+ Action Plan Group in 2016 to monitor progress against LGBT+ action plan, with target of Top 50 in Stonewall WEI by 2020. Now in Stonewall Top 100, which requires, explicitly, a strong Trans Inclusion mark.
(ii) information on its teaching and its research focus (28 words)

The University has equal teaching/research focus: Silver TEF Award; 98\% of UoR research Internationally Recognised in last REF. Teaching and research portfolios are both balanced equally across STEMM/AHSSBL.
(iii) the number of staff. Present data for academic and professional and support staff separately (175 words)

Tables 2.4-2.5: staff numbers/gender-balance, whole University. Close to $50 \%$ F in our A\&R staff, between 60 and 65\%F in our P\&S staff.

Table 2.4 Staff (whole University), by count of records, snapshot 2019 [Source: Trent]

| Classification | Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 | 1682 | 942 | 2624 | $64.1 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 1086 | 1058 | 2144 | $50.7 \%$ |

Table 2.5 Staff (whole University), by sum of FTE, snapshot 2019 [Source: Trent]

| Classification | Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 | 1329.9 | 809.7 | 2139.5 | $62.2 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 596.4 | 678.7 | 1275.1 | $46.8 \%$ |

A\&R staff in AHSSBL schools are 56\%F (Table 2.6), 47\%F in STEMM. There are, additionally, small A\&R staff numbers in Student Services (20,50\%F) and VC's Office (20, Deans/PVCs, 50\%F).

Table 2.6. A\&R staff by AHSSBL/STEMM, by number of records, snapshot 2019 [Source: Trent]

| Area | Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| AHSSBL | 2019 | 662 | 515 | 1177 | $56.2 \%$ |
| STEMM | 2019 | 400 | 523 | 923 | $43.3 \%$ |

Fig 2.3 and Table 2.7: P\&S staff locations, most in functions. P\&S staff are 67\%F across STEMM schools, 72\%F in AHSSBL, these mainly Executive-Support staff; in STEMM schools we have smaller numbers of other staff (e.g. the farm within SAPD, in two NERC National Centres in SMPCS). Outside Schools P\&S gender balance varies widely, from $90 \%$ F in Graduate School, to $32 \%$ F in IT.

Fig 2.3. P\&S staff by area (whole University), by number of records: snapshot 2019 [Source: Trent]


Table 2.7. P\&S staff by area (whole University), by number of records [Source: Trent]

| Area | Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| AHSSBL | 2019 | 293 | 113 | 406 | $72.2 \%$ |
| STEMM | 2019 | 235 | 115 | 350 | $67.1 \%$ |
| Academic \& Governance Services | 2019 | 201 | 78 | 279 | $72.0 \%$ |
| Alumni \& Supporter Engagement | 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Campus Commerce | 2019 | 157 | 113 | 270 | $58.2 \%$ |
| Estates | 2019 | 111 | 189 | 300 | $37.0 \%$ |
| Property Services | 2019 |  |  |  | $33.3 \%$ |
| Finance and Corporate Services | 2019 | 63 | 33 | 96 | $65.6 \%$ |
| Global Recruitment \& Admissions | 2019 | 67 | 21 | 88 | $76.1 \%$ |
| Human Resources | 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Information Technology | 2019 | 48 | 102 | 150 | $32.0 \%$ |
| Marketing Communication \& Engagement | 2019 | 51 | 20 | 71 | $71.8 \%$ |
| Research \& Enterprise and Business Incubation | 2019 | 45 | 23 | 68 | $66.2 \%$ |
| Student Services | 2019 | 216 | 46 | 262 | $82.4 \%$ |
| Technical Services | 2019 | 57 | 66 | 123 | $46.3 \%$ |
| Graduate School | 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Vice Chancellor's Office | 2019 |  |  |  |  |

Table 2.8: P\&S (i.e. non-academic) staff in line with the sector. Other discussion of Tables 2.8-2.10 deferred to §4.1(iii).

Table 2.8. Sector data: proportion of staff within each Academic employment function group who are female (whole University), by FPE, snapshot 2017/18 [Source: HESA]

| Academic employment <br> function | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Not academic/not known | $62.9 \%$ | 2225 | $62.7 \%$ |
| Research only | $49.7 \%$ | 435 | $47.2 \%$ |
| Teaching \& research | $43.3 \%$ | 715 | $41.4 \%$ |
| Teaching only | $57.7 \%$ | 640 | $52.1 \%$ |

Table 2.9. Sector data: proportion of staff within each Academic employment function group who are female (STEMM), by FPE, snapshot 2017/18 [Source: HESA]

| Academic employment <br> function | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Not academic/not known | $65.7 \%$ | 235 | $58.9 \%$ |
| Research only | $48.3 \%$ | 380 | $39.9 \%$ |
| Teaching \& research | $35.9 \%$ | 375 | $31.0 \%$ |
| Teaching only | $53.5 \%$ | 180 | $44.3 \%$ |

Table 2.10. Sector data: proportion of staff within each Academic employment function group who are female (AHSSBL), by FPE, snapshot 2017/18 [Source: HESA]

| Academic employment <br> function | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Not academic/not known | $73.0 \%$ | 285 | $73.4 \%$ |
| Research only | $64.3 \%$ | 50 | $55.7 \%$ |
| Teaching \& research | $51.5 \%$ | 335 | $46.6 \%$ |
| Teaching only | $59.0 \%$ | 455 | $53.6 \%$ |

Tables 2.11-2.13 makes HESA-category sector comparisons for the whole University and for STEMM/AHSSBL.
Whole University is close to sector for Senior Management and Other Contract Level, 6\% more female professors overall ( $7.5 \% / 10.8 \%$ more in STEMM/AHSSBL), as impact of actions described in §5.1(iii).

Table 2.11. Sector data - proportion of staff within each Contract level group who are female (whole University), by FPE, snapshot 2017/18 [Source: HESA]

| Contract level | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Other contract level | $59.4 \%$ | 3655 | $56.3 \%$ |
| Professor | $31.5 \%$ | 240 | $25.5 \%$ |
| Senior management | $39.3 \%$ | 105 | $40.5 \%$ |

Table 2.12. Sector data - proportion of staff within each Contract level group who are female (STEMM), by FPE, snapshot 2017/18 [Source: HESA]

| Contract level | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Other contract level | $52.3 \%$ | 1000 | $44.7 \%$ |
| Professor | $25.5 \%$ | 145 | $18.0 \%$ |
| Senior management | $38.9 \%$ | 25 | $26.7 \%$ |

Table 2.13. Sector data - proportion of staff within each Contract level group who are female (AHSSBL), by FPE, snapshot 2017/18 [Source: HESA]

| Contract level | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Other contract level | $63.1 \%$ | 990 | $56.7 \%$ |
| Professor | $41.1 \%$ | 90 | $30.3 \%$ |
| Senior management | $39.2 \%$ | 35 | $41.9 \%$ |

(iv) the total number of departments and total number of students ( 82 words)

We have 15 schools (7 STEM, 8 AHBBSL, Tables 2.1,2.2). Table 2.15 shows total students by level, UG numbers increasing substantially year-by-year, with stable female proportion of $57 \%$. While PGT and PGR numbers are stable, we note the positive trend in the rising proposition of women, beneficial to the pipeline across very many of our schools. We will explore reasons behind this trend further, which seem to be school-specific rather than as a result of central action, within schools' AS action plans.

Table 2.15. Number of students (UK Location of Study only, All Schools), by level of study [Source: HESA and HOP returns]

| Level of <br> study | Acad. Year | Female | Male | Other | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| UG | $2013 / 4$ | 5339 | 4131 |  | 9470 | $56.4 \%$ |
|  | $2014 / 5$ | 5665 | 4231 |  | 9897 | $57.2 \%$ |
|  | $2015 / 6$ | 6076 | 4461 |  | 10539 | $57.7 \%$ |
|  | $2016 / 7$ | 6569 | 4807 |  | 11378 | $57.7 \%$ |
|  | $2017 / 8$ | 7180 | 5408 |  | 12589 | $57.0 \%$ |
|  | $2013 / 4$ | 2125 | 1730 |  | 3855 | $55.1 \%$ |
|  | $2014 / 5$ | 2218 | 1762 |  | 3980 | $55.7 \%$ |
|  | $2015 / 6$ | 2268 | 1727 |  | 3998 | $56.7 \%$ |
|  | $2016 / 7$ | 2179 | 1668 |  | 3850 | $56.6 \%$ |
|  | $2017 / 8$ | 2305 | 1597 |  | 3907 | $59.0 \%$ |
|  | $2013 / 4$ | 854 | 967 |  | 1821 | $46.9 \%$ |
|  | $2014 / 5$ | 926 | 980 |  | 1906 | $48.6 \%$ |
|  | $2015 / 6$ | 947 | 982 |  | 1930 | $49.1 \%$ |
|  | $2016 / 7$ | 954 | 932 |  | 1888 | $50.5 \%$ |
|  | $2017 / 8$ | 985 | 873 |  | 1860 | $53.0 \%$ |

(v) list and sizes of science, technology, engineering, maths and medicine (STEMM) and arts, humanities, social science, business and law (AHSSBL) departments. Present data for academic and support staff separately

Tables 2.16-2.30 show, for each STEMM/AHSSBL school in Tables 2.1-2.2, numbers and \%F for our staff/student cohorts as a snapshot at 2019: Fig 2.4 summarises the A\&R staff data. There is large variety, and much detail behind these numbers that is being/will be addressed in School AS submissions (Tables 2.1-2.2).

Fig 2.4. A\&R staff numbers and female \% by Schools at 2019. [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]


Table 2.16. Number of staff and students by count of records (STEMM - SAGES) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Other | Total | Female <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 |  |  |  |  | $56.52 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 52 | 43 | 0 | 95 | $54.74 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 363 | 353 | 0 | 716 | $50.70 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ |  |  |  |  | $50.00 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ | 73 | 49 | 0 | 122 | $59.84 \%$ |

Table 2.17. Number of staff and students by count of records (STEMM - SAPD) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 | 34 | 41 | 75 | $45.33 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 39 | 65 | 104 | $37.50 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 357 | 241 | 598 | $59.70 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ | 45 | 49 | 94 | $47.87 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ | 72 | 74 | 146 | $49.32 \%$ |

Table 2.18. Number of staff and students by count of records (STEMM - SCFP) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Other | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 |  |  |  |  | $74.19 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 82 | 84 | 0 | 166 | $49.40 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 655 | 395 | 0 | 1050 | $62.38 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ |  |  |  | 260 | $75.00 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ | 140 | 84 | 0 | 224 | $62.50 \%$ |

Table 2.19. Number of staff and students by count of records (STEMM - SMPCS) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Other | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 | 25 | 22 | 0 | 47 | $53.19 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 76 | 182 | 0 | 258 | $29.46 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 276 | 676 | 0 | 952 | $28.99 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ | 40 | 56 | 0 | 96 | $41.67 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ |  |  |  |  | $38.32 \%$ |

Table 2.20. Number of staff and students by count of records (STEMM - SPCLS) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Other | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 |  |  |  |  | $86.67 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 90 | 45 | 0 | 135 | $66.67 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 793 | 98 | 0 | 891 | $89.00 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ |  |  |  |  | $81.74 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ | 78 | 34 | 0 | 112 | $69.64 \%$ |

Table 2.21. Number of staff and students by count of records (STEMM - SBE) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 |  |  |  | $83.33 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 26 | 43 | 69 | $37.68 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 132 | 366 | 498 | $26.51 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ | 58 | 101 | 159 | $36.48 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ | 26 | 44 | 70 | $37.14 \%$ |

Table 2.22. Number of staff and students by count of records (STEMM - SBS) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Other | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 |  |  |  |  | $88.00 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 35 | 55 | 0 | 90 | $38.89 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 568 | 344 | 0 | 912 | $62.28 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ |  |  |  |  | $61.90 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ | 90 | 90 | 0 | 180 | $50.00 \%$ |

Table 2.23. Number of staff and students by count of records (AHSSBL - SACD) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Other | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 |  |  |  |  | $65.22 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 85 | 55 | 0 | 140 | $60.71 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 464 | 171 | 0 | 635 | $73.07 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ | 28 | 20 | 0 | 48 | $58.33 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ | 53 | 37 | 0 | 90 | $58.89 \%$ |

Table 2.24. Number of staff and students by count of records (AHSSBL - IoE) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 |  |  |  | $88.89 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 129 | 63 | 192 | $67.19 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 346 | 36 | 382 | $90.58 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ | 391 | 124 | 515 | $75.92 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ | 111 | 55 | 166 | $66.87 \%$ |

Table 2.25. Number of staff and students by count of records (AHSSBL - HBS) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Other | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 | 176 | 63 | 0 | 239 | $73.64 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 129 | 173 | 0 | 302 | $42.72 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 987 | 1208 | 0 | 2195 | $44.97 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ |  |  |  |  | $49.54 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ | 108 | 172 | 0 | 280 | $38.57 \%$ |

Table 2.26. Number of staff and students by count of records (AHSSBL - HUM) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Other | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 |  |  |  |  | $45.45 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 71 | 53 | 0 | 124 | $57.26 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ |  |  |  |  | $54.15 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ | 29 | 20 | 0 | 49 | $59.18 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ | 50 | 37 | 0 | 87 | $57.47 \%$ |

Table 2.27. Number of staff and students by count of records (AHSSBL - ISLI) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 |  |  |  | $76.00 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 82 | 28 | 110 | $74.55 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 258 | 146 | 404 | $63.86 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |

Table 2.28. Number of staff and students by count of records (AHSSBL - LAW) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 |  |  |  | $85.71 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 45 | 42 | 87 | $51.72 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 500 | 288 | 788 | $63.45 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ | 80 | 59 | 139 | $57.55 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ |  |  |  | $53.33 \%$ |

Table 2.29. Number of staff and students by count of records (AHSSBL - SLL) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Other | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 |  |  |  |  | $65.00 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 83 | 55 | 0 | 138 | $60.14 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 781 | 241 | 0 | 1022 | $76.42 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ |  |  |  |  | $80.60 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ |  |  |  |  | $67.71 \%$ |

Table 2.30. Number of staff and students by count of records (AHSSBL - SPEIR) [Source: Trent, HESA and HOP returns]

| Type | Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| P\&S Staff | 2019 |  |  |  | $57.14 \%$ |
| A\&R staff | 2019 | 36 | 47 | 83 | $43.37 \%$ |
| UG students | $2017 / 8$ | 224 | 442 | 666 | $33.63 \%$ |
| PGT students | $2017 / 8$ | 40 | 35 | 75 | $53.33 \%$ |
| PGR students | $2017 / 8$ | 31 | 37 | 68 | $45.59 \%$ |

## 3. THE SELF-ASSESSSMENT PROCESS-

Recommended word count: Bronze: 1000 words | Silver: 1000 words ( 920 words, total of (i)-(iii))
Describe the self-assessment process. This should include:
(i) a description of the self-assessment team

The SAT was formed through all-staff call for expressions of interest, November 2018, making clear SATmembership recognised in local workload models. This call was followed by invitations to ensure a SAT balanced across A\&R/P\&S, with at least $30 \%$ of either gender, and with representation from existing Athena Implementation Team (AIT) that the SAT replaced. The membership ( $33.3 \% \mathrm{M}, 66.7 \% \mathrm{~F}, 23.8 \%$ BAME, $38.1 \% \mathrm{P} \& \mathrm{~S}$, 42.9\% A\&R, $9.5 \%$ student representatives, Table 3.1) includes staff at all levels G5-G9 plus VC, with staff on fixedterm and open-ended contracts, and working PT at G5 up to G9/LG, and ages from early 20 s through to 60. Members of the SAT have experience of flexible working, family leave, job-shares, promotion, and are at various stages of caring responsibilities for children and/or parents.

The SAT was originally co-chaired by the job-share Deans D\&I. More recently, in keeping with the welcome focus on P\&S staff in AS at Silver level, the SAT has been co-chaired by one Dean D\&I and a P\&S member of the LG, Dr Karen Henderson, Director of Technical Services: throughout the Co-Chairs were 1M, 1F.


Fig 3.1. Some of our Athena SWAN SAT at their meeting on 1/4/19.

Table 3.1. Membership of the SAT

| Name | Gender <br> (B) <br> where <br> BAME) | Staff Family, Part-Time (PT)/Full-Time (FT), FixedTerm (FXT), Open-Ended (OE), Campus | Roles at the University | School/Function | Role on the SAT | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yasmin Ahmed | F, B | P\&S, FT, OE, Whiteknights | Diversity and Inclusion Advisor | HR | D\&I Expertise, Part of SAT Core Team and ASPSG. <br> Was part of AIT. | Has Co-Led on our annual Stonewall Workplace Equality Index Submission, and co-author of our Trans and Gender Identity Guidelines. |
| Simon ChandlerWilde | M | A\&R, FT, OE, Whiteknights | Dean for Diversity and Inclusion (Job-Share until 31/7/19), Professor of Applied Mathematics | VC's Office \& SMPCS | Co-Chair, part of SAT Core Team. Lead on final drafting. Part of equal pay/gender pay gap working group. <br> Was Co-chair of AIT. | Co-Chair of the Athena Implementation Team 2016-2018. |
| Ben Cosh | M | A\&R, FT, OE, Whiteknights | Head of School of Mathematical, Physical and Computational Sciences | SMPCS | Academic representative of Senior Leadership Group | Was part of Athena SWAN SAT in SMPCS for successful Silver Athena SWAN renewal 2017. |
| Maddi Davies | F | A\&R, FT, OE, Whiteknights | Associate Professor of Women's Writing | School of Literature and Languages | Mid-Career Academic, led Harassment and Bullying Survey/Interviews | Career-long focus on feminist theory, issues of equality. Particular interest in progression, harassment and bullying within HE. |
| Steve George | M | A\&R, FT, FXT, Whiteknights | Research Scientist on Climate and High Impact Weather | NERC National Centre for Atmospheric Science, SMPCS | Early Career Research Representative | Chair of University of Reading Research Staff Committee |
| Rachel Greenwood | F | P\&S, PT, OE, Whiteknights | Senior Support Officer, Student Information Systems | Student Services | Led focus groups on flexible working, part of ASPSG. | Joined UoR last year Keen to encourage flexible working |


| Rebecca Harris | F | A\&R, FT, OE, London Road | Professor of History <br> Education, School <br> Director of Teaching and Learning | Institute of Education | Representative of LGBT+ Network (trans representative on their committee) | Research interests include LGBT+ issues, especially in secondary schools. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nathan Helsby | M | P\&S, FT, OE, Whiteknights | Head of Planning and Reporting | Planning and Support Office | Co-led work on inclusivity and university committees, part of ASPSG, equal pay group. |  |
| Karen Henderson | F | P\&S, FT, OE, Whiteknights | Director of Technical Services | Technical Services | Co-Chair since 1/8/1, Convenor of the Athena SWAN Professional Services Subgroup (ASPSG), led Family Leave and Career Development Focus Groups. | Now Head of one of the P\&S Functions and has previously worked as Research Staff in academia and industry. |
| Ellie Highwood | F | A\&R, PT, OE, Whiteknights | Dean for Diversity and Inclusion (until 31/7/19, as job-share), Professor of Climate Physics | VC's Office \& SMPCS | Co-Chair until 31/7/19. Led survey on academic promotions processes. <br> Was Co-chair of AIT. | Has worked part-time and in job-share, including as Head of Department and Dean for D\&I. |
| Joanna John | F, B | P\&S, PT, OE, Whiteknights | Joint Head of Doctoral Skills Training and Development | Graduate School | Led section on flexible working. Part of equal pay/gender pay gap working group, and ASPSG. <br> Was in AIT. | Part of RE-ACT. <br> Completed PhD part-time alongside maternity/ 0.8FTE post, interested in ethnicity/socioeconomic status intersectionality, international development background |
| Carol McAnally | F | P\&S, FT, OE, Whiteknights | Senior Business Relationship Manager, <br> Knowledge Transfer Centre | Commercial | Co-led work on inclusivity and university committees. Part of ASPSG. | Full-time working parent |


| Sinead O'Flynn | F | P\&S, PT, OE, Whiteknights | Executive Assistant | VC's Office | Secretary to the SAT, <br> contributed to Culture, <br> Role Model sections. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Patricia Riddell | F |  | A\&R, PT, OE, Whiteknights |  |  |

(ii) an account of the self-assessment process ( 363 words)

The SAT met as per Table 3.2, communicating in between meetings through subgroup meetings, email, and our SAT Microsoft Teams.

Table 3.2. SAT Meetings through 2019

| Date of SAT Meeting | Main Agenda Items |
| :---: | :---: |
| 14 January | - Athena SWAN process <br> - Why are each of us here? <br> - Planning engagement with the University <br> - Evidencing impact |
| 14 February | - Proposal to set up Athena SWAN Professional Services (Sub)group of SAT (ASPSG) <br> - Data and implications for what focus groups we run |
| 1 April | - Report from the ASPSG <br> - Report from smaller subgroups on progress so far |
| 4 June | - Report from the ASPSG <br> - Report on work on harassment and bullying <br> - Updates on focus group work and other work of subgroups <br> - Plan for distributing writing the submission <br> - Update on evidencing impacts |
| 9 July | - Work on Action Plan, including best practice action coming out of DICOP and coming out of data and focus group work |
| 3 September | - Structured discussion of draft action plan |
| 8 October | - Feedback on draft of self-assessment document |

The SAT had available to it much work done by the Athena Implementation Team and other groups supporting Athena SWAN work since our last submission (see Table 3.3 and Fig 2.2).

In particular, the Dean D\&I and other AIT members supported the development, jointly with external partner Capita, of the 2017 Staff Survey (and the 2018 update Pulse Staff Survey). The 2017 survey, executed by Capita with our support, attracted 2673 responses, a response rate of $64 \%$ across all staff ( $69 \%$ excluding sessional staff). The responses broke down by gender as $51 \% \mathrm{~F}, 35 \% \mathrm{M}, 14 \%$ No response/prefer not to say, compared to $58 \% \mathrm{~F}$, $42 \% \mathrm{M}$ in the staff population in 2017, Table 2.3. The full results from the Staff Survey were made available to all staff, with University-level and individual School/Function-level reports downloadable from our Staff Portal. Additionally, the VC gave presentations/Q\&A on the results, open to all staff, in June 2017. Also made available to all staff and discussed in the AIT and the D\&IAB, was a comprehensive D\&I analysis of the results. This presented all statistically-significant differences by protected characteristics (there were none by gender).

## Impact from AP2016

AP2016:B4

Table 3.3. Committees involved in assessment and oversight of D\&I including Athena SWAN status (and see Fig 2.2 for their inter-relation).

| Name | Role | Membership |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Board (D\&IAB) | - Strategic oversight of D\&I <br> - Oversight targets and action plans <br> - Oversight progress against targets | - PVC Research and Innovation (Chair) <br> - Dean for Diversity and Inclusion <br> - Director of Human Resources, Asst Dir HR, D\&I Advisor HR <br> - Diversity Officer Students' Union <br> - Dean of PGR Studies, a T\&L Dean, a Research Dean <br> - Chair/Co-Chair of network groups: Women@ Reading, Racial Equity and Cultural Diversity Group, LGBT+ Staff Network, Staff Disability Network, Parent and Family Network <br> - Representatives of Staff Forum, UCU <br> - Director of Student Services <br> - Three Representatives of P\&S Functions <br> - A Head of School |
| Athena SWAN <br> Implementation Team (AIT) | - Met termly 2016 to end 2018 to monitor and drive progress against the 2016 AS Action Plan | - Members of the current SAT |
| Diversity and Inclusion Community of Practice (DICOP) | - Meets termly to share good practice, support School level Athena SWAN applications | - Dean for D\&I <br> - D\&I Advisor HR <br> - D\&l leads across Schools/Functions <br> - Local Athena SWAN leads |
| Athena SWAN Professional Services Group (ASPSG) | - Subgroup of SAT <br> - Met fortnightly through to August 2019 <br> - Focus engagement and consultation with P\&S colleagues in Functions | - D\&I Leads from 4 P\&S Functions <br> - 10 representatives of other P\&S Functions |

Table 3.4 shows staff survey results relating specifically to gender, which were positive (indeed Equality and Diversity highlighted in the main report as a strength across all staff groups, Fig 3.2). We make reference to relevant staff survey results (including the smaller 2018 Pulse update) throughout.

Table 3.4 Staff Survey 2017 results relating to gender

| Question | Agree \% |
| :--- | :--- |
| The University of Reading respects people equally regardless of their gender | $92 \%$ |
| In the last 12 months I have not been made to feel uncomfortable whilst working at the University <br> because of my race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, pregnancy/maternity/paternity/disability or <br> age by a student | $96 \%$ |
| I feel the University of Reading acts fairly regardless of race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, <br> pregnancy/maternity/paternity/disability or age with regard to recruitment | $94 \%$ |
| In the last 12 months I have not been made to feel uncomfortable whilst working at the University <br> because of my race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, pregnancy/maternity/paternity/disability or <br> age by a member of staff | $90 \%$ |
| I feel the University of Reading acts fairly regardless of race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, <br> pregnancy/maternity/paternity/disability or age with regard to career progression | $82 \%$ |

Most positive perceptions by Job Group


Fig 3.2. Slide from 2017 Capita presentation to Leadership Group high-lighting most positive results.

Internal consultation carried out by the SAT included focus groups, one-to-one interviews, surveys (Table 3.5), advertising these via all-staff comms routes (e.g. Staff Portal screenshots below). Additionally, we surveyed Heads of Schools/Functions and DICOP to get feedback/proposals on actions (e.g. from local good practice). Finally, we sought feedback on draft action plans (Table 3.6).

External consultation included: good-practice sharing through regular meetings of: London West Athena SWAN Regional Network (including at UoR); Network of Equality, Diversity \& Inclusion Academic Leads (NEDIAL). Rob Bell, Athena SWAN Coordinator at Imperial, acted as critical friend providing feedback on draft.

Table 3.5. Consultations run by the SAT (after formal Focus Group training by PD in HR).

| Consultation type | Subject | Participation (F/M split where known) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Focus groups (2) | Flexible working | 25 |
| Focus groups (2), plus some 1.2.1 | Family leave | 23 (17F:6M) |
| Focus groups (2) | Career development | 18 (12F:6M) |
| Staff survey | Career development | 178 (121F:53M:4 Not known) |
| Focus group with committee secretaries | Inclusivity in committees | 8 (6F:2M) |
| 1.2.1 interviews | Harassment \& bullying | 20 (16F:4M) |
| Survey out to all applicants <br> (successful/unsuccessful) over last 3 <br> years | Evaluation of new <br> academic promotion <br> processes | 133 (44\% response rate, 67F:50M:1 Not <br> known) |
| Focus groups with Heads of <br> School/Function (2) | Reward and recognition <br> processes | 6 HoS(3F:3M),17 HoF(11F:6M) |



四Renading $\quad$ Staff portal


Fig 3.3. All-staff messages vis Staff Portal to join focus groups/respond to surveys/etc.

Table 3.6. Formal face-to-face consultations on drafts of action plan

| Date |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 / 7 / 19$ | UEB |
| $8 / 10 / 19$ | Staffing Committee |
| $9 / 10 / 19$ | D\&IAB (includes representation from all network groups + staff forum/UCU) |
| $4 / 11 / 19$ | DICOP |
| $11 / 11 / 19$ | UEB |

(iii) plans for the future of the self-assessment team (377 words)

A new team, the Athena SWAN Implementation group (ASIG), will be convened in January 2020 to oversee implementation of the Athena SWAN Action Plan, and keep it under review. This will meet termly and report into D\&IAB, and through D\&IAB to UEB (Fig 2.2).

ASIG will be chaired jointly by Dean D\&I and Dr Karen Henderson, current SAT Co-Chair, ensuring M/F and A\&R/P\&S leadership. Membership of ASIG will include small group of current SAT members, including VC as UEB Gender Champion, to ensure continuity in driving forwards Action Plan. Additionally, we will make an open call, as done for the SAT, making clear that membership of ASIG is recognised in workload models, this supplemented with direct invitations as needed to ensure balance in ASIG composition. We will send out annual reminders to HoS/HoF regarding their ASIG members, to ensure ASIG membership continues to be captured in workload models.

ASIG membership will be reviewed annually to ensure diversity and succession planning and refreshed with at least one member each year. Members of ASIG will carry out proportionate consultation and engagement with staff year-on-year to assess effectiveness of progress. They will engage with RE-ACT to further intersectionality work and will support the development of updates to the next Staff Survey in the assessment period. In addition, members of ASIG will support the Dean D\&I in engaging externally and incorporating good practice into our culture.

The ASPSG has worked well as a subgroup of SAT. We will continue to convene this group termly, to share good practice across the Functions.

We will provide annual updates from ASIG on progress against the Action Plan to D\&IAB, these summarised in allstaff comms and in our D\&I Annual Reports published 31 Jan.

Encouragement for Schools to maintain progress in applying for local Athena SWAN awards, and sharing of good practice, will remain responsibility of the Dean D\&I plus DICOP. But, to support this work, and link institutional and school-level Athena SWAN, members of the SAT will join DICOP and/or ASPSG to provide cohesion in cascading awareness of institutional actions and progress to Schools/Functions. Particularly this will support those AHSSBL Schools in the earlier stages of Athena SWAN work.

In January 2023 a new SAT will be convened following a call across the University.

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 A2.1 | Form new Athena SWAN implementation group (ASIG) to drive actions and ensure <br> that this continues to be representative of Schools/Functions, with at least 30\% <br> male/female, representative of career stages, PT/FT, variety of work-life balance, <br> caring responsibilities. |
| AP2019 A2.2 | Formalise Athena Swan Professional Services (Sub)Group of SAT (ASPSG) as <br> ongoing group that progresses P\&S actions and feeds in to DICOP and ASIG |
| AP2019 A2.3 | Both Co-Chairs of ASIG to join D\&IAB |
| AP2019 A2.4 | ASIG to engage with internal equality and diversity networks throughout <br> implementation stage, including through D\&IAB |
| AP2019 A2.5 | ASIG to engage externally throughout implementation stage, including through <br> London West Athena SWAN Regional Network and Network of Equality, Diversity <br> \& Inclusion Academic Leads. |

## 4. A PICTURE OF THE INSTITUTION

Recommended word count: Bronze: 2000 words | Silver: 3000 words

Internal census dates/periods as Table ND1 above.
4.1. Academic and research staff data ( 2052 words, total of (i)-(v))
(i) Academic and research staff by grade and gender (611 words)

Look at the career pipeline across the whole institution and between STEMM and AHSSBL subjects. Comment on and explain any differences between women and men, and any differences between STEMM and AHSSBL subjects. Identify any issues in the pipeline at particular grades/levels.

Career pipeline for the whole university is shown in Table 4.1.1/Fig 4.1.1, by headcount (and FTE in the last column).
Grade 6 staff are mainly ( $92.4 \%$ in 2019) postdoctoral research staff (see $\S 4.1$ (iii) detail). Grade 7 and Grade 8 staff are, respectively, Lecturers and Associate Professors plus a very small number of staff termed Research Grade 7/8 (with identical status and promotion routes). Grade 9 academic staff are Professors (except for one Grade 9 HoS as at 2019). We have small FTE numbers as sessional staff or "Other" (which means grade not clear/miscellaneous in Trent).

Fig 4.1.1 shows good G6-8 gender balance, and significant progress in \%F professors since our last AS submission. This is mainly an impact of substantial work on our promotions processes (see §5.1(iii)); effects of recruitment (§5.1(i)) and leavers ( $\S 4.1$ (iv)) are relatively smaller. We continue to be substantially above sector norms for \%F professors, Table 2.10.

Table 4.1.1. Academic and research staff by grade (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Year | Female count | Male count | Total count | Female \% | Total FTE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4-5 | 2016 |  |  |  | 66.7\% |  |
| Grade 4-5 | 2017 |  |  |  | 50.0\% |  |
| Grade 4-5 | 2018 |  |  |  | 75.0\% |  |
| Grade 4-5 | 2019 |  |  |  | 100\% |  |
| Grade 6 (mainly research staff) | 2016 | 135 | 148 | 283 | 47.7\% | 257.9 |
| Grade 6 (mainly research staff) | 2017 | 165 | 148 | 313 | 52.7\% | 277.8 |
| Grade 6 (mainly research staff) | 2018 | 176 | 146 | 322 | 54.7\% | 287.8 |
| Grade 6 (mainly research staff) | 2019 | 157 | 158 | 315 | 49.8\% | 285.7 |
| Grade 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | 2016 | 213 | 197 | 411 | 52.2\% | 367.6 |
| Grade 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | 2017 | 227 | 206 | 433 | 52.4\% | 382.0 |
| Grade 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | 2018 | 226 | 201 | 427 | 52.9\% | 379.9 |
| Grade 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | 2019 | 229 | 189 | 418 | 54.8\% | 366.8 |
| Grade 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | 2016 | 139 | 146 | 284 | 48.9\% | 271.0 |
| Grade 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | 2017 | 157 | 149 | 306 | 51.3\% | 287.6 |
| Grade 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | 2018 | 155 | 147 | 302 | 51.3\% | 280.8 |
| Grade 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | 2019 | 149 | 158 | 307 | 48.5\% | 289.7 |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2016 | 86 | 193 | 279 | 30.8\% | 243.1 |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2017 | 97 | 205 | 302 | 32.1\% | 258.1 |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2018 | 96 | 204 | 300 | 32.0\% | 258.1 |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2019 | 114 | 212 | 326 | 35.0\% | 280.0 |
| Sessionals | 2016 | 283 | 260 | 543 | 52.1\% | 28.9 |
| Sessionals | 2017 | 309 | 229 | 538 | 57.4\% | 24.6 |
| Sessionals | 2018 | 362 | 270 | 632 | 57.3\% | 29.0 |
| Sessionals | 2019 | 414 | 322 | 736 | 56.3\% | 27.6 |
| Other | 2016 |  |  |  | 43.8\% | 32.9 |
| Other | 2017 |  |  |  | 44.4\% | 26.7 |
| Other | 2018 |  |  |  | 44.4\% | 29.5 |
| Other | 2019 |  |  |  | 53.7\% | 25.1 |
| Total | 2016 | 890 | 986 | 1876 | 47.5\% | 1189.4 |
| Total | 2017 | 980 | 968 | 1948 | 50.3\% | 1257.8 |
| Total | 2018 | 1042 | 999 | 2041 | 51.1\% | 1269.1 |
| Total | 2019 | 1086 | 1058 | 2144 | 50.7\% | 1275.1 |

Fig. 4.1.1. Academic and research staff by gender and grade (whole University) [Source: Trent]


Tables/Figs 4.1.2-4.1.3 show STEMM/AHSSBL splits.
STEMM: excellent G6 gender-balance and increased to $47 \%$ G7 since last AS submission. At AP/G8 fall by 2.1p.p. in F\% since 2016, driven by promotion effects: in 2016/17 and 2017/18 60\% of the 30 AP-Prof promotions were female, but only $38 \%$ of the 39 Lecturer-AP promotions (Tables 5.1.16,17). But the AP-Prof promotions have led to marked increase in \%F at Professor, and we are substantially above sector norms (Table 2.11).

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 H1.1 | Local STEMM Athena SWAN SATs to remind their HoS and local promotion committee each <br> year in advance of the promotions round of the gender balance at Grades 7-9 over the last 3 <br> years, to bear this in mind when thinking through promotion cases for the coming year. |
| AP2019 B1.1 | Building on existing Athena SWAN dashboards available to Athena SWAN SAT teams, publish <br> annually for each school (where there at least 5 in each sub-category to avoid identifying <br> individual staff): <br> i) $\quad \%$ of academic staff who are M/F, who are BAME/White; <br> ii) \% at Grades 6-9 who are M/F, BAME/White; <br> iii) comparison data for sector. |
| AP2019 B1.2 | In advance of annual Five-Year Planning round, make available to Heads of Schools/Functions <br> (where headcount is sufficiently large) local pay gap data (including for gender and race), <br> together with guidance on actions that are being taken at University level to reduce pay gaps, <br> and advice on potential actions at local level to increase F and BAME staff representation and <br> reduce pay gaps. |
| AP2019 A1.5 | Ask Schools/Functions to articulate in Five Year Plans what actions they are taking to support <br> progress against University D\&I targets. |

Table 4.1.2. Academic and research staff by gender and grade (STEMM) [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Year | Female count | Male count | Total count | Female \% | Total FTE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4-5 | 2016 |  |  |  | 66.7\% |  |
| Grade 4-5 | 2017 |  |  |  | 100.0\% |  |
| Grade 4-5 | 2018 |  |  |  | 75.0\% |  |
| Grade 4-5 | 2019 |  |  |  | 100.0\% |  |
| Grade 6 (mainly research staff) | 2016 | 119 | 136 | 255 | 46.7\% | 233.5 |
| Grade 6 (mainly research staff) | 2017 | 140 | 137 | 277 | 50.5\% | 250.2 |
| Grade 6 (mainly research staff) | 2018 | 145 | 137 | 282 | 51.4\% | 256.6 |
| Grade 6 (mainly research staff) | 2019 | 132 | 146 | 278 | 47.5\% | 254.9 |
| Grade 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | 2016 | 77 | 117 | 194 | 39.7\% | 178.1 |
| Grade 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | 2017 | 90 | 115 | 205 | 43.9\% | 187.5 |
| Grade 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | 2018 | 93 | 112 | 205 | 45.4\% | 190.1 |
| Grade 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | 2019 | 89 | 102 | 191 | 46.6\% | 174.4 |
| Grade 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | 2016 | 56 | 84 | 140 | 40.0\% | 134.4 |
| Grade 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | 2017 | 66 | 85 | 151 | 43.7\% | 143.0 |
| Grade 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | 2018 | 67 | 87 | 154 | 43.5\% | 144.9 |
| Grade 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | 2019 | 58 | 95 | 153 | 37.9\% | 146.5 |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2016 | 33 | 110 | 143 | 23.1\% | 125.0 |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2017 | 40 | 123 | 163 | 24.5\% | 141.8 |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2018 | 40 | 119 | 159 | 25.2\% | 139.9 |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2019 | 51 | 125 | 176 | 29.0\% | 153.3 |
| Sessionals | 2016 | 31 | 48 | 79 | 39.2\% | 8.4 |
| Sessionals | 2017 | 47 | 53 | 100 | 47.0\% | 6.0 |
| Sessionals | 2018 | 55 | 53 | 108 | 50.9\% | 5.6 |
| Sessionals | 2019 | 50 | 44 | 94 | 53.2\% | 3.1 |
| Other | 2016 |  |  |  | 41.9\% |  |
| Other | 2017 |  |  |  | 44.7\% |  |
| Other | 2018 |  |  |  | 46.3\% |  |
| Other | 2019 |  |  |  | 63.3\% |  |
| Total | 2016 | 336 | 521 | 857 | 39.2\% | 706.8 |
| Total | 2017 | 401 | 534 | 935 | 42.89\% | 751.5 |
| Total | 2018 | 422 | 531 | 953 | 44.28\% | 765.9 |
| Total | 2019 | 400 | 523 | 923 | 43.34\% | 755.5 |

Fig 4.1.2. Academic and research staff by gender and grade (STEMM) [Source: Trent]


Fig 4.1.3. Academic and research staff by gender and grade (AHSSBL) [Source: Trent]


Table 4.1.3. Academic and research staff by grade (AHSSBL), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Year | Female count | Male count | Total count | Female \% | Total FTE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-5 | 2016 |  |  |  | N/A |  |
| 4-5 | 2017 |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |
| 4-5 | 2018 |  |  |  | N/A |  |
| 4-5 | 2019 |  |  |  | N/A |  |
| 6 (mainly research staff) | 2016 |  |  |  | 57.7\% |  |
| 6 (mainly research staff) | 2017 |  |  |  | 69.4\% |  |
| 6 (mainly research staff) | 2018 |  |  |  | 77.5\% |  |
| 6 (mainly research staff) | 2019 |  |  |  | 66.7\% |  |
| 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | 2016 | 135 | 80 | 215 | 62.8\% | 188.5 |
| 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | 2017 | 136 | 90 | 226 | 60.2\% | 193.4 |
| 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | 2018 | 132 | 88 | 220 | 60.0\% | 188.8 |
| 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | 2019 | 140 | 86 | 226 | 61.9\% | 191.5 |
| 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | 2016 | 81 | 61 | 142 | 57.0\% | 134.8 |
| 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | 2017 | 88 | 63 | 151 | 58.3\% | 142.7 |
| 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | 2018 | 85 | 59 | 144 | 59.0\% | 134.0 |
| 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | 2019 | 90 | 63 | 153 | 58.8\% | 142.2 |
| 9 and Professors | 2016 | 46 | 72 | 118 | 39.0\% | 102.8 |
| 9 and Professors | 2017 | 49 | 73 | 122 | 40.2\% | 101.5 |
| 9 and Professors | 2018 | 49 | 77 | 126 | 38.9\% | 104.8 |
| 9 and Professors | 2019 | 53 | 78 | 131 | 40.5\% | 110.1 |
| Sessionals | 2016 | 240 | 202 | 442 | 54.3\% | 20.3 |
| Sessionals | 2017 | 242 | 166 | 408 | 59.3\% | 18.5 |
| Sessionals | 2018 | 289 | 208 | 497 | 58.1\% | 23.2 |
| Sessionals | 2019 | 352 | 268 | 620 | 56.8\% | 24.3 |
| Other | 2016 |  |  |  | 48.3\% |  |
| Other | 2017 |  |  |  | 43.8\% |  |
| Other | 2018 |  |  |  | 38.5\% |  |
| Other | 2019 |  |  |  | 27.3\% |  |
| Total | 2016 | 531 | 441 | 972 | 54.6\% | 477.1 |
| Total | 2017 | 547 | 413 | 960 | 57.0\% | 488.3 |
| Total | 2018 | 591 | 449 | 1040 | 56.8\% | 486.7 |
| Total | 2019 | 662 | 516 | 1178 | 56.2\% | 499.8 |

AHBBSL: G6 numbers (97\% researchers at 2019) are small and 66.7\%F female at 2019 (above the F\% for PGR study, Tables 2.22-2.29). Evidence of leaky pipeline for women, and little change in \%F since 2016 at G7-9. Between $2015 / 16$ and $2018 / 19$, the $(2016 / 17,2017 / 18)$ Professor promotions were $83 \%$ F, adding 10 women professors (Table 5.1.21), but this offset by effects of recruitment (20\%F in 10 appointments, Table 5.1.12) and leavers (58\%F in 19 leavers, Table 4.1.32), so net increase a modest 1.5 p.p. in \%F professors. We expect larger \%F increases by next $3 / 1 / 2020$ census date at both AP and P level, due to the large female promotion numbers in 2019 (Tables 5.1.20,21). Even without this additional impact our \%F professors in AHSSBL exceeds sector by >10p.p. percentage points (Table 2.12).

## New actions

AP2019 B2.1
Explore, through local Athena SWAN SATs in AHSSBL schools, the existence of leaky pipelines (in particular for men) from PGR to postdoc in AHSSBL schools, and the reasons behind these, with a view to remedial action.

Tables 4.1.5-4.1.7 are UoR/Sector comparisons using HESA salary bands ${ }^{1}$ (see Table 4.1.4). For the whole University/STEMM/AHBBSL we are well above sector \%F in all salary ranges.

Table 4.1.4. HESA Salary ranges (for 2017/18) compared to UoR salary structure (at 1/8/19).

| HESA Contract Salary Ranges |  | University of Reading Salary Bands |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Range 1 |  |  | Grade 1 |
|  |  | Grade 2 | $£ 16,420$ |
| Range 2 |  | Grade 3 | $£ 17,682-£ 19,612$ |
|  |  | Grade 4 | $£ 20,130-£ 24,461$ |
| Range 3 | $£ 24,983-£ 33,517$ | Grade 5 | $£ 25,217-£ 30,048$ |
| Range 4 | $£ 33,518-£ 44,991$ | Grade 6 | $£ 30,942-£ 40,322$ |
| Range 5 | $£ 44,992-£ 60,409$ | Grade 7 (Lecturer) | $£ 41,526-£ 51,034$ |
|  |  | Grade 8 (AP) | $£ 52,560-£ 59,135$ |
| Range 6 | $£ 60,410-$ | Grade 9 (Prof) | $£ 60,905-$ |

Table 4.1.5. Sector Data - Proportion of academic staff within each salary range who are female (whole University), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Salary range $^{\mathbf{1}}$ | Year | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Female \% | FPE | Female \% |
| Contract salary range 3 | $2015 / 16$ | $56.0 \%$ | 180 | $51.4 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 3 | $2016 / 17$ | $52.8 \%$ | 205 | $52.4 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 3 | $2017 / 18$ | $58.0 \%$ | 225 | $51.1 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 4 | $2015 / 16$ | $52.8 \%$ | 400 | $50.4 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 4 | $2016 / 17$ | $55.2 \%$ | 375 | $50.5 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 4 | $2017 / 18$ | $57.7 \%$ | 435 | $50.7 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 5 | $2015 / 16$ | $49.5 \%$ | 725 | $45.7 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 5 | $2016 / 17$ | $50.1 \%$ | 720 | $45.9 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 5 | $2017 / 18$ | $51.5 \%$ | 750 | $46.1 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 6 | $2015 / 16$ | $32.4 \%$ | 370 | $28.8 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 6 | $2016 / 17$ | $32.3 \%$ | 385 | $29.5 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 6 | $2017 / 18$ | $33.8 \%$ | 380 | $30.3 \%$ |

[^0]Table 4.1.6. Sector Data - Proportion of academic staff within each salary range who are female (STEMM), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Salary range | Year | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Female \% | FPE | Female \% |
| Contract salary range 3 | $2015 / 16$ | $54.4 \%$ | 135 | $42.7 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 3 | $2016 / 17$ | $50.7 \%$ | 160 | $45.0 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 3 | $2017 / 18$ | $54.3 \%$ | 170 | $43.4 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 4 | $2015 / 16$ | $44.7 \%$ | 245 | $41.8 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 4 | $2016 / 17$ | $49.8 \%$ | 215 | $42.0 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 4 | $2017 / 18$ | $53.7 \%$ | 255 | $42.3 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 5 | $2015 / 16$ | $36.6 \%$ | 295 | $33.1 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 5 | $2016 / 17$ | $39.4 \%$ | 305 | $33.9 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 5 | $2017 / 18$ | $41.9 \%$ | 315 | $34.3 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 6 | $2015 / 16$ | $24.7 \%$ | 175 | $19.3 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 6 | $2016 / 17$ | $24.2 \%$ | 180 | $20.4 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 6 | $2017 / 18$ | $27.7 \%$ | 195 | $20.8 \%$ |

Table 4.1.7. Sector Data - Proportion of academic staff within each salary range who are female (AHSSBL), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Salary range | Year | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Female \% | FPE | Female \% |
| Contract salary range 3 | $2015 / 16$ | $62.1 \%$ | 45 | $56.7 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 3 | $2016 / 17$ | $60.1 \%$ | 40 | $56.1 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 3 | $2017 / 18$ | $69.0 \%$ | 55 | $55.5 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 4 | $2015 / 16$ | $65.3 \%$ | 155 | $54.7 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 4 | $2016 / 17$ | $61.9 \%$ | 160 | $54.7 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 4 | $2017 / 18$ | $63.6 \%$ | 180 | $55.1 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 5 | $2015 / 16$ | $58.4 \%$ | 425 | $49.0 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 5 | $2016 / 17$ | $57.9 \%$ | 415 | $49.2 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 5 | $2017 / 18$ | $58.3 \%$ | 435 | $49.3 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 6 | $2015 / 16$ | $39.3 \%$ | 180 | $32.9 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 6 | $2016 / 17$ | $39.4 \%$ | 190 | $33.3 \%$ |
| Contract salary range 6 | $2017 / 18$ | $39.6 \%$ | 170 | $34.3 \%$ |

Intersectionality with Ethnicity
Table 4.1.8. Academic staff in 2016 (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Sex | BAME |  | White |  | Unknown |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% |
| 4-5 | F |  | 0.0\% |  | 50.0\% |  | 50.0\% |
| 4-5 | M |  | 100.0\% |  | 0.0\% |  | 0.0\% |
| 6 (mainly research staff) | F |  | 16.3\% |  | 79.3\% |  | 4.4\% |
| 6 (mainly research staff) | M |  | 18.2\% |  | 68.9\% |  | 12.8\% |
| 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | F |  | 16.9\% |  | 79.3\% |  | 3.8\% |
| 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | M |  | 14.7\% |  | 74.6\% |  | 10.7\% |
| 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | F |  | 15.8\% |  | 82.7\% |  | 1.4\% |
| 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | M |  | 6.8\% |  | 89.0\% |  | 4.1\% |
| 9 and Professors | F |  | 9.3\% |  | 83.7\% |  | 7.0\% |
| 9 and Professors | M |  | 7.3\% |  | 83.4\% |  | 9.3\% |
| Sessionals | F |  | 14.5\% |  | 74.9\% |  | 10.6\% |
| Sessionals | M |  | 9.6\% |  | 76.2\% |  | 14.2\% |
| Other | F |  | 0.0\% |  | 87.5\% |  | 12.5\% |
| Other | M |  | 7.3\% |  | 61.0\% |  | 31.7\% |
| Total | $F$ | 129 | 14.5\% | 704 | 79.1\% | 57 | 6.4\% |
| Total | M | 109 | 11.1\% | 763 | 77.4\% | 114 | 11.6\% |

Table 4.1.9. Academic and research staff in 2019 (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Sex | BAME |  | White |  | Unknown |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% |
| 4-5 | F |  | 0.0\% |  | 0.0\% |  | 100.0\% |
| 4-5 | M |  | 0.0\% |  | 0.0\% |  | 0.0\% |
| 6 (mainly research staff) | F |  | 19.1\% |  | 65.6\% |  | 15.3\% |
| 6 (mainly research staff) | M |  | 17.1\% |  | 55.7\% |  | 27.2\% |
| 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | F |  | 14.0\% |  | 73.4\% |  | 12.7\% |
| 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | M |  | 19.6\% |  | 65.6\% |  | 14.8\% |
| 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | F |  | 18.1\% |  | 79.2\% |  | 2.7\% |
| 8 (e.g. Associate Professor) | M |  | 4.4\% |  | 86.7\% |  | 8.9\% |
| 9 and Professors | F |  | 7.9\% |  | 86.8\% |  | 5.3\% |
| 9 and Professors | M |  | 8.0\% |  | 80.7\% |  | 11.3\% |
| Sessionals | F |  | 9.2\% |  | 67.6\% |  | 23.2\% |
| Sessionals | M |  | 10.9\% |  | 64.3\% |  | 24.8\% |
| Other | F |  | 27.3\% |  | 45.5\% |  | 27.3\% |
| Other | M |  | 15.8\% |  | 68.4\% |  | 15.8\% |
| Total | F | 142 | 13.1\% | 778 | 71.6\% | 166 | 15.3\% |
| Total | M | 126 | 11.9\% | 740 | 69.9\% | 192 | 18.1\% |

Tables 4.1.8-4.1.9 are Table 4.1.1 data, for 2016, 2019, respectively, showing intersectionality with ethnicity. Figs 4.1.4-4.1.7 show the data for G6-9 that comprise vast majority of the FTE (last column Table 4.1.1).

Fig 4.1.4. Proportions of academic and research staff who are BAME in 2016 (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]


Fig 4.1.5. Proportions of academic and research staff who are BAME in 2019 (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]


Fig 4.1.6. Proportions of academic and research staff who are White in 2016 (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]


Fig 4.1.7. Proportions of academic and research staff who are White in 2019 (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]


The University set D\&I targets at the end of $2015^{2}$, which included 40\%F professors by 2020 and 14\% BAME academic staff on average across G7-9 by 2020, matching the 2011 national census (our 2015 baseline 11\%). As discussed

[^1]above, we are well on the way to the first target, but progress stalled against the 2 nd (Tables 4.1.8-4.1.9 imply 12.2\%BAME across G7-G9 in 2016, 12.3\% in 2019).

The intersectional picture in Tables 4.1.8-4.1.9 is mixed. From 2016 to 2019 F/BAME has fallen at G7, increased G8, fallen G9, while M/BAME has increased G7, fallen G8, increased G9. At the senior G8/G9 only F/BAME at AP exceeds $14 \%$ at 2019, the other figures $\leq 8 \%$. The number of unknown records has increased from 2016 to 2019.

Table 4.1.10 makes sector comparisons using HESA salary bands (Table 4.1.4). This data (by FPE) presents more positive picture of progress than Tables 4.1.8-4.1.9: there have been increases in \%BAME in all salary ranges over the last three years. In the latest year we are above sector averages in ranges 3 and 5, below in 4 and 6 .

Table 4.1.10. Comparison with Sector Data - Proportion of academic and research staff within each salary range who are BAME (whole University), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Salary range | Year | UoR | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | $2015 / 16$ | $20.8 \%$ | $18.1 \%$ |
| 3 | $2016 / 17$ | $21.8 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ |
| 3 | $2017 / 18$ | $22.7 \%$ | $19.1 \%$ |
| 4 | $2015 / 16$ | $13.8 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ |
| 4 | $2016 / 17$ | $12.4 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ |
| 4 | $2017 / 18$ | $14.5 \%$ | $16.8 \%$ |
| 5 | $2015 / 16$ | $10.5 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ |
| 5 | $2016 / 17$ | $12.5 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ |
| 5 | $2017 / 18$ | $13.2 \%$ | $12.4 \%$ |
| 6 | $2015 / 16$ | $8.1 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ |
| 6 | $2016 / 17$ | $8.7 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ |
| 6 | $2017 / 18$ | $8.8 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ |

Tables 4.1.11-4.1.12/Figs 4.1.8-4.1.9 provide more detailed breakdown with respect to ethnicity of data in Tables 4.1.8-4.1.9. Representation at G8/9 levels is particularly low for Black/Mixed ethnicity staff, with no improvement from 2016 to 2019.

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 B3.1 | Push on staff protected characteristics declaration via the sensitive data tab on Employee Self <br> Service within Trent, with a particular emphasis on race, sexual orientation, gender <br> reassignment, where "unknowns" are high. |
| AP2019 H2.1 | Set up a joint project group with the Race Equality Action Plan Team to investigate barriers to <br> progression in increasing BAME staff at grades G7-G9, taking into account intersectional <br> factors including intersectionality with respect to distinct ethnicities, and to determine if <br> existing actions in Themes 4 and 5 of our Race Equality Action Plan 2018-20213 are sufficient. |

[^2]Table 4.1.11. Academic and research staff by grade and ethnicity in 2016 (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Sex | White | Asian | Black | Chinese | Mixed | Other | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-5 | F | 50.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% |
| 4-5 | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 (mainly research staff) | F | 79.3\% | 10.4\% | 2.2\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 0.7\% | 4.4\% |
| 6 (mainly research staff) | M | 68.9\% | 10.1\% | 2.0\% | 4.1\% | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 12.8\% |
| 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | F | 79.3\% | 6.6\% | 0.9\% | 6.1\% | 0.5\% | 2.8\% | 3.8\% |
| 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | M | 74.6\% | 7.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.5\% | 0.5\% | 2.0\% | 10.7\% |
| 8 (e.g. AP) | F | 82.7\% | 4.3\% | 0.0\% | 5.8\% | 2.2\% | 3.6\% | 1.4\% |
| 8 (e.g. AP) | M | 89.0\% | 2.1\% | 0.7\% | 2.7\% | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 4.1\% |
| 9 and Professors | F | 83.7\% | 2.3\% | 0.0\% | 4.7\% | 0.0\% | 2.3\% | 7.0\% |
| 9 and Professors | M | 83.4\% | 2.1\% | 0.5\% | 1.6\% | 0.0\% | 3.1\% | 9.3\% |
| Sessionals | F | 74.9\% | 8.5\% | 1.1\% | 3.5\% | 0.4\% | 1.1\% | 10.6\% |
| Sessionals | M | 76.2\% | 4.6\% | 2.7\% | 1.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 14.2\% |
| Other | F | 87.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 12.5\% |
| Other | M | 61.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.9\% | 31.7\% |
| Total | $F$ | 79.1\% | 6.7\% | 0.9\% | 4.2\% | 0.8\% | 1.9\% | 6.4\% |
| Total | M | 77.4\% | 5.0\% | 1.7\% | 2.3\% | 0.2\% | 1.8\% | 11.6\% |

Table 4.1.12. Academic and research staff by grade and ethnicity in 2019 (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Sex | White | Asian | Black | Chinese | Mixed | Other | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-5 | F | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| 4-5 | M | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 6 (e.g. research staff) | F | 65.6\% | 10.8\% | 2.5\% | 5.1\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 15.3\% |
| 6 (e.g. research staff) | M | 55.7\% | 6.3\% | 0.6\% | 6.3\% | 1.3\% | 2.5\% | 27.2\% |
| 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | F | 73.4\% | 4.8\% | 1.7\% | 4.8\% | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 12.7\% |
| 7 (e.g. Lecturer) | M | 65.6\% | 8.5\% | 2.6\% | 4.8\% | 1.6\% | 2.1\% | 14.8\% |
| 8 (e.g. AP) | F | 79.2\% | 6.0\% | 0.0\% | 6.7\% | 2.0\% | 3.4\% | 2.7\% |
| 8 (e.g. AP) | M | 86.7\% | 1.3\% | 0.6\% | 2.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 8.9\% |
| 9 and Professors | F | 86.8\% | 2.6\% | 0.0\% | 3.5\% | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 5.3\% |
| 9 and Professors | M | 80.7\% | 3.3\% | 0.5\% | 1.4\% | 0.0\% | 2.8\% | 11.3\% |
| Sessionals | F | 67.6\% | 5.1\% | 0.2\% | 2.7\% | 0.2\% | 1.0\% | 23.2\% |
| Sessionals | M | 64.3\% | 4.7\% | 3.4\% | 1.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.9\% | 24.8\% |
| Other | F | 45.5\% | 18.2\% | 4.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.5\% | 27.3\% |
| Other | M | 68.4\% | 10.5\% | 5.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 15.8\% |
| Total | $F$ | 71.6\% | 6.0\% | 0.9\% | 4.1\% | 0.5\% | 1.7\% | 15.3\% |
| Total | M | 69.9\% | 4.9\% | 1.9\% | 3.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.6\% | 18.1\% |

Fig 4.1.8. Proportions of female academic and research staff by ethnicity in 2016 and 2019 (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]


Fig 4.1.9. Proportions of male academic and research staff by ethnicity in 2016 and 2019 (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

(ii) Academic and research staff on fixed-term, open-ended/permanent and zero-hour contracts by gender (631 words)

Comment on the proportions of men and women on these contracts. Comment on what is being done to ensure continuity of employment and to address any other issues, including redeployment schemes.

We have no zero-hours contracts but a small number of casual contracts where staff are clear of the activities/hours that they will work over agreed period, e.g. exam invigilators. Otherwise staff are fixed-term or openended/permanent. For a few staff contract type not recorded on Trent.

Table 4.1.13. Permitted reasons for fixed-term posts on staffing request forms.

| Reason | Example |
| :--- | :--- |
| The nature of the funding of the post | Fixed-term research funding |
| That the vacancy is fixed-term, e.g. covering leave of <br> absence | To cover maternity leave or temporary secondment |
| The post is linked to an activity of fixed-term | A specific, fixed-term research project. |
| The post is linked to an activity of an experimental or <br> developmental nature | Post linked to a new, experimental collaboration with <br> an external partner. |

Tables 4.1.14-4.1.16 show contract-type breakdown for whole University/STEMM/AHSSBL. Fixed-term numbers have grown over last three years, this growth in AHSSBL; fixed-term numbers have fallen slightly in STEMM.

F\% on fixed-term contracts in AHSSBL identical to F\% on permanent. In STEMM fixed-term F\% approximately 50\%, lower that permanent F\%, because fixed-term contracts are norm for the large G6 STEMM research-staff cohort; see below.

Table 4.1.14. Academic and research staff by type (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Type | Year | Female <br> count | Male count | Total <br> count | Female \% | Total FTE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Casual | 2017 |  |  |  | $57.14 \%$ |  |
| Casual | 2018 |  |  |  | $71.43 \%$ |  |
| Casual | 2019 |  |  |  | $68.75 \%$ |  |
| Fixed-term | 2017 | 522 | 430 | 952 | $54.83 \%$ | 392.3 |
| Fixed-term | 2018 | 584 | 469 | 1053 | $55.46 \%$ | 407.9 |
| Fixed-term | 2019 | 615 | 526 | 1141 | $53.90 \%$ | 400.8 |
| Permanent | 2017 | 445 | 528 | 973 | $45.73 \%$ | 865.1 |
| Permanent | 2018 | 443 | 523 | 966 | $45.86 \%$ | 860.0 |
| Permanent | 2019 | 460 | 527 | 987 | $46.61 \%$ | 874.3 |
| Unknown | 2017 |  |  |  | $50.00 \%$ |  |
| Unknown | 2018 |  |  |  | $0.00 \%$ |  |
| Unknown | 2019 |  |  |  | N |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 4 8}$ | $50.31 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 2 5 7 . 7}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 1}$ | $51.05 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 2 6 9 . 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 6 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 7 5 . 1}$ |

Table 4.1.15. Academic and research staff by type (STEMM), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Type | Year | Female <br> count | Male count | Total <br> count | Female \% | Total FTE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Casual | 2017 |  |  |  | $50.0 \%$ |  |
| Casual | 2018 |  |  |  | $68.8 \%$ |  |
| Casual | 2019 |  |  |  | $72.7 \%$ |  |
| Fixed-term | 2017 | 227 | 227 | 454 | $50.0 \%$ | 313.5 |
| Fixed-term | 2018 | 237 | 226 | 463 | $51.2 \%$ | 319.7 |
| Fixed-term | 2019 | 216 | 216 | 432 | $50.0 \%$ | 307.4 |
| Permanent | 2017 | 167 | 300 | 467 | $35.8 \%$ | 437.9 |
| Permanent | 2018 | 174 | 300 | 474 | $36.7 \%$ | 445.2 |
| Permanent | 2019 | 176 | 304 | 480 | $36.7 \%$ | 448.2 |
| Total | 2017 |  |  |  | $42.89 \%$ | 751.4 |
| Total | 2018 |  |  |  | $44.28 \%$ | 765.9 |
| Total | 2019 |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4 3 . 3 4 \%}$ | 755.6 |

Table 4.1.16. Academic and research staff by type (AHSSBL), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Type | Year | Female <br> count | Male count | Total <br> count | Female <br> $\%$ | Total <br> FTE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Casual | 2017 |  |  |  | $50.00 \%$ |  |
| Casual | 2018 |  |  |  | $75.00 \%$ |  |
| Casual | 2019 |  |  |  | $50.00 \%$ |  |
| Fixed-term | 2017 | 278 | 195 | 473 | $58.77 \%$ | 67.9 |
| Fixed-term | 2018 | 331 | 235 | 566 | $58.48 \%$ | 77.8 |
| Fixed-term | 2019 | 390 | 301 | 691 | $56.44 \%$ | 80.9 |
| Permanent | 2017 | 266 | 215 | 481 | $55.30 \%$ | 420.2 |
| Permanent | 2018 | 257 | 212 | 469 | $54.80 \%$ | 408.8 |
| Permanent | 2019 | 270 | 212 | 482 | $56.02 \%$ | 419.1 |
| Unknown | 2017 |  |  |  | $50.00 \%$ |  |
| Unknown | 2018 |  |  |  | $0.00 \%$ |  |
| Unknown | 2019 |  |  |  | N/A |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 0}$ | $56.98 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 8 8 . 4}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4 0}$ | $56.83 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 8 6 . 7}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7 7}$ | $56.24 \%$ | 500.0 |

Table 4.1.17 breaks fixed-term data down by grade, showing fixed-term staff growth linked to sessional staff growth, which has driven some increase in \%fixed-term staff, specifically (Table 4.1.14) in AHSSBL.

Table 4.1.17, column 5 shows large majority ( $86.2 \%$ in 2019) of fixed-term staff are Grade 6/sessional. The penultimate column shows $>93 \%$ of sessional staff, $>94 \%$ research staff are fixed-term; smaller percentages of staff at G7/G9 also fixed-term. Comparing the last column with column 6, we see \%F on fixed-term in G6 and sessional coincides with \%F in the population. At G7/G9 \%F on fixed-term slightly in access of population \%F; large excess at G8, though G8 fixed-term numbers very small.

## New actions

AP2019: G1.1 $\quad$ Explore reasons for use of fixed-term contracts at G7-G9, and reasons for the gender imbalance.

In Table 4.1.18 we tease out function employed for G6/Sessional cohorts. The vast majority (96.4\% in 2019) of sessional staff are teaching-only. The vast majority ( $97.7 \%$ in 2019) of G6 fixed-term staff are research, where the reason for fixed-term is usually combination of short-term funding and/or fixed-term activity. The data for the smaller numbers of fixed-term G7-G9 staff shows a balance of Research/Teaching/T\&R contracts.

Table 4.1.17. Fixed-term Academic and research staff by Grade (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Year | Female count | Male count | Total count | Female \% | Total as \% of total academic staff in that grade (from Table 4.1.1). | Female \% across all academic staff (from Table 4.1.1). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-5 | 2017 |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 50\% | 50\% |
| 4-5 | 2018 |  |  |  | 75.0\% | 100\% | 75\% |
| 4-5 | 2019 |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| 6 | 2017 | 158 | 139 | 297 | 53.2\% | 94.9\% | 52.7\% |
| 6 | 2018 | 169 | 139 | 308 | 54.9\% | 95.7\% | 54.7\% |
| 6 | 2019 | 149 | 149 | 298 | 50.0\% | 94.6\% | 49.8\% |
| 7 | 2017 | 50 | 38 | 88 | 56.8\% | 20.3\% | 52.4\% |
| 7 | 2018 | 46 | 33 | 79 | 58.2\% | 18.5\% | 52.9\% |
| 7 | 2019 | 48 | 32 | 80 | 60.0\% | 19.1\% | 54.8\% |
| 8 | 2017 |  |  |  | 81.8\% | 3.6\% | 51.3\% |
| 8 | 2018 |  |  |  | 76.9\% | 4.3\% | 51.3\% |
| 8 | 2019 |  |  |  | 75.0\% | 2.6\% | 48.5\% |
| 9 and Professors | 2017 |  |  |  | 36.1\% | 11.9\% | 32.1\% |
| 9 and Professors | 2018 |  |  |  | 38.2\% | 11.3\% | 32.0\% |
| 9 and Professors | 2019 |  |  |  | 38.5\% | 12.0\% | 35.0\% |
| Sessionals | 2017 | 271 | 209 | 480 | 56.5\% | 89.2\% | 57.4\% |
| Sessionals | 2018 | 323 | 253 | 576 | 56.1\% | 91.1\% | 57.3\% |
| Sessionals | 2019 | 378 | 307 | 685 | 55.2\% | 93.1\% | 56.3\% |
| Other | 2017 |  |  |  | 51.3\% | 72.2\% | 44.4\% |
| Other | 2018 |  |  |  | 51.3\% | 72.2\% | 44.4\% |
| Other | 2019 |  |  |  | 60.0\% | 73.1\% | 53.7\% |
| Total | 2017 | 522 | 430 | 952 | 54.8\% | 48.9\% | 50.3\% |
| Total | 2018 | 584 | 469 | 1053 | 55.5\% | 51.6\% | 51.1\% |
| Total | 2019 | 615 | 526 | 1141 | 53.9\% | 53.2\% | 50.7\% |

Table 4.1.18. Fixed-term Academic and research staff by Grade and Function (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Function | Year | Female count | Male count | Total count | Female \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 6 | Research only | 2017 | 148 | 132 | 280 | 52.86\% |
| Grade 6 | Research only | 2018 | 161 | 136 | 297 | 54.21\% |
| Grade 6 | Research only | 2019 | 144 | 147 | 291 | 49.48\% |
| Grade 6 | Teaching and research | 2017 |  |  |  | 60.00\% |
| Grade 6 | Teaching and research | 2018 |  |  |  | 50.00\% |
| Grade 6 | Teaching and research | 2019 |  |  |  | 50.00\% |
| Grade 6 | Teaching only | 2017 |  |  |  | 57.14\% |
| Grade 6 | Teaching only | 2018 |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| Grade 6 | Teaching only | 2019 |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| Sessionals | Not an academic contract | 2017 |  |  |  | 88.24\% |
| Sessionals | Not an academic contract | 2018 |  |  |  | 80.00\% |
| Sessionals | Not an academic contract | 2019 |  |  |  | 50.00\% |
| Sessionals | Not teaching and/or research | 2017 |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| Sessionals | Not teaching and/or research | 2018 |  |  |  | 75.00\% |
| Sessionals | Not teaching and/or research | 2019 |  |  |  | 50.00\% |
| Sessionals | Research only | 2017 |  |  |  | 75.00\% |
| Sessionals | Research only | 2018 |  |  |  | 77.78\% |
| Sessionals | Research only | 2019 |  |  |  | 71.43\% |
| Sessionals | Teaching and research | 2017 |  |  |  | 0.00\% |
| Sessionals | Teaching and research | 2018 |  |  |  | 25.00\% |
| Sessionals | Teaching and research | 2019 |  |  |  | 25.00\% |
| Sessionals | Teaching only | 2017 | 243 | 199 | 442 | 54.98\% |
| Sessionals | Teaching only | 2018 | 291 | 240 | 531 | 54.80\% |
| Sessionals | Teaching only | 2019 | 367 | 293 | 660 | 55.61\% |
| Sessionals | Unknown | 2017 |  |  |  | 62.50\% |
| Sessionals | Unknown | 2018 |  |  |  | 62.50\% |
| Sessionals | Unknown | 2019 |  |  |  | 16.67\% |

Tables 4.1.19-4.1.21 compare with the sector (using FPE).
AHSSBL: larger \%F than sector for both fixed-term and open-ended. The sector \%F fixed-term is larger than \%F openended, but the fixed-term \%F is essentially identical to open-ended \%F in UoR.

STEMM: higher \%F than sector for both fixed-term and open-ended. The ratio (\%F within fixed-term)/(\%F within open-ended) is approximately 1.25 for both sector and UoR. Within UoR, as discussed above, this associated with fixed-term contracts being the norm for research staff.

Table 4.1.19. Sector Data - Proportion of academic staff with each terms of employment category who are female (whole University), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Terms of employment | Year | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Fixed-term | $2015 / 16$ | $50.5 \%$ | 760 | $48.2 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2016 / 17$ | $49.5 \%$ | 745 | $48.8 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2017 / 18$ | $53.0 \%$ | 785 | $48.7 \%$ |
| Open-ended | $2015 / 16$ | $44.8 \%$ | 930 | $43.7 \%$ |
| Open-ended | $2016 / 17$ | $46.3 \%$ | 955 | $44.0 \%$ |
| Open-ended | $2017 / 18$ | $47.7 \%$ | 1010 | $44.4 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 3 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 7 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 9 \%}$ |

Table 4.1.20. Sector Data - Proportion of academic staff with each terms of employment category who are female (STEMM), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Terms of employment | Year | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Fixed-term | $2015 / 16$ | $46.1 \%$ | 385 | $40.4 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2016 / 17$ | $47.3 \%$ | 400 | $41.9 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2017 / 18$ | $50.4 \%$ | 440 | $41.7 \%$ |
| Open-ended | $2015 / 16$ | $34.2 \%$ | 465 | $32.7 \%$ |
| Open-ended | $2016 / 17$ | $36.3 \%$ | 470 | $33.2 \%$ |
| Open-ended | $2017 / 18$ | $38.9 \%$ | 495 | $33.8 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 . 6 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 4 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 8 \%}$ |

Table 4.1.21. Sector Data - Proportion of academic staff with each terms of employment category who are female (AHSSBL), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Terms of employment | Year | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Fixed-term | $2015 / 16$ | $55.6 \%$ | 360 | $53.8 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2016 / 17$ | $52.1 \%$ | 330 | $53.6 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2017 / 18$ | $56.8 \%$ | 330 | $53.7 \%$ |
| Open-ended | $2015 / 16$ | $55.6 \%$ | 450 | $47.6 \%$ |
| Open-ended | $2016 / 17$ | $56.2 \%$ | 475 | $48.0 \%$ |
| Open- ended | $2017 / 18$ | $56.0 \%$ | 505 | $48.5 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 4 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 7 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 9 \%}$ |

To support fixed-term staff we provide a central redeployment register, contacting staff who are nearing the end of fixed-term contracts, inviting signing-up. Staff on the register receive alerts whenever new vacancies added.

All fixed-term staff, subject to certain provisos, have the right, if on $2^{\text {nd }}$ contract, to move to open-ended contract after four years, and any requests to move to open-ended contracts after four years are considered. As an action from our AS2016AP, and from our HRER Action Plans for 2016-20, we have run careers development workshops regularly in three STEMM schools that together host over 55\% of our research staff, with a spec that includes talking explicitly about routes to open-ended contracts. We also run for all research staff biannual workshops on moving to a lectureship, and on promotion processes, and annually a workshop on Careers in Industry, recognising that only minority of research staff have long-term academic careers.

We recognise that other institutions make wider use of open-ended contracts, especially for research staff, while making clear that continued employment is contingent on funding.

As noted above we have large teaching-focussed sessional numbers, these increasing in AHSSBL (though with \%F matching overall AHSSBL staffing). As part of action AS2016:C3 we made an initial review of sessional staff pay/conditions, and then set up a working group chaired by a T\&L Dean with representation from HR, local UCU, and schools (loE/SAGES/ISLI/HBS) that have large sessional numbers. This reported in November 2018 with recommendations on a new UoR Policy on Engagement of Sessional Staff, with improved transparency/uniformity in rates of pay/conditions. Further work with UCU is underway to bring this to fruition.

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 G2.1 | Review University approach to use of fixed-term contracts and develop University-wide <br> guidelines on approach to fixed-term contracts, transitioning staff from fixed-term to open- <br> ended contracts. |
| AP2019 G2.2 | Advertise guidelines produced, for example via web pages, and via guidance booklets for PIs <br> and research staff. |
| AP2019 G3.1 | Complete, working collaboratively with UCU, the development of a new Policy for the <br> Engagement of Sessional Staff across UoR, that builds on the November 2018 recommendations <br> of the Working Group on Sessional Staff, in relation to unified UoR framework for rates of pay <br> and other terms and conditions. |

(iii) Academic staff by contract function and gender: research-only, research and teaching, and teaching-only (422 words)

Comment on the proportions of men and women on these contracts and by job grade.

Tables 4.1.22-4.1.24 compare with sector for contract-type/gender for the whole University/STEMM/AHSSBL.
For the whole University female Research-only has increased in last 3 years to close to 50\%F, ahead of sector. Likewise, we are ahead of sector in \%F T\&R staff, and larger proportion of our Teaching-only staff are female.

Table 4.1.22. Sector data: proportion of staff within each Academic employment function group who are female (whole University), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Academic employment <br> function | Year | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Research only | $2015 / 16$ | $44.0 \%$ | 375 | $46.8 \%$ |
| Research only | $2016 / 17$ | $46.2 \%$ | 390 | $47.3 \%$ |
| Research only | $2017 / 18$ | $49.7 \%$ | 435 | $47.2 \%$ |
| Teaching \& research | $2015 / 16$ | $41.4 \%$ | 665 | $40.7 \%$ |
| Teaching \& research | $2016 / 17$ | $42.2 \%$ | 685 | $41.1 \%$ |
| Teaching \& research | $2017 / 18$ | $43.3 \%$ | 715 | $41.4 \%$ |
| Teaching only | $2015 / 16$ | $56.3 \%$ | 640 | $52.5 \%$ |
| Teaching only | $2016 / 17$ | $54.8 \%$ | 620 | $52.4 \%$ |
| Teaching only | $2017 / 18$ | $57.7 \%$ | 640 | $52.1 \%$ |

STEMM: We are significantly ahead of the sector (averages closer to 50\%) in \%F in each of Research/T\&R/Teaching, and in Research/T\&R we have made significant progress in last 3 years.

AHSSBL: We are better (closer to 50\%F) for T\&R staff, but not for our small Research cohort or our larger Teaching cohort.

Table 4.1.23. Sector data: proportion of staff within each Academic employment function group who are female (STEMM), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Academic employment <br> function | Year | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Research only | $2015 / 16$ | $43.2 \%$ | 335 | $39.3 \%$ |
| Research only | $2016 / 17$ | $45.0 \%$ | 345 | $40.1 \%$ |
| Research only | $2017 / 18$ | $48.3 \%$ | 380 | $39.9 \%$ |
| Teaching \& research | $2015 / 16$ | $32.0 \%$ | 355 | $29.9 \%$ |
| Teaching \& research | $2016 / 17$ | $33.8 \%$ | 360 | $30.6 \%$ |
| Teaching \& research | $2017 / 18$ | $35.9 \%$ | 375 | $31.0 \%$ |
| Teaching only | $2015 / 16$ | $50.0 \%$ | 160 | $43.3 \%$ |
| Teaching only | $2016 / 17$ | $49.8 \%$ | 165 | $44.3 \%$ |
| Teaching only | $2017 / 18$ | $53.5 \%$ | 180 | $44.3 \%$ |

Table 4.1.24. Sector data: proportion of staff within each Academic employment function group who are female (AHSSBL), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Academic employment <br> function | Year | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Research only | $2015 / 16$ | $54.6 \%$ | 35 | $54.6 \%$ |
| Research only | $2016 / 17$ | $61.4 \%$ | 35 | $55.1 \%$ |
| Research only | $2017 / 18$ | $64.3 \%$ | 50 | $55.7 \%$ |
| Teaching \& research | $2015 / 16$ | $51.9 \%$ | 300 | $45.8 \%$ |
| Teaching \& research | $2016 / 17$ | $51.5 \%$ | 320 | $46.5 \%$ |
| Teaching \& research | $2017 / 18$ | $51.5 \%$ | 335 | $46.6 \%$ |
| Teaching only | $2015 / 16$ | $58.3 \%$ | 470 | $54.2 \%$ |
| Teaching only | $2016 / 17$ | $56.3 \%$ | 450 | $53.6 \%$ |
| Teaching only | $2017 / 18$ | $59.0 \%$ | 455 | $53.6 \%$ |

Tables 4.1.25-4.1.27 show internal data by grades for $T / T \& R / R$, for the whole university by headcount.
To progress through pipelines (see §5.1(iii)) we provide promotion routes for all the significant A\&R cohorts, i.e. from Research G6-G7, and, for staff on all of T, T\&R, and R contracts, from G7 to AP then AP-Professor through a single promotion system. (Staff, by mutual agreement, can also move contract from one track to another.)

Table 4.1.25. Academic and research staff by gender and grade (Function: Teaching and research) (whole University) [Source: Trent]


T\&R (Table 4.1.25): even gender split at G7/G8 (negligible staff at Grade 6). The professorial gender imbalance has reduced in three years by 10p.p., but 32p.p. difference remains.

Research (Table 4.1.26): even gender split at G6/G7. Only 14 G8 staff and large (currently 42p.p.) gender gap. At G9/Professor cohort is small and currently 34p.p. gap, 2p.p. worse than 2016.

Table 4.1.26. Academic and research staff by gender and grade (Function: Research only) (whole University) [Source: Trent]


Table 4.1.27. Academic and research staff by gender and grade (Function: Teaching only) (whole University) [Source: Trent]


Teaching (Table 4.1.27): More women at G7, currently 30p.p. difference, no change in three years. At G8 gap has fallen by 14p.p. to essentially gender parity. At G9 numbers are small, gap only 10p.p., but up 4p.p over last three years.

In summary significant leaky pipeline G8-G9 for T\&R women, and G7-G8 (Lecturer-AP) for women on Teaching-only/Research-only contracts.

The mechanism with large gender-imbalance impact at higher grades over the last three years is academic promotions (see $\S 4.1(\mathrm{i})$ ), because new promotion process over the last three years has led to increased female applications/success, and because promotion volume large compared to recruitments/gender differences in staff leaving.

Tables 4.1.28-4.1.29 explore how promotions are working for each contract type, important for gender equality given: large Teaching-only F\% at G7; the specific leaky-pipeline issues by contract type. For Teaching staff percentage of successful promotions within 1.6p.p. of the T\% in the pool for G7-G8 and G8-G9 promotions. There is significant over-representation in T\&R promotions awarded at G7-G8 (and a 3.2p.p. over-representation also at G8-G9), mainly at the expense of R staff. Staff on Research-only contracts have had no successful G7-G8 or G8-G9 promotions since new system introduced.

Table 4.1.28. Number of G7 (Lecturer) to G8 (AP) promotions by headcount compared to number of staff by count of records at G7 (whole university) [Source: Tables 4.1.25-4.1.27 and Tables XX]

| Contract type | Number of <br> staff at G7 <br> (average over <br> last 3 years) | Percentage in <br> each contract <br> type | Number of <br> promotions <br> from G7 to G8 <br> (total over last <br> 3 years) | Percentage in <br> each contract <br> type |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Teaching | 145.0 | $34.2 \%$ | 28 | $32.6 \%$ |
| T\&R | 221.3 | $52.2 \%$ | 58 | $67.4 \%$ |
| Research | 57.7 | $13.6 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Total | 424.0 | $100 \%$ | 86 | $100 \%$ |

Table 4.1.29. Number of $\mathbf{G 8}$ to Professor promotions by headcount compared to number of staff by count of records at G8 (whole university) [Source: Tables 4.1.25-4.1.27 and Tables XX]

| Contract type | Number of <br> staff at G8 <br> (average over <br> last 3 years) | Percentage in <br> each contract <br> type | Number of <br> promotions <br> from G8 to G9 <br> (total over last <br> 3 years) | Percentage in <br> each contract <br> type |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Teaching |  |  |  | $20.7 \%$ |
| T\&R | 230.3 | $76.1 \%$ |  | 65 |
| Research |  |  |  | $79.3 \%$ |
| Total | 302.7 | $100 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ |

[^3](iv) Academic leavers by grade and gender (77 words)

Comment on the reasons academic staff leave the institution. Comment on and explain any differences between men and women, and any differences in schools or departments.

Reasons for leaving UoR are recorded by line-manager on Leaver's Form, fed into Trent. Tables 4.1.30-4.1.32 show distribution of leavers across grades for University/STEMM/AHSSBL. There is almost no data for sessional staff, prompting AP2019:B4.1, and no feedback provided directly by staff leaving, prompting B4.2. Comparing last two columns of each table, while there is some year-to-year fluctuation there appear to be no significant gender-related issues.

Table 4.1.30. Academic and research staff leavers by grade (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Year | Female count | Male count | Total count | Female \% | \% Females in population ${ }^{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4-5 | 2017 |  |  |  | 66.7\% | 50.0\% |
| Grade 4-5 | 2018 |  |  |  | N/A | 75.0\% |
| Grade 4-5 | 2019 |  |  |  | 66.7\% | 100.0\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 66.7\% |  |
| Grade 6 | 2017 | 43 | 47 | 90 | 47.8\% | 52.7\% |
| Grade 6 | 2018 | 22 | 24 | 46 | 47.8\% | 54.7\% |
| Grade 6 | 2019 | 56 | 45 | 101 | 55.5\% | 49.8\% |
| Total |  | 121 | 116 | 237 | 51.1\% |  |
| Grade 7 | 2017 |  |  |  | 68.0\% | 52.4\% |
| Grade 7 | 2018 |  |  |  | 45.0\% | 52.9\% |
| Grade 7 | 2019 | 20 | 26 | 46 | 43.5\% | 54.8\% |
| Total |  | 46 | 45 | 91 | 50.5\% |  |
| Grade 8 | 2017 |  |  |  | 31.3\% | 51.3\% |
| Grade 8 | 2018 |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 51.3\% |
| Grade 8 | 2019 |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 48.5\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 42.5\% |  |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2017 |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 32.1\% |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2018 |  |  |  | 40.0\% | 32.0\% |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2019 |  |  |  | 42.9\% | 35.0\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 45.5\% |  |
| Sessionals | 2017 |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 57.4\% |
| Sessionals | 2018 |  |  |  | N/A | 57.3\% |
| Sessionals | 2019 |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 56.3\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 100.0\% |  |
| Other | 2017 |  |  |  | 58.3\% | 44.4\% |
| Other | 2018 |  |  |  | 0.0\% | 44.4\% |
| Other | 2019 |  |  |  | 25.0\% | 53.7\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 35.7\% |  |
| Total | 2017 | 82 | 79 | 161 | 50.9\% | 50.3\% |
| Total | 2018 | 36 | 45 | 81 | 44.4\% | 51.1\% |
| Total | 2019 | 97 | 98 | 195 | 49.7\% | 50.7\% |
| Three-year total |  | 215 | 222 | 437 | 49.2\% |  |

[^4]Table 4.1.31. Academic and research staff leavers by grade (STEMM), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Year | Female <br> count | Male <br> count | Total <br> count | Female \% | \% Females in <br> population |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Grade 4-5 | 2017 |  |  |  | $66.7 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Grade 4-5 | 2018 |  |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $75.0 \%$ |
| Grade 4-5 | 2019 |  |  |  | $66.7 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  | $66.7 \%$ |  |
| Grade 6 | 2017 |  |  |  | $48.2 \%$ | $50.5 \%$ |
| Grade 6 | 2018 |  |  |  | $42.5 \%$ | $51.4 \%$ |
| Grade 6 | 2019 |  |  |  | $55.3 \%$ | $47.5 \%$ |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{1 0 9}$ | 108 | $\mathbf{2 1 7}$ | $50.2 \%$ |  |
| Grade 7 | 2017 |  |  |  | $44.4 \%$ | $43.9 \%$ |
| Grade 7 | 2018 |  |  |  | $30.0 \%$ | $45.4 \%$ |
| Grade 7 | 2019 |  |  |  | $47.6 \%$ | $46.6 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4 2 . 5 \%}$ |  |
| Grade 8 | 2017 |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $43.7 \%$ |
| Grade 8 | 2018 |  |  |  | $100.0 \%$ | $43.5 \%$ |
| Grade 8 | 2019 |  |  |  | $57.1 \%$ | $37.9 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  | $40.0 \%$ |  |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2017 |  |  |  | $60.0 \%$ | $24.5 \%$ |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2018 |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $25.2 \%$ |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2019 |  |  |  | $16.7 \%$ | $29.0 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 8 . 6 \%}$ |  |
| Other | 2017 |  |  |  | $33.3 \%$ | $44.7 \%$ |
| Other | 2018 |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $46.3 \%$ |
| Other | 2019 |  |  |  |  | $18.2 \%$ |

[^5]Table 4.1.32. Academic and research staff leavers by grade (AHSSBL), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Year | Female count | Male count | Total count | Female \% | \% Females in population ${ }^{6}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 6 | 2017 |  |  |  | 42.9\% | 69.4\% |
| Grade 6 | 2018 |  |  |  | 83.3\% | 77.5\% |
| Grade 6 | 2019 |  |  |  | 57.1\% | 66.7\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 60.0\% |  |
| Grade 7 | 2017 |  |  |  | 80.0\% | 60.2\% |
| Grade 7 | 2018 |  |  |  | 60.0\% | 60.0\% |
| Grade 7 | 2019 |  |  |  | 40.0\% | 61.9\% |
| Total |  | 28 | 22 | 50 | 56.0\% |  |
| Grade 8 | 2017 |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 58.3\% |
| Grade 8 | 2018 |  |  |  | 25.0\% | 59.0\% |
| Grade 8 | 2019 |  |  |  | 40.0\% | 58.8\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 41.7\% |  |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2017 |  |  |  | 44.4\% | 40.2\% |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2018 |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 38.9\% |
| Grade 9 and Professors | 2019 |  |  |  | 62.5\% | 40.5\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 57.9\% |  |
| Sessionals | 2017 |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 59.3\% |
| Sessionals | 2018 |  |  |  | N/A | 58.1\% |
| Sessionals | 2019 |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 56.8\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 100.0\% |  |
| Other | 2017 |  |  |  | 83.3\% | 43.8\% |
| Other | 2018 |  |  |  | 0.0\% | 38.5\% |
| Other | 2019 |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 27.3\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 75.0\% |  |
| Total | 2017 |  |  |  | 62.5\% | 57.0\% |
| Total | 2018 |  |  |  | 60.9\% | 56.8\% |
| Total | 2019 |  |  |  | 48.1\% | 56.2\% |
| Three-year total |  | 69 | 54 | 123 | 56.0\% |  |

Tables 4.1.33-4.1.35 show, for whole University, recorded reasons for leaving by grade.

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 B4.1 | The leavers' form system is not currently working for Sessional Staff (very few forms <br> completed). Review and update the leaver process, in particular to ensure that it is applied <br> consistently to sessional staff ensuring good quality data going forwards. |
| AP2019 B4.2 | A new online Leavers' Questionnaire (providing data on reasons for leaving and experience <br> of UoR to supplement existing Leaver's Form completed by line manager) will roll-out in <br> December 2019. Review completion rates after 3 months, and then review new data <br> provided on reasons for leaving annually, with a view to addressing issues raised. |
| AP2019 B4.3 | Investigate why there appears to be some excess (admittedly with low numbers) in \%F <br> leaving because of end of fixed-term contracts at G7 and G8 (compare last column of Table <br> 4.1.31/32 with last column of Table 4.1.28). |

[^6]Table 4.1.33. Academic and research staff reasons for leaving by grade: Grades 4-7 (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Reason | Year | Female | Male | Total | \%F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G4-5 | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2017 |  |  |  | 66.7\% |
| G4-5 | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| G4-5 | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2019 |  |  |  | 66.7\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 66.7\% |
| G6 | Other | 2017 |  |  |  | 50.0\% |
| G6 | Other | 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| G6 | Other | 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 44.4\% |
| G6 | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2017 |  |  |  |  |
| G6 | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| G6 | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  | 77 | 73 | 150 | 51.3\% |
| G6 | Redundancy | 2017 |  |  |  |  |
| G6 | Redundancy | 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| G6 | Redundancy | 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| G6 | Resignation | 2017 |  |  |  | 56.0\% |
| G6 | Resignation | 2018 |  |  |  | 35.3\% |
| G6 | Resignation | 2019 |  |  |  | 57.1\% |
| Total |  |  | 40 | 37 | 77 | 51.9\% |
| G7 | Other | 2017 |  |  |  | 66.7\% |
| G7 | Other | 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| G7 | Other | 2019 |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 50.0\% |
| G7 | Death in Service | 2017 |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| G7 | Death in Service | 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| G7 | Death in Service | 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| G7 | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2017 |  |  |  | 85.7\% |
| G7 | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2018 |  |  |  | 50.0\% |
| G7 | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2019 |  |  |  | 58.3\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 64.0\% |
| G7 | Redundancy | 2017 |  |  |  |  |
| G7 | Redundancy | 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| G7 | Redundancy | 2019 |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| G7 | Resignation | 2017 |  |  |  | 66.7\% |
| G7 | Resignation | 2018 |  |  |  | 46.2\% |
| G7 | Resignation | 2019 |  |  |  | 42.3\% |
| Total |  |  | 25 | 26 | 51 | 49.0\% |
| G7 | Retirement | 2017 |  |  |  | 66.7\% |
| G7 | Retirement | 2018 |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| G7 | Retirement | 2019 |  |  |  | 40.0\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 44.4\% |

Table 4.1.34. Academic and research staff reasons for leaving by grade: Grades 8 (AP) and 9 (Professor) (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Reason | Year | Female | Male | Total | \%F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G8 | Other | 2017 |  |  |  |  |
| G8 | Other | 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| G8 | Other | 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| G8 | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2017 |  |  |  |  |
| G8 | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| G8 | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| G8 | Resignation | 2017 |  |  |  | 33.3\% |
| G8 | Resignation | 2018 |  |  |  | 60.0\% |
| G8 | Resignation | 2019 |  |  |  | 53.8\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 46.7\% |
| G8 | Retirement | 2017 |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| G8 | Retirement | 2018 |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| G8 | Retirement | 2019 |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| G9 and Professors | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2017 |  |  |  |  |
| G9 and Professors | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2018 |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| G9 and Professors | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| G9 and Professors | Resignation | 2017 |  |  |  | 25.0\% |
| G9 and Professors | Resignation | 2018 |  |  |  | 0.0\% |
| G9 and Professors | Resignation | 2019 |  |  |  | 44.4\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 31.6\% |
| G9 and Professors | Retirement | 2017 |  |  |  | 83.3\% |
| G9 and Professors | Retirement | 2018 |  |  |  | 100.0\% |
| G9 and Professors | Retirement | 2019 |  |  |  | 33.3\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 64.3\% |

Table 4.1.35. Academic and research staff reasons for leaving by grade: Sessional and Other Staff (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Reason | Year | F | M | Not known | Total | \%F | \%F ignoring "Not known" |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sessionals | Other | 2017 |  |  |  |  | 100\% |  |
| Sessionals | Other | 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sessionals | Other | 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |  |
| Sessionals | Resignation | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sessionals | Resignation | 2018 |  |  |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |
| Sessionals | Resignation | 2019 |  |  |  |  | 100\% |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| Other | Other | 2017 |  |  |  |  | 100\% |  |
| Other | Other | 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | Other | 2019 |  |  |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80.0\% |  |
| Other | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2017 |  |  |  |  | 42.9\% |  |
| Other | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2018 |  |  |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Other | End of Fixed-Term Contract | 2019 |  |  |  |  | 22.2\% |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26.3\% |  |
| Other | Resignation | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | Resignation | 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | Resignation | 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.0\% | 23.5\% |
| Other | Retirement | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | Retirement | 2018 |  |  |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Other | Retirement | 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0\% |  |

(v) Equal pay audits/reviews (329 words)

Comment on the findings from the most recent equal pay audit and identify the institution's top three priorities to address any disparities and enable equality in pay.

We audited equal pay in 2015 as part of development of D\&I Staff Targets (Table 4.1.36). Across our grade structure (Table 4.1.4) there were pay gaps at $5 \%$ or larger only at Grade 9/Professorial, hence target 4 (1/1/16 Equal-PayAudit update established G1-G8 pay gaps $<1.6 \%$ ). Targets 2-4 are current university gender equal-pay priorities.

Table 4.1.36. Staff Gender D\&I targets for 2020 announced by VC in February 2016, and see reading.ac.uk/diversity/diversity-commitment.aspx

| No. | Gender Target | Baseline at Feb 2016 | Progress against target |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Have at least 30\% of either gender in all key <br> University committees and boards, including the <br> University Executive Board (UEB) | UEB was 0\% female | UEB currently 28.6\%F, and see <br> §5.5(iv)-(v). |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Maintain the current baseline of at least 45\% of <br> either gender in the overall University LG - <br> including UEB, Deans, Heads of Schools and <br> Functions | Already meeting <br> target. | $43.3 \% F$, see §2. |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Have a gender-balanced professoriate, with at <br> least 40\% of professors of either gender. | 30\% of professors <br> are female | 35\%F, Table 4.1.1. |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Reduce the pay gap that exists at senior <br> (professorial and Grade 9) levels. | 11\% gender pay gap <br> across Grade <br> $9 / P r o f e s s o r s ~$ | Pay gap 7.9\% across Grade <br> $9 /$ Professors as at 1/1/18 <br> [Source UoR D\&I Annual <br> Report 2018/18 $]$ |
| 5 | Achieve University-wide Athena SWAN Gender <br> Charter Mark Silver level recognition, with all <br> STEMM Schools holding awards and all other <br> Schools working towards an award | See Tables 2.1-2.2. | See Tables 2.1-2.2. |

UoR produced Gender Pay Gap reports for 2017 and 2018: summary Tables 4.1.37-4.1.38-YY. (The increase in \%F in lowest quartile appears to be due to inclusion in 2018 data of new "Campus Jobs" initiative employing our students, which has had large female uptake.)

Our equal-pay/gender pay gap SAT working group has:

- reflected on progress (Table 4.1.36), on 2016 Working Group Report (see Impact Box), on Gender Pay Gap reports (plus further analysis), on external recommendations/good practice ${ }^{8}$, on the data in §4.1(i), §5.1(i)(iii);

[^7]- explored with HR teams feasibility of extending to race/ethnicity/intersectional data, leading to proof-ofconcept Tables 4.1.39-4.1.40;
- consulted widely on proposed actions (see §3).

This has led to actions below (in addition to actions elsewhere in this report).

```
Impact from 2016 AS Action Plan
AP2016:E1 A PVC (now our VC) chaired 2016 Gender Pay-Gap Working Group that reported to UEB in
    10/2016. Recommendations taken forward included commissioning full external review of
    Grade 9 P&S pay structure/roles of all Grade 9 staff. Impacts of this major review included:
    i) new more transparent Grade 9 grade structure and associated descriptors;
    ii) immediate pay uplifts for some staff (retrospective to 1/8/18);
    iii)prospective pay reductions for other staff (though with right of appeal and temporary pay
        protection);
    iv) as a result of ii)/iii), reduction in Grade 9 P&S gender pay gap, though full effect will not be
        felt until after two-year pay-protection period.
```

Table 4.1.37. Summary of main gender pay gap data from UoR 2017 and 2018 Gender Pay Gap Reports (snapshot dates 31/3/2017 and 31/3/2018): Mean and Median Salaries

|  | Mean |  | Median |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2017 | 2018 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Hourly rate of pay | $19.58 \%$ | $20.51 \%$ | $20.99 \%$ | $18.52 \%$ |

Table 4.1.38. Summary of main gender pay gap data from UoR 2017 and 2018 Gender Pay Gap Reports (snapshot dates 31/3/2017 and 31/3/2018): Quartile Data

| Percentage of Women in Each Quartile | Percentage <br> of Women <br> in the <br> Workforce |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lower <br> Quartile | Lower <br> Middle <br> Quartile | Upper <br> Middle <br> Quartile | Upper <br> Quartile | Worn |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $62 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $66 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $59 \%$ |

Table 4.1.39. Intersectional breakdown of data from Table 4.1.37 for 2018, displayed as pay gap between men and women.

| Difference between men and women |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  | Mean |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ |  |
|  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ |  |  |
| Hourly <br> rate of <br> pay | BAME |  | $11.54 \%$ |  | $16.05 \%$ |  |
|  | White |  | $18.94 \%$ |  | $16.18 \%$ |  |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 9 . 5 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 5 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 9 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 5 2 \%}$ |  |

Table 4.1.40. Intersectional breakdown of data from Table 4.1.37 for 2018, displayed as pay gap between BAME/White.

| Difference between BAME and White |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  | Mean |  | Median |  |  |
|  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | $24.40 \%$ |  | $23.24 \%$ |  |
|  | Women |  | $17.50 \%$ |  | $23.12 \%$ |  |
|  | Total |  | $\mathbf{2 0 . 9 8 \%}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 3 . 2 9 \%}$ |  |


| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 A1.4 | Take stock in 2020 of progress against our D\&I targets (gender targets in Table 4.1.36), revisit our targets for <br> 2026 agreed by UEB in 2015, and adopt through UEB and Council challenging new targets for gender equality <br> through to 2026, which we then widely and publicly advertise, at the same time celebrating progress made <br> against 2020 targets. |
| AP2019 D1.1 | Provide additional University-level pay data and analysis, either within our standard annual gender pay gap <br> reports, or in other internal reporting, namely: <br> i) Ethnicity (BAME/White) and intersectional pay gap data, this published on D\&I website alongside other <br> annual reports, or included in the existing gender pay gap report; <br> ii) More forensic detail analysing the reasons for year-to-year and longer timescale trends, this to be <br> published at least internally. |
| AP2019 D1.2 | To support this additional analysis we will appoint annually a student intern, employed through Campus <br> Jobs, with data analysis skills, to work with HR and the Dean for D\&I, funded via the D\&I budget. |
| To support the additional analysis in D1.1ii) we will appoint annually a student intern, employed through |  |
| Campus Jobs, with data analysis skills, to work with HR and the Dean for D\&I, funded via the D\&I budget. |  |$|$

### 4.2. Professional and support staff data

(i) Professional and support staff by grade and gender 583+289+156 (total 1026)

Look at the career pipeline across the whole institution and between STEMM and AHSSBL subjects. Comment on and explain any difference between women and men, and any differences between STEMM and AHSSBL subjects. Identify any issues at particular grades/levels.

We employ c 2600 P\&S staff (Table 2.3), F 64.1\% (Sector 62.7\% Table 2.6). Over 70\% of P\&S staff are centrally-based in Functions (Table 2.7). Many P\&S employees in Schools are ES staff who undertake administrative activities and a small number of Professional and Managerial staff in Interdisciplinary Research Institutes (Figure 2.1). Of P\&S staff in Schools, 54\% are in AHSSBL Schools and 46\% are in STEMM Schools (Table 2.7). Across the University, of those P\&S staff in Schools, approximately 30\% are based in Henley Business School (Table 2.25).

P\&S staff traditionally sit in three job families (Table 4.2.1) with no grade ceilings as all staff can progress through the Professional and Managerial family.

Staff are within a Grade 1-9 structure and some representative roles are described in Table 4.2.2

Table 4.2.1. P\&S Job Families

|  | Grade |
| :--- | :--- |
| Academic and Administrative Support | $1-5$ |
| Ancillary and Operational Support | $1-5$ |
| Professional and Managerial (PM) | $6-9$ |

For P\&S staff (except Grade 2), the overrepresentation of females at all grades is fairly consistent (Table 4.2.3). A restructure and centralisation of some Functions such as Student Services (SAS), and the establishment of a new one (Technical Services), in 2016, included the creation of new Grade 8 and 9 posts. These were advertised on the University Jobsite and provided valuable progression opportunities. Over the reporting period, there has been an increase in numbers of females at grades 6,7 , and 8 .

Closed out actions and impact from Bronze submission
AP 2016: B1 $\quad$ Diversity Data Dashboard now in place and being used to track gender equality progress in Functions

Table 4.2.2. Representative Job Titles and Associated Responsibilities at each grade (G)

| G | Representative Job Titles | Representative Responsibilities | Academic Job Titles at grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Kitchen Assistant Cleaning Operative | Engaged in performing a narrow range of straightforward, repetitive tasks within established routines under regular or direct supervision |  |
| 2 | Floor Technician <br> Front of House Assistant | Engaged in prescribed or reactive work, performing straightforward tasks within established routines and procedures and under regular or direct supervision |  |
| 3 | Customer Enquiries Assistant <br> Trainee Technician <br> Transactional Finance Clerks | Engaged in performing a range of duties within basic procedures and under regular supervision |  |
| 4 | Security Controller <br> Hotel Services Supervisor <br> Executive Support Administrator | Work more autonomously within established processes and procedures. |  |
| 5 | Content Officer <br> Building Support Officer <br> Executive Support Administrator <br> HR Co-ordinator | Responsible for providing or contributing to the provision of support services to an agreed quality standard or specification. May involve supervision of other staff. |  |
| 6 | Events Manager <br> Executive Support Manager <br> Contracts Associate <br> Paralegal <br> Deputy Category Manager | Providing advice and support based on a detailed understanding of methods, systems and procedures. May involve management of staff. | PDRA (for grade comparison only) |
| 7 | Head of Retail and Hospitality Technical Head Student Recruitment Manager Business Relationship Manager | Providing advice and support to schools/departments/work units based upon a full understanding of a technical, professional or specialised field. May involve management of staff. | Lecturer <br> Senior PDRA <br> (for grade comparison only) |
| 8 | Campus Services Director <br> Associate Director <br> HR Partner <br> Financial Systems Manager | Experienced professionals providing specialist/technical expertise and/or managing a diverse team and resources. Typically, accountable for service delivery within their area of responsibility. | Associate <br> Professor, <br> Principal PDRA <br> (for grade comparison <br> only) |
| 9 | Head/Associate Director of Unit /Director of Function | Professional specialists with high-level expertise, exercising within their particular functional area a substantial degree of independent professional responsibility and discretion. | Head of School, Professor <br> (for grade comparison only) |

Table 4.2.3 Professional \& support staff by grade (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Year | Female count | Male count | Total count | Female \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| National Minimum Wage | 2017 |  |  |  | 66.67\% |
| National Minimum Wage | 2018 |  |  |  | 68.18\% |
| National Minimum Wage | 2019 |  |  |  | 68.75\% |
| Grade 1 | 2017 | 136 | 78 | 214 | 63.55\% |
| Grade 1 | 2018 | 136 | 75 | 211 | 64.45\% |
| Grade 1 | 2019 | 139 | 69 | 208 | 66.83\% |
| Grade 2 | 2017 | 44 | 48 | 92 | 47.83\% |
| Grade 2 | 2018 | 38 | 49 | 87 | 43.68\% |
| Grade 2 | 2019 | 31 | 46 | 77 | 40.26\% |
| Grade 3 | 2017 | 130 | 93 | 223 | 58.30\% |
| Grade 3 | 2018 | 124 | 96 | 220 | 56.36\% |
| Grade 3 | 2019 | 124 | 93 | 217 | 57.14\% |
| Grade 4 | 2017 | 317 | 139 | 456 | 69.52\% |
| Grade 4 | 2018 | 327 | 143 | 470 | 69.57\% |
| Grade 4 | 2019 | 329 | 141 | 470 | 70.00\% |
| Grade 5 | 2017 | 313 | 152 | 465 | 67.31\% |
| Grade 5 | 2018 | 316 | 150 | 466 | 67.81\% |
| Grade 5 | 2019 | 331 | 152 | 483 | 68.53\% |
| Grade 6 | 2017 | 306 | 167 | 473 | 64.69\% |
| Grade 6 | 2018 | 327 | 174 | 501 | 65.27\% |
| Grade 6 | 2019 | 355 | 186 | 541 | 65.62\% |
| Grade 7 | 2017 | 178 | 119 | 297 | 59.93\% |
| Grade 7 | 2018 | 187 | 119 | 306 | 61.11\% |
| Grade 7 | 2019 | 217 | 128 | 345 | 62.90\% |
| Grade 8 | 2017 | 50 | 41 | 91 | 54.95\% |
| Grade 8 | 2018 | 54 | 38 | 92 | 58.70\% |
| Grade 8 | 2019 | 59 | 38 | 97 | 60.82\% |
| Grade 9 | 2017 | 27 | 31 | 58 | 46.55\% |
| Grade 9 | 2018 | 27 | 33 | 60 | 45.00\% |
| Grade 9 | 2019 | 26 | 31 | 57 | 45.61\% |
| Sessionals | 2017 |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| Sessionals | 2018 |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| Sessionals | 2019 |  |  |  | 100.00\% |
| Other | 2017 | 220 | 169 | 389* | 56.56\% |
| Other | 2018 | 127 | 111 | 238* | 53.36\% |
| Other | 2019 | 59 | 53 | 112* | 52.68\% |
| Total | 2017 | 1777 | 1064 | 2841 | 62.55\% |
| Total | 2018 | 1694 | 1002 | 2696 | 62.83\% |
| Total | 2019 | 1682 | 942 | 2624 | 64.10\% |

[^8]Figure 4.2.1 Professional \& support staff by gender and grade (whole University) [Source: Trent]


Despite a larger female population, the \%F at the most senior Grade 9 level is less than $50 \%$ though there is a strong pipeline at Grades 7 and 8 (Figure 4.2.1)
For the most part there is parity in the spread of males and females at each grade when using the total male or female figures (Table 4.2.4.). Many Grade 2 posts in Estates (E) are occupied by males and females occupy many of the ES roles at Grades 4 and 5 (Action AP2019 C3.1).

Table 4.2.4. spread of grades across total population of females and males

| Grade | \% of female population | \% of male population |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $8.2 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ |
| 2 | $1.8 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ |
| 3 | $7.3 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ |
| 4 | $19.5 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ |
| 5 | $19.7 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ |
| 6 | $21.0 \%$ | $19.7 \%$ |
| 7 | $12.9 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ |
| 8 | $3.5 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ |
| 9 | $1.5 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ |
| N/A | $4.2 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ |
|  | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

With the exception of Grade 9, there is underrepresentation of males in many Functions (Table 2.7). Figures 4.2.2 (HR) and Figure 4.2.3 (SAS) are examples where males are underrepresented, for HR at more junior levels, and for SS, at all levels. \%F overall is within 3\% of sector data (Sector 79.9\%F: UoR 82.9\%F, HESA) (Action AP2019 C3.1).

Figure 4.2.2 Professional \& support staff by gender and grade (Human Resources)


Figure 4.2.3 Professional \& support staff by gender and grade (Student Services)


Figures 4.2.4 (IT), 4.2.5 (TS) and 4.2.5a (E) show career pipelines in Functions where, generally, as is the case across the sector, females are underrepresented (Table 2.7; IT 32\%F, TS 46\%F, and E37\%F) (Action AP2019 C3.1) .

Figure 4.2.4 Professional \& support staff by gender and grade (Information Technology)


Figure 4.2.5 Professional \& support staff by gender and grade (Technical Services)


Figure 4.2.5a Professional \& support staff by gender and grade in 2019 (Estates) [Source: Trent] (new Function therefore data shown for first year only)


AP2019:C3.1 looks to explore and improve the gender imbalance across Functions where possible.

| New actions | Via Function Leads (members of DICOP), share good practice associated with strategies for <br> diverse recruitment across Functions that have been traditionally either male or female <br> C3.1 <br> dominated. Explore and understand recruitment strategies, particularly how we widen the <br> selection pool to increase the number of applicants of the under-represented gender. |
| :--- | :--- |

STEMM areas (Figure 4.2.6) have a similar \%F at Grades 1-6 compared to AHSSBL (Figure 4.2.7). For STEMM, numbers are small and although there are less females at Grade 8, this has improved.

Figure 4.2.6 Professional \& support staff by gender and grade (STEMM)


Figure 4.2.7 Professional \& support staff by gender and grade (AHSSBL)


Despite a strong pipeline, in AHSBBL subjects at the most senior level only $21.4 \%$ staff are female ( $n=14$ ).

[^9]Intersectionality with Ethnicity

Table 4.2.5 P\&S staff by grade and ethnicity in 2016 (whole University), count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Sex | BAME |  | White |  | Unknown |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% |
| National Minimum Wage | Female |  | 24.1\% |  | 67.9\% |  | 8.0\% |
| National Minimum Wage | Male |  | 15.0\% |  | 77.5\% |  | 7.5\% |
| Grade 1-5 | Female |  | 18.5\% |  | 76.7\% |  | 4.7\% |
| Grade 1-5 | Male |  | 19.8\% |  | 74.6\% |  | 5.6\% |
| Grade 1-5 | Unspecified |  | 0.0\% |  | 0.0\% |  | 100.0\% |
| Grade 6 | Female |  | 9.0\% |  | 87.3\% |  | 3.7\% |
| Grade 6 | Male |  | 8.9\% |  | 86.6\% |  | 4.5\% |
| Grade 7 | Female |  | 6.3\% |  | 91.2\% |  | 2.5\% |
| Grade 7 | Male |  | 6.4\% |  | 89.1\% |  | 4.5\% |
| Grade 8 | Female |  | 6.8\% |  | 88.6\% |  | 4.5\% |
| Grade 8 | Male |  | 2.7\% |  | 89.2\% |  | 8.1\% |
| Grade 9 | Female |  | 0.0\% |  | 96.0\% |  | 4.0\% |
| Grade 9 | Male |  | 3.0\% |  | 93.9\% |  | 3.0\% |
| Sessionals | Female |  | 50.0\% |  | 50.0\% |  | 0.0\% |
| Sessionals | Male |  | 0.0\% |  | 100.0\% |  | 0.0\% |
| Other | Female |  | 20.9\% |  | 68.1\% |  | 11.0\% |
| Other | Male |  | 27.9\% |  | 60.4\% |  | 11.7\% |
| Total | Female | 308 | 16.3\% | 1466 | 77.8\% | 111 | 5.9\% |
| Total | Male | 210 | 17.8\% | 887 | 75.2\% | 83 | 7.0\% |
| Total | Unspecified |  | 0.0\% |  | 0.0\% | 1 | 100.0\% |

Table 4.2.6 P\&S staff by grade and ethnicity in 2019 (whole University), count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Sex | BAME |  | White |  | Unknown |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% |
| National Minimum Wage | Female |  | 45.5\% |  | 18.2\% |  | 36.4\% |
| National Minimum Wage | Male |  | 0.0\% |  | 60.0\% |  | 40.0\% |
| Grade 1-5 | Female |  | 18.3\% |  | 67.6\% |  | 14.0\% |
| Grade 1-5 | Male |  | 18.0\% |  | 67.3\% |  | 14.8\% |
| Grade 6 | Female |  | 8.7\% |  | 79.4\% |  | 11.8\% |
| Grade 6 | Male |  | 9.7\% |  | 74.7\% |  | 15.6\% |
| Grade 7 | Female |  | 11.1\% |  | 81.1\% |  | 7.8\% |
| Grade 7 | Male |  | 7.0\% |  | 78.9\% |  | 14.1\% |
| Grade 8 | Female |  | 1.7\% |  | 88.1\% |  | 10.2\% |
| Grade 8 | Male |  | 0.0\% |  | 89.5\% |  | 10.5\% |
| Grade 9 | Female |  | 7.7\% |  | 88.5\% |  | 3.8\% |
| Grade 9 | Male |  | 6.5\% |  | 80.6\% |  | 12.9\% |
| Sessionals | Female |  | 0.0\% |  | 0.0\% |  | 100.0\% |
| Other | Female |  | 5.1\% |  | 69.5\% |  | 25.4\% |
| Other | Male |  | 24.5\% |  | 62.3\% |  | 13.2\% |
| Total | Female | 241 | 14.3\% | 1221 | 72.6\% | 220 | 13.1\% |
| Total | Male | 132 | 14.0\% | 672 | 71.3\% | 138 | 14.6\% |

Table 4.25 and Table 4.26 show intersectionality with ethnicity for 2016 and 2019 respectively. Figures 4.2.8-4.2.11 show the data with grades 1-5 split out.

Figure 4.2.8 Proportion of P\&S staff who are BAME in 2016 (whole University) [Source: Trent]


Figure 4.2.9 Proportion of P\&S staff who are BAME in 2019 (whole University), [Source: Trent]


Figure 4.2.10 Proportion of P\&S staff who are White in 2016 (whole University) [Source: Trent]


Figure 4.2.11 Proportion of P\&S staff who are White in 2019 (whole University) [Source: Trent]

\% BAME appears to have dropped between 2016 (Table 4.2.5) and 2019 (Table 4.2.6), from 16.3\%F, 17.8\%M to $14.3 \% \mathrm{~F}, 14.0 \% \mathrm{M}$. The number of BAME females has increased at Grade 7 from 10 to 24 and we have 2 BAME females at Grade 9. Our increased numbers in the 'unknown' category makes analysis of proportions of \%F BAME and \%M BAME (Figures 4.2.8-4.2.11) difficult to interpret (Action AP2019: B3.1 section 4.1)

Breakdown of ethnicity (Figures 4.2.12 and 4.2.13) shows little change (Action AP2019: B3.1 and H2.1 Section 4.1)

Figure 4.2.12 Proportion of female P\&S staff by ethnicity in 2016 and 2019 (whole University) [Source: Trent]


Figure 4.2.13 Proportion of male P\&S staff by ethnicity in 2016 and 2019 (whole University), [Source: Trent]

(ii) Professional and support staff on fixed-term, open-ended/permanent and zero-hour contracts by gender 289

Comment on the proportions of men and women on these contracts. Comment on what is being done to ensure continuity of employment and to address any other issues, including redeployment schemes.

Section 4.1(ii) describes our approach to the use of fixed-term contracts, including redeployment.

Less than $20 \%$ of our PS staff are employed on fixed-term contracts (Table 4.2.8) with $41.2 \%$ in Functions, $41.8 \%$ in STEMM (Table 4.2.9) and 17.0\% in AHSSBL (Table 4.2.10) Schools and 42\% employed in Functions.

Table 4.2.8 Professional \& Support staff by type (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Type | Year | Female <br> count | Male count | Total <br> count | Female \% | Total FTE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Casual | 2017 | 143 | 92 | 235 | $60.85 \%$ | 0.0 |
| Casual | 2018 | 81 | 62 | 143 | $56.64 \%$ | 0.4 |
| Casual | 2019 | 55 | 35 | 90 | $61.11 \%$ | 0.0 |
| Fixed Term | 2017 | 440 | 258 | 698 | $63.04 \%$ | 309.9 |
| Fixed Term | 2018 | 378 | 218 | 596 | $63.42 \%$ | 335.6 |
| Fixed Term | 2019 | 338 | 184 | 522 | $64.75 \%$ | 364.6 |
| Permanent | 2017 | 1194 | 714 | 1908 | $62.58 \%$ | 1680.3 |
| Permanent | 2018 | 1235 | 722 | 1957 | $63.11 \%$ | 1729.9 |
| Permanent | 2019 | 1289 | 723 | 2012 | $64.07 \%$ | 1775.0 |
| Total | 2017 | $\mathbf{1 7 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 5 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0 . 2}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 8 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 6 5 . 9}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 . 1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 3 9 . 6}$ |

Table 4.2.9. Professional \& Support staff by type (STEMM), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Type | Year | Female <br> count | Male count | Total <br> count | Female \% | Total FTE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Casual | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Casual | 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Casual | 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fixed Term | 2017 | 235 | 156 | 391 | $60.10 \%$ | 125.3 |
| Fixed Term | 2018 | 182 | 120 | 302 | $60.26 \%$ | 135.2 |
| Fixed Term | 2019 | 143 | 75 | 218 | $65.60 \%$ | 136.8 |
| Permanent | 2017 | 79 | 36 | 115 | $68.70 \%$ | 98.1 |
| Permanent | 2018 | 80 | 33 | 113 | $70.80 \%$ | 98.4 |
| Permanent | 2019 | 84 | 38 | 122 | $68.85 \%$ | 107.1 |
| Total | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4.2.10 Professional \& Support staff by type (AHSSBL), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Type | Year | Female <br> count | Male count | Total <br> count | Female \% | Total FTE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Casual | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Casual | 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Casual | 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fixed Term | 2017 | 64 | 40 | 104 | $61.54 \%$ | 34.1 |
| Fixed Term | 2018 | 55 | 34 | 89 | $61.80 \%$ | 42.7 |
| Fixed Term | 2019 | 52 | 37 | 89 | $58.43 \%$ | 51.4 |
| Permanent | 2017 | 211 | 68 | 279 | $75.63 \%$ | 247.4 |
| Permanent | 2018 | 216 | 69 | 285 | $75.79 \%$ | 256.2 |
| Permanent | 2019 | 234 | 69 | 303 | $77.23 \%$ | 274.8 |
| Total | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |

The total number of fixed-term posts in Functions (Table 4.2.11) has dropped. As a proportion of total males and females, there is no gender difference associated with those on fixed-term contracts. (Table 4.2.11). The proportion of females is similar to sector data (Table 4.2.14).

Table 4.2.11 Fixed-term posts in Functions

| Year Functions | Total <br> permanent | Fixed term | \% fixed term | \% Female fixed <br> term to <br> permanent <br> female | \% male fixed <br> term to <br> permanent <br> male | \%fixed term <br> female to fixed <br> term male |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | 1908 | 698 | 26.8 | 26.9 | 26.5 |  |
| 2018 | 1957 | 596 | 23.3 | 23.4 | 23.2 | 6 |
| 2019 | 2012 | 522 | 20.1 | 20.8 | 63.4 |  |

The total number of fixed-term posts in STEMM Schools (Table 4.2.12) has dropped significantly. As a proportion of total males and females, there are slightly less females on fixed-term contracts. Sector data (Table 4.2.15) shows that the proportion of females on fixed-term contracts is higher than the sector average (Action AP2019: G2.1, G2.2). Our proportion of female staff employed on permanent contracts is higher than the sector average.

Table 4.2.12 Fixed-term posts in STEMM

| Year STEMM | Total <br> permanent | Fixed term | \% fixed term | \% Female fixed <br> term to <br> permanent <br> female | \% male fixed <br> term to <br> permanent <br> male | \%fixed term <br> female to fixed <br> term male |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | 115 | 391 | 77.3 | 74.8 | 81.3 | 60.1 |
| 2018 | 113 | 302 | 72.8 | 69.5 | 78.4 | 60.3 |
| 2019 | 122 | 218 | 64.1 | 63.0 | 66.4 | 65.6 |

The proportion of fixed-term posts in AHSSBL (Table 4.2.13) is significantly lower than in STEMM. As a proportion of total males and females, there are significantly less females on fixed-term contracts (Table 4.2.13).

Table 4.2.13 Fixed term posts in AHSSBL

| Year AHSSBL | Total <br> permanent | Fixed term | \% fixed term | \% Female fixed <br> term to <br> permanent <br> female | \% male fixed <br> term to <br> permanent <br> male | \%fixed term <br> female to fixed <br> term male |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | 279 | 104 | 27.2 | 23.3 | 37.0 | 61.5 |
| 2018 | 285 | 89 | 23.8 | 20.3 | 33.0 | 61.8 |
| 2019 | 303 | 89 | 22.7 | 18.2 | 34.9 | 58.4 |

Sector data (Table 4.2.16) demonstrates that the proportion of females on fixed-term contracts is significantly lower than the sector average

Table 4.2.14 Sector data. Proportion P\&S staff within each category who are female (University), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Terms of employment | Year | UoR | Sector |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Fixed-term | $2015 / 16$ | $63.2 \%$ | 635 | $64.6 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2016 / 17$ | $60.0 \%$ | 575 | $64.4 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2017 / 18$ | $65.5 \%$ | 360 | $64.7 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2015 / 16$ | $61.9 \%$ | 1630 | $62.4 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2016 / 17$ | $61.6 \%$ | 1775 | $62.3 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2017 / 18$ | $62.4 \%$ | 1860 | $62.3 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 7 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 . 2 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 6 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 9 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 7 \%}$ |

Table 4.2.15 Sector data. Proportion of P\&S staff within each category who are female (STEMM), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Terms of employment | Year | UoR | Sector |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Fixed-term | $2015 / 16$ | $64.7 \%$ | 160 | $60.7 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2016 / 17$ | $61.7 \%$ | 140 | $59.3 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2017 / 18$ | $65.1 \%$ | 140 | $59.2 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2015 / 16$ | $63.4 \%$ | 245 | $59.0 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2016 / 17$ | $70.2 \%$ | 90 | $58.6 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2017 / 18$ | $66.6 \%$ | 95 | $58.8 \%$ |
| Total | $2015 / 16$ | $63.91 \%$ | 405 | $59.8 \%$ |
| Total | $2016 / 17$ | $65.03 \%$ | 230 | $58.8 \%$ |
| Total | $2017 / 18$ | $65.71 \%$ | 235 | $58.9 \%$ |

Table 4.2.16 Sector data. Proportion of P\&S staff within each category who are female (AHSSBL), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Terms of employment | Year | UoR | Sector |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Fixed-term | $2015 / 16$ | $67.6 \%$ | 75 | $68.9 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2016 / 17$ | $56.5 \%$ | 50 | $69.0 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2017 / 18$ | $55.3 \%$ | 45 | $71.3 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2015 / 16$ | $82.9 \%$ | 255 | $74.6 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2016 / 17$ | $75.7 \%$ | 220 | $74.3 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2017 / 18$ | $76.6 \%$ | 235 | $73.9 \%$ |
| Total | $2015 / 16$ | $79.42 \%$ | 330 | $73.6 \%$ |
| Total | $2016 / 17$ | $72.14 \%$ | 270 | $73.4 \%$ |
| Total | $2017 / 18$ | $73.18 \%$ | 280 | $73.4 \%$ |

There are no gender issues associated with full-time fixed-term staff as a proportion of those on permanent contracts (Table 4.2.17 and Figures 4.2.16-4.2.19). There is a higher proportion of males on fixed-term, part-time contracts as a proportion of those on permanent contracts, though this has fallen.

Table 4.2.17 Part time and full time P\&S staff by part-time/full-time and contract type

| Part <br> time PT <br> /full <br> time FT | Contract Type | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  | 2019 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Female |  | Male |  | Female |  | Male |  | Female |  | Male |  |
| FT | Fixed Term | 138 | 16\% | 81 | 12\% | 141 | 15\% | 98 | 14\% | 156 | 16\% | 113 | 16\% |
| FT | Permanent | 737 | 84\% | 607 | 88\% | 771 | 85\% | 616 | 86\% | 799 | 84\% | 615 | 84\% |
| FT | Casual |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PT | Fixed Term | 302 | 34\% | 177 | 47\% | 237 | 30\% | 120 | 42\% | 182 | 25\% | 71 | 33\% |
| PT | Permanent | 457 | 51\% | 107 | 29\% | 464 | 59\% | 106 | 37\% | 490 | 67\% | 108 | 50\% |
| PT | Casual | 142 | 16\% | 91 | 24\% | 81 | 10\% | 62 | 22\% | 55 | 8\% | 35 | 16\% |

Figure 4.2.16 Percentage of full time P\&S staff on fixed term contracts


Figure 4.2.17 Percentage of part time P\&S staff on fixed term contracts


Figure 4.2.18 Percentage of full time P\&S staff on permanent contracts


Figure 4.2.19 Percentage of part time P\&S staff on permanent contracts


Sector data (Tables 4.2 .18 and 4.2 .19 ) show that \%F full-time fixed-term has fallen and is close to sector average. \%F part-time fixed-term, previously lower, has increased and is approaching the sector average.
Table 4.2.18 Sector data. Proportion of full-time P\&S staff in each category who are female (University), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Terms of employment | Year | UoR |  | Sector |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Fixed-term | $2015 / 16$ | $65.7 \%$ | 245 | $60.3 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2016 / 17$ | $59.4 \%$ | 165 | $60.7 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2017 / 18$ | $62.8 \%$ | 200 | $60.5 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2015 / 16$ | $53.0 \%$ | 1160 | $53.8 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2016 / 17$ | $54.0 \%$ | 1300 | $53.9 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2017 / 18$ | $55.1 \%$ | 1365 | $54.0 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 . 6 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 . 7 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 . 8 \%}$ |

Table 4.2.19 Sector data - Proportion of part-time P\&S staff in each category who are female (whole University), by FPE [Source: HESA]

| Terms of employment | Year | UoR | Sector |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Female \% | Total | Female \% |
| Fixed-term | $2015 / 16$ | $61.6 \%$ | 390 | $70.8 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2016 / 17$ | $60.2 \%$ | 410 | $69.7 \%$ |
| Fixed-term | $2017 / 18$ | $68.7 \%$ | 165 | $71.1 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2015 / 16$ | $83.9 \%$ | 470 | $81.8 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2016 / 17$ | $82.3 \%$ | 475 | $81.9 \%$ |
| Open ended/permanent | $2017 / 18$ | $82.7 \%$ | 495 | $81.7 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 8 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 6 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 7 \%}$ |

(iii) Professional and support staff leavers by grade and gender 156

Comment on the reasons staff leave the institution. Comment on and explain any differences between men and women, and any differences in schools or departments. Comment on the reasons staff leave the institution. Comment on and explain any differences between men and women, and any differences in schools or department

For Functions (Table 4.2.20) and staff in STEMM (Table 4.2.21) and AHBBSL (Table 4.2.22) Schools, the \%F leavers at each grade, for the most part, reflects the \%F staff. At higher grades, there are fluctuations and this is likely to be due to the small numbers. There are no concerns relating to gender.

Table 4.2.20 Professional and Support staff leavers by grade (whole University)

| Grade | Year | Female <br> count | Male <br> count | Total <br> count | Female <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ in <br> population |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| National Minimum Wage | 2017 |  |  |  | $60.7 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ |
| National Minimum Wage | 2018 |  |  |  | $56.7 \%$ | $68.2 \%$ |
| National Minimum Wage | 2019 |  |  |  | $68.8 \%$ | $68.8 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{6 0 . 7 \%}$ |  |
| Grade 1-5 | 2017 | 180 | 108 | 288 | $62.5 \%$ | $64.8 \%$ |
| Grade 1-5 | 2018 | 76 | 53 | 129 | $58.9 \%$ | $64.7 \%$ |
| Grade 1-5 | 2019 | 197 | 96 | 293 | $67.2 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{4 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 0}$ | $63.8 \%$ |  |
| Grade 6 | 2017 |  |  |  | $62.3 \%$ | $64.7 \%$ |
| Grade 6 | 2018 |  |  |  | $57.9 \%$ | $65.3 \%$ |
| Grade 6 | 2019 |  |  |  | $56.0 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{8 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 7}$ | $58.5 \%$ |  |
| Grade 7 | 2017 |  |  |  | $61.5 \%$ | $59.9 \%$ |
| Grade 7 | 2018 |  |  |  | $44.4 \%$ | $61.1 \%$ |
| Grade 7 | 2019 |  |  |  | $54.8 \%$ | $62.9 \%$ |
| Total |  | 41 | $\mathbf{3 4}$ | 75 | $54.7 \%$ |  |
| Grade 8 | 2017 |  |  |  | $87.5 \%$ | $55.0 \%$ |
| Grade 8 | 2018 |  |  |  | $40.0 \%$ | $58.7 \%$ |
| Grade 8 | 2019 |  |  |  | $50.0 \%$ | $60.8 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{6 0 . 9 \%}$ |  |
| Grade 9 | 2017 |  |  |  | $55.6 \%$ | $46.6 \%$ |
| Grade 9 | 2018 |  |  |  | $75.0 \%$ | $45.0 \%$ |
| Grade 9 | 2019 |  |  |  | $28.6 \%$ | $45.6 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  | $50.0 \%$ |  |
| Sessionals | 2017 |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |


| Sessionals | 2018 |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sessionals | 2019 |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{0 . 0 \%}$ |  |
| Other | 2017 | 158 | 92 | 250 | $63.2 \%$ | $56.6 \%$ |
| Other | 2018 | 43 | 36 | 79 | $54.4 \%$ | $53.4 \%$ |
| Other | 2019 | 54 | 44 | 98 | $55.1 \%$ | $52.7 \%$ |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{2 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 . 7 \%}$ |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 5 \%}$ | $62.6 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 1 \%}$ | $62.8 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 . 8 \%}$ | $64.1 \%$ |
| Three-year total |  | $\mathbf{9 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 . 1 \%}$ |  |

Table 4.2.21 Professional and Support staff leavers by grade (STEMM), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Year | Female count | Male count | Total count | Female \% | \% F in population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 1-5 | 2017 |  |  |  | 64.7\% | 69.9\% |
| Grade 1-5 | 2018 |  |  |  | 52.6\% | 69.8\% |
| Grade 1-5 | 2019 |  |  |  | 69.6\% | 70.6\% |
| Total |  | 75 | 41 | 116 | 64.7\% |  |
| Grade 6 | 2017 |  |  |  | 46.7\% | 68.8\% |
| Grade 6 | 2018 |  |  |  | 66.7\% | 68.7\% |
| Grade 6 | 2019 |  |  |  | 58.8\% | 73.3\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 54.3\% |  |
| Grade 7 | 2017 |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 60.0\% |
| Grade 7 | 2018 |  |  |  | 60.0\% | 61.8\% |
| Grade 7 | 2019 |  |  |  | 60.0\% | 65.0\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 63.4\% |  |
| Grade 8 | 2017 |  |  |  | N/A | 27.3\% |
| Grade 8 | 2018 |  |  |  | 0.0\% | 30.0\% |
| Grade 8 | 2019 |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 38.5\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 50.0\% |  |
| Grade 9 | 2017 |  |  |  | N/A | 75.0\% |
| Grade 9 | 2018 |  |  |  | 100.00\% | 66.7\% |
| Grade 9 | 2019 |  |  |  | N/A | 66.7\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 100.0\% |  |
| Other | 2017 |  |  |  | 46.4\% | 55.1\% |
| Other | 2018 |  |  |  | 53.7\% | 51.8\% |
| Other | 2019 |  |  |  | 52.8\% | 51.2\% |
| Total |  | 99 | 98 | 197 | 50.3\% |  |
| Total | 2017 | 80 | 71 | 151 | 53.0\% | 61.46\% |
| Total | 2018 | 38 | 32 | 70 | 54.3\% | 62.15\% |
| Total | 2019 | 84 | 57 | 141 | 59.6\% | 67.14\% |
| Three-year total |  | 202 | 160 | 362 | 55.8\% |  |

Table 4.2.22 Professional and Support staff leavers by grade (AHSSBL), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Grade | Year | Female count | Male count | Total count | Female \% | \% F in population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| National Minimum Wage | 2017 |  |  |  | 85.7\% | 100.0\% |
| National Minimum Wage | 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |
| National Minimum Wage | 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 85.7\% |  |
| Grade 1-5 | 2017 |  |  |  | 79.3\% | 79.0\% |
| Grade 1-5 | 2018 |  |  |  | 81.0\% | 79.5\% |
| Grade 1-5 | 2019 |  |  |  | 81.6\% | 79.3\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 80.7\% |  |
| Grade 6 | 2017 |  |  |  | 64.3\% | 71.3\% |
| Grade 6 | 2018 |  |  |  | 33.3\% | 68.6\% |
| Grade 6 | 2019 |  |  |  | 52.6\% | 69.7\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 55.6\% |  |
| Grade 7 | 2017 |  |  |  | 80.0\% | 63.3\% |
| Grade 7 | 2018 |  |  |  | 0.0\% | 73.7\% |
| Grade 7 | 2019 |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 76.9\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 54.5\% |  |
| Grade 8 | 2017 |  |  |  | N/A | 57.1\% |
| Grade 8 | 2018 |  |  |  | N/A | 55.6\% |
| Grade 8 | 2019 |  |  |  | 0.0\% | 57.1\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |
| Grade 9 | 2017 |  |  |  | 0.0\% | 25.0\% |
| Grade 9 | 2018 |  |  |  | N/A | 20.0\% |
| Grade 9 | 2019 |  |  |  | 0.0\% | 21.4\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |
| Sessionals | 2017 |  |  |  | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Sessionals | 2018 |  |  |  | N/A | 100.0\% |
| Sessionals | 2019 |  |  |  | N/A |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |
| Other | 2017 |  |  |  | 69.5\% | 64.1\% |
| Other | 2018 |  |  |  | 47.8\% | 71.7\% |
| Other | 2019 |  |  |  | 71.4\% | 63.3\% |
| Total |  | 62 | 34 | 96 | 64.6\% |  |
| Total | 2017 | 83 | 33 | 116 | 71.6\% | 71.39\% |
| Total | 2018 | 29 | 20 | 49 | 59.2\% | 71.87\% |
| Total | 2019 | 53 | 24 | 77 | 68.8\% | 72.17\% |
| Three-year total |  | 165 | 77 | 242 | 68.2\% |  |

Turnover by grade is shown in table 4.2.23. Although there are fluctuations, over a three-year period there are no gender concerns.

Table 4.2.23 Professional and Support turnover by grade

| Grade |  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 1-5 | Female Leavers |  |  |  |
| Grade 1-5 | Male Leavers |  |  |  |
| Grade 1-5 | Total Grade 1-5 females |  |  |  |
| Grade 1-5 | Total Grade 1-5 males |  |  |  |
|  | \% Female Grade 1-5 Turnover | 19.1\% | 8.1\% | 20.6\% |
|  | \% Male Grade 1-5 Turnover | 21.2\% | 10.3\% | 19.2\% |
| Grade 6 | Female Leavers |  |  |  |
| Grade 6 | Male Leavers |  |  |  |
| Grade 6 | Total Grade 6 females |  |  |  |
| Grade 6 | Total Grade 6 males |  |  |  |
|  | \% Female Grade 6 Turnover | 10.8\% | 3.4\% | 11.8\% |
|  | \% Male Grade 6 Turnover | 12.0\% | 4.6\% | 17.7\% |
| Grade 7 | Female Leavers |  |  |  |
| Grade 7 | Male Leavers |  |  |  |
| Grade 7 | Total Grade 7 females |  |  |  |
| Grade 7 | Total Grade 7 males |  |  |  |
|  | \% Female Grade 7 Turnover | 9.0\% | 4.3\% | 8.3\% |
|  | \% Male Grade 7 Turnover | 8.4\% | 8.4\% | 10.9\% |
| Grade 8 | Female Leavers |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 | Male Leavers |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 | Total Grade 8 females |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 | Total Grade 8 males |  |  |  |
|  | \% Female Grade 8 Turnover | 16.0\% | 3.7\% | 8.5\% |
|  | \% Male Grade 8 Turnover | 2.4\% | 7.9\% | 15.8 |
| Grade 9 | Female Leavers |  |  |  |
| Grade 9 | Male Leavers |  |  |  |
| Grade 9 | Total Grade 9 females |  |  |  |
| Grade 9 | Total Grade 9 males |  |  |  |
|  | \% Female Grade 9 Turnover | 18.5\% | 11.1\% | 7.7\% |
|  | \% Male Grade 9 Turnover | 12.9\% | 3.0\% | 19.4\% |
| Total | Female Leavers | 242 | 100 | 264 |
|  | Male Leavers | 143 | 75 | 155 |
|  | Total Females | 1501 | 1536 | 1611 |
|  | Total Males | 868 | 877 | 884 |
|  | \% Female Turnover | 16.1\% | 6.5\% | 16.4\% |
|  | \%Male Turnover | 16.5\% | 8.6\% | 17.5\% |

Reasons for leaving are shown in Table 4.2.24. \%F redundancy in 2017 was high though numbers are low. \%F end of FT contracts is high in 2019 (Action AP2019: G2.1, G2.2 section 4.1)

Table 4.2.24 Professional and Support staff reasons for leaving (whole University), by count of records [Source: Trent]

| Reason for <br> leaving | 2017 |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  | 2019 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | M | $\%$ | F | M | $\%$ | F | M | $\%$ |  |
| Other | 31 | 31 | $50.0 \%$ |  |  | $66.7 \%$ |  |  | $60.0 \%$ |  |
| Death |  |  |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ |  |  | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| End of FT contract | 161 | 87 | $64.9 \%$ | 57 | 49 | $53.8 \%$ | 76 | 52 | $77.6 \%$ |  |
| Redundancy |  |  | $80 \%$ |  |  | $40.0 \%$ |  |  | $68.0 \%$ |  |
| Resignation | 262 | 161 | $61.9 \%$ | 91 | 63 | $59.1 \%$ | 198 | 104 | $65.6 \%$ |  |
| Retirement |  |  | $60 \%$ |  |  | $44.4 \%$ |  |  | $37.8 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 0 \%}$ |  |

In one of the Functions, informal exit interviews have highlighted career development (Table 4.2.25) (Actions AP2019 B4.2 and B8.1) Of the 38 leavers, .. moved to higher grades within the University, and .. embarked on further study or PhDs. .. of these were female. There are no gender issues.

Table 4.2.25 P\&S staff reasons for leaving in one Function (over a 3 year period)

| Reason for leaving | Female | Male |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Relocation |  |  |
| Left during probation |  |  |
| Took up PhD |  |  |
| Further study |  |  |
| New position at another University |  |  |
| Recruited to a higher grade in same Function |  |  |
| Recruited to a higher grade in different Function |  |  |
| Travel |  |  |
| Change of career |  |  |
| Similar career in private sector/FE |  |  |
| Unknown |  |  |
| Retirement |  |  |
| Total |  |  |

## New actions

| AP2019 B4.2 | Roll out new online Leavers' Questionnaire (providing data on reasons for leaving and experience of UoR <br> to supplement existing Leaver's Form completed by line manager). Review completion rates after 3 <br> months, and then review new data provided on reasons for leaving annually, with a view to addressing <br> issues raised. |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 B8.1 | Explore, with HR Systems, whether it is possible to establish system to track career progress of staff within <br> University. |

## 5. SUPPORTING AND ADVANCING WOMEN'S CAREERS

Recommended word count: Bronze: 5000 words | Silver: 6000 words
5.1. Key career transition points: academic staff (1025 words, total (i)-(iv))
(i) Recruitment ( 224 words)

Break down data by gender and grade for applications, long-and shortlisted candidates, offer and acceptance rates. Comment on how recruitment processes ensure that women (and men in underrepresented disciplines) are encouraged to apply.

## Closed out actions and impact from Bronze Action Plan

| AP2016: B6 | Recruitment system (Jobtrain) has been launched enabling tracking of applicants <br> through recruitment process. | $\checkmark$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AP2016: D2 | Faces of Reading webpages created, highlighting diversity of staff and job roles (detail <br> $\S 5.6(\mathrm{x}))$. | $\checkmark$ |

When advertising, we use a variety of media and job boards, depending on the role, to widen selection pool. For specific roles where there is an under-representation of gender, recruiting managers may be encouraged to seek out particular specific recruitment channels (e.g. through our WISE membership).

All job ads state 'The University is committed to having a diverse and inclusive workforce, supports the gender equality Athena SWAN Charter'.... 'Applications for job-share, part-time and flexible working arrangements are welcomed', this supported by job-share/flexible working examples on Faces of Reading. Banners on the Job Ad pages link to the Equality and Diversity Networks and Faces of Reading webpages.

All recruiters are required to complete UB training.

In the data below, focussing on three-year totals and the last column, women are more than 5 p.p. underrepresented at:

- applicant stage at grades 7-9 in both STEMM/AHSSBL, particularly G9 (Professor) in AHSSBL
- successful-appointment stage at G9/Professor in both AHSSBL/STEMM, with only $25 \%$ of university professorial appointments women over last 3 years.

The actions below derive from the SAT Equal Pay/Gender Pay Gap Working Group, reflecting on this data and other factors (see §4.1(v)), refined via Table 3.6 consultation. AP2019:B3.1 addresses high unknowns (U).

Table 5.1.1. Recruitment of Academic and research staff (whole University), by count of records (Grade 6) [Source: Jobtrain] N.B. U is 'Unknown', F\%WU is \%F ignoring U, i.e. as fraction of F+M.

| Closing date time period | Stage | F | M | U | Total | F\% | F\%WU |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Application | 921 | 1114 | 59 | 2094 | $44.0 \%$ | $45.3 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Interviewed | 237 | 230 | 40 | 507 | $46.7 \%$ | $50.7 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Successful | 107 | 91 | 32 | 230 | $46.5 \%$ | $54.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Application | 822 | 976 | 86 | 1884 | $43.6 \%$ | $45.7 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Interviewed | 201 | 225 | 67 | 493 | $40.8 \%$ | $47.2 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Successful | 99 | 93 | 67 | 259 | $38.2 \%$ | $51.6 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Application | 708 | 776 | 69 | 1553 | $45.6 \%$ | $47.7 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Interviewed | 188 | 191 | 63 | 442 | $42.5 \%$ | $49.6 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Successful | 94 | 90 | 62 | 246 | $38.2 \%$ | $51.1 \%$ |
| Total | Application | $\mathbf{2 4 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 1 \%}$ |
| Total | Interviewed | $\mathbf{6 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 2 \%}$ |
| Total | Successful | $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 . 3 \%}$ |

Table 5.1.2 Recruitment of Academic and research staff (whole University), by count of records (Lecturer/ Grade 7) [Source: Jobtrain] N.B. U is 'Unknown', F\%WU is \%F ignoring U, i.e. as fraction of F+M.

| Time period | Stage | F | M | U | Total | F\% | F\%WU |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Application | 667 | 1006 | 29 | 1702 | $39.2 \%$ | $39.9 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Interviewed | 120 | 108 | 12 | 240 | $50.0 \%$ | $52.6 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Successful | 44 | 29 | 12 | 85 | $51.8 \%$ | $60.3 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Application | 917 | 1321 | 56 | 2294 | $40.0 \%$ | $41.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Interviewed | 136 | 123 | 20 | 279 | $48.7 \%$ | $52.5 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Successful | 51 | 40 | 18 | 109 | $46.8 \%$ | $56.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Application | 338 | 511 | 20 | 869 | $38.9 \%$ | $39.8 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Interviewed | 61 | 76 | 11 | 148 | $41.2 \%$ | $44.5 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Successful | 25 | 31 | 11 | 67 | $37.3 \%$ | $44.6 \%$ |
| Total | Application | $\mathbf{1 9 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 4 \%}$ |
| Total | Interviewed | $\mathbf{3 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 4 \%}$ |
| Total | Successful | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 . 5 \%}$ |

Table 5.1.3 Recruitment of Academic and research staff (whole University), by count of records (Associate Professor/Grade 8) [Source: Jobtrain] N.B. U is 'Unknown', F\%WU is \%F ignoring U, i.e. as fraction of F+M.

| Time period | Stage | F | M | U | Total | F\% | F\%WU |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and 30/9/17 | Application |  |  |  |  | $43.5 \%$ | $44.2 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $39.1 \%$ | $39.1 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Successful |  |  |  |  | $16.7 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Application |  |  |  |  | $32.2 \%$ | $32.8 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $42.4 \%$ | $45.2 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Successful |  |  |  |  | $42.9 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Application |  |  |  |  | $37.5 \%$ | $38.2 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $55.6 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Successful |  |  |  |  | $66.7 \%$ | $75.0 \%$ |
| Total | Application | $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 . 4 \%}$ |
| Total | Interviewed | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 8}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 5 \%}$ |
| Total | Successful |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4 4 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 0 \%}$ |

Table 5.1.4 Recruitment of Academic and research staff (whole University), by count of records (Professor/Grade 9) [Source: Jobtrain] N.B. U is 'Unknown', F\%WU is \%F ignoring U, i.e. as fraction of F+M.

| Time period | Stage | F | M | U | Total | F\% | F\%WU |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and 30/9/17 | Application |  |  |  |  | $35.7 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $18.2 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Successful |  |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Application |  |  |  |  | $17.1 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $25.0 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Successful |  |  |  |  | $25.0 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Application |  |  |  |  | $47.1 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $50.0 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Successful |  |  |  |  | $33.3 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Total | Application | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 0 \%}$ |
| Total | Interviewed |  |  |  | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 3 \%}$ |
| Total | Successful |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 1 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 0 \%}$ |

Table 5.1.5 Recruitment of Academic and research staff (STEMM), by count of records (Grade 6) [Source: Jobtrain]

| Time period | Stage | F | M | U | Total | F \% | F\%WU |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and 30/9/17 | Application | 611 | 832 | 51 | 1494 | $40.9 \%$ | $42.3 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Interviewed | 157 | 166 | 35 | 358 | $43.9 \%$ | $48.6 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Successful | 61 | 57 | 28 | 146 | $41.8 \%$ | $50.8 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Application | 661 | 820 | 33 | 1514 | $43.7 \%$ | $51.7 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Interviewed | 141 | 171 | 19 | 331 | $42.6 \%$ | $41.2 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Successful | 61 | 63 | 19 | 143 | $42.7 \%$ | $49.1 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Application | 481 | 617 | 27 | 1125 | $42.8 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Interviewed | 129 | 137 | 24 | 290 | $44.5 \%$ | $48.4 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Successful | 53 | 54 | 23 | 130 | $40.8 \%$ | $49.5 \%$ |
| Total | Application | $\mathbf{1 7 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 . 6 \%}$ |
| Total | Interviewed | $\mathbf{4 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 . 4 \%}$ |
| Total | Successful | $\mathbf{1 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 1 \%}$ |

Table 5.1.6 Recruitment of Academic and research staff (STEMM), by count of records (Grade 7) [Source: Jobtrain]

| Time period | Stage | F | M | U | Total | F \% | F\%WU |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Application |  |  |  |  | $41.7 \%$ | $42.4 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $49.0 \%$ | $51.5 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Successful |  |  |  |  | $51.4 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Application |  |  |  |  | $34.7 \%$ | $35.4 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $54.1 \%$ | $56.7 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Successful |  |  |  |  | $47.5 \%$ | $54.3 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Application |  |  |  |  | $40.8 \%$ | $41.7 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $44.7 \%$ | $46.7 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Successful |  |  |  |  | $45.8 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| Total | Application | $\mathbf{5 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 0 \%}$ |
| Total | Interviewed | $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 . 8 \%}$ |
| Total | Successful | $\mathbf{4 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 2 \%}$ |

Table 5.1.7 Recruitment of Academic and research staff (STEMM), by count of records (Grade 8) [Source: Jobtrain]

| Time period | Stage | F | M | U | Total | F\% | F\%WU |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and 30/9/17 | Application | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and 30/9/17 | Interviewed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and 30/9/17 | Successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Application |  |  |  |  | $34.1 \%$ | $35.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $42.9 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Successful |  |  |  |  | $40.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Application |  |  |  |  | $40.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $40.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Successful |  |  |  |  | $33.3 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| Total | Application |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{3 4 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 2 \%}$ |
| Total | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4 1 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 0 \%}$ |
| Total | Successful |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{3 7 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 0 \%}$ |

Table 5.1.8 Recruitment of Academic and research staff (STEMM), by count of records (Grade 9) [Source: Jobtrain]

| Time period | Stage | F | M | U | Total | F\% | F\%WU |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and 30/9/17 | Application | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and 30/9/17 | Interviewed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and 30/9/17 | Successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Application |  |  |  |  | $16.7 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $20.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Successful |  |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Application |  |  |  |  | $50.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $60.0 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Successful |  |  |  |  | $50.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| Total | Application |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4 0 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 9 \%}$ |
| Total | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 0 \%}$ |
| Total | Successful |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 5 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 0 \%}$ |

Table 5.1.9 Recruitment of Academic and research staff (AHSSBL), by count of records (Grade 6) [Source: Jobtrain]

| Time period | Stage | F | M | U | Total | F\% | F\%WU |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Application | 299 | 271 | 8 | 578 | $51.7 \%$ | $52.5 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Interviewed | 76 | 63 | 5 | 144 | $52.8 \%$ | $54.7 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Successful | 45 | 34 | 4 | 83 | $54.2 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Application | 161 | 156 | 52 | 369 | $43.6 \%$ | $50.8 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Interviewed | 60 | 54 | 47 | 161 | $37.3 \%$ | $52.6 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Successful | 38 | 30 | 47 | 115 | $33.0 \%$ | $55.9 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Application | 209 | 149 | 42 | 400 | $52.3 \%$ | $58.4 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Interviewed | 56 | 51 | 39 | 146 | $38.4 \%$ | $52.3 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Successful | 40 | 35 | 39 | 114 | $35.1 \%$ | $53.3 \%$ |
| Total | Application | $\mathbf{6 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 7 \%}$ | $53.7 \%$ |
| Total | Interviewed | $\mathbf{1 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 3 \%}$ |
| Total | Successful | $\mathbf{1 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 4 \%}$ |

Table 5.1.10 Recruitment of Academic and research staff (AHSSBL), by count of records (Grade 7) [Source: Jobtrain]

| Time period | Stage | F | M | U | Total | F\% | F\%WU |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Application |  |  |  |  | $38.1 \%$ | $38.7 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $51.1 \%$ | $53.9 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Successful |  |  |  |  | $53.1 \%$ | $61.9 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Application |  |  |  |  | $42.3 \%$ | $43.4 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $45.0 \%$ | $49.4 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Successful |  |  |  |  | $45.6 \%$ | $56.4 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Application |  |  |  |  | $38.2 \%$ | $39.1 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $39.6 \%$ | $43.5 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Successful |  |  |  |  | $32.6 \%$ | $41.2 \%$ |
| Total | Application | $\mathbf{1 3 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 0 \%}$ |
| Total | Interviewed | $\mathbf{1 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 5 \%}$ |
| Total | Successful | $\mathbf{7 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 . 2 \%}$ |

Table 5.1.11 Recruitment of Academic and research staff (AHSSBL), by count of records (Grade 8) [Source: Jobtrain]

| Time period | Stage | F | M | U | Total | F\% | F\%WU |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Application |  |  |  |  | $43.5 \%$ | $44.2 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $39.1 \%$ | $36.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and $30 / 9 / 17$ | Successful |  |  |  |  | $16.7 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Application |  |  |  |  | $31.6 \%$ | $32.1 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $42.3 \%$ | $44.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and $30 / 9 / 18$ | Successful |  |  |  |  | $44.4 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Application |  |  |  |  | $37.3 \%$ | $37.3 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $61.5 \%$ | $61.5 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and $30 / 9 / 19$ | Successful |  |  |  |  | $83.3 \%$ | $83.3 \%$ |
| Total | Application | $\mathbf{1 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 6}$ |  | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 . 1 \%}$ |
| Total | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4 5 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 9 \%}$ |
| Total | Successful |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4 7 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 0 \%}$ |

Table 5.1.12 Recruitment of Academic and research staff (AHSSBL), by count of records (Grade: 9) [Source: Jobtrain]

| Time period | Stage | F | M | U | Total | F\% | F\%WU |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and 30/9/17 | Application |  |  |  |  | $35.7 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and 30/9/17 | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $18.2 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 16$ and 30/9/17 | Successful |  |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Application |  |  |  |  | $16.1 \%$ | $16.4 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $23.1 \%$ | $23.1 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 17$ and 30/9/18 | Successful |  |  |  |  | $25.0 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Application |  |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $1 / 10 / 18$ and 30/9/19 | Successful |  |  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Total | Application |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 2 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 3 \%}$ |
| Total | Interviewed |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 8 \%}$ |
| Total | Successful |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{1 5 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 0 \%}$ |


| New actions | AP2019 C1.1 <br> AP2019 C1.2 <br> AP2019 C1.3 <br> Aste on starting salaries" referencing the University's gender pay gap and its reporting, and the need <br> not set salaries for new starters with awareness of salaries of existing staff. |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 C1.4 | Adjust the New Starter Form on JobTrain recruitment system so that appointing managers required to <br> justify starting salary (where above bottom of grade). |
| Introduce and communicate a policy for the use of Market-Rate salary supplements. |  |
| As additional information to assist in arriving at fair decisions for starting salaries for more senior <br> posts, make available to chairs of interview panels across the University for appointments at G7 or <br> above: Salaries in that school/function for similar roles, provided by the HoS/HoF (who would <br> i) <br> normally be on the panel) via the Manager Self Service function on Trent, to be soft rolled out in <br> December; <br> ii) Exceptionally, where i) is not relevant, salaries for similar posts across the University to be |  |
| provided through HoS/HoF conversation with HR Partner. |  |

(ii) Induction (206 words)

Describe the induction and support provided to new all staff at all levels. Comment on the uptake of this and how its effectiveness is reviewed.
Our inductions have three components: central, local (School/Function), line manager.
In 2018 we re-designed and relaunched our central induction day to make it more innovative, dynamic, and engaging. We moved to a more interactive approach (Table 5.1.13).

Table 5.1.13 Central Induction Day programme

| Welcome and introduction from the VC |
| :--- |
| University of Reading Board game (Figure 5.1.1) |
| $>$ Diversity and Inclusion |
| $>$ Values and Behaviours |
| $>$ History of University of Reading |
| $>$ Research, Teaching and Learning |
| $>$ Our students |
| $>$ Our workplace |

- Video celebrating our $90^{\text {th }}$ anniversary as a University
- Our People Plan (see §7)
- Our '3Rs' of Leadership: Resourceful, Responsible and Respectful


## Marketplace

- University Benefits
- Meet representatives from the trade union and staff forum
- Meet staff from Women@Reading, Parent and Family Network, LGBT+ Network, etc.


## Closed out action and impact from Bronze Action Plan

AP 2016: E3 $\quad$ Central induction overhauled with increased focus on Diversity and Inclusion and very good feedback as evidence of impact:

- Central Induction is being highly recommended to new staff by other recent joiners
- Numbers of all staff (academic and PS) attendees are increasing
- Satisfaction rates have increased to $100 \%$ of attendees rating the day as either excellent (56\%) or good (44\%) compared to previous results of $88 \%$ overall with $25 \%$ excellent, $63 \%$ good, $11 \%$ average).

We were the only University to be shortlisted for the finals of the Training Journal awards in 2018 for our new induction and board game. We will use the Board Game also with existing staff (AP2019:I8.1).

Figure 5.1.1 Induction Board Game (Diversity and Inclusion cards are dark green)


More females than males attend our induction (Table 5.1.14).

All new staff additionally are required, with email reminders, to complete a suite of mandatory eLearning modules, including Diversity and Inclusion with a required pass rate of $80 \%$.

Table 5.1.14 A\&R Attendance at Central Induction

|  | A\&R males | A\&R females | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2016 / 2017$ | 32 | 43 | 75 |
| $2017 / 2018$ | 27 | 45 | 72 |
| $2018 / 2019$ | 35 | 30 | 65 |

We have superb practice in many Schools (e.g. HBS, Figure 5.1.2) regarding local induction and should be sharing this (Action AP2019:I8.2).

Figure 5.1.2. Local Induction


Welcome to the Henley Business School -
New Starter Resource Centre
Here you can find all the information you need to help get
your career at Henley off to a great start!
Follow the links below to discover your place within the Henley Business School
community.
Cant find what yourt looking for? Gest infouch and et us know


| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 I8.1 | Raise awareness of availability of Induction Board Game for Schools and Functions as a way to keep up <br> with changes that new staff are made aware of at induction |
| AP2019 I8.2 | Through DICOP undertake a review of inductions at School and Function level and share good practice. |

(iii) Promotion (547 words)

Provide data on staff applying for promotion and comment on applications and success rates by gender, grade and full- and part-time status. Comment on any evidence of a gender pay gap in promotions at any grade.

Largescale changes were introduced in the main academic promotions process (Lecturer/G7 to Associate Professor/G8, and AP/G8 to Professor/G9) for the 2016/17 round and are described in the box.

| Closed out action and impact from Bronze Action Plan |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AP 2016:C7 | In 2016/17 the University Academic Promotions process was completely overhauled introducing following features: <br> - Criteria-based application and pro-forma rather than judgement of CV <br> - Citizenship criterion, requiring demonstrating taking share of important nonresearch/teaching work: examples given include outreach, open days, admin roles, D\&। work <br> - Routes (and different criteria) for Teaching-focussed, Research-focussed, T\&R staff (but all must meet Citizenship criterion) <br> - All Schools have formal promotion committees (with gender-balance sought by governance), plus Promotion Mentors to support applications <br> - Systematic training in applications, open to all, before promotion round, plus training for Mentors <br> - As first stage School Promotion Committees consider systematically all possible candidates, with exploratory conversations as needed <br> - Process changes to guard personal circumstances considerations against bias, and to detail impact in terms of quantity reasonably expected for each criterion <br> - Contextual statements introduced laying out expectations for each discipline (e.g. grant income, publication rates) <br> The data in this section (and in $\S 4.1(i)$ ), together with our Evaluation of New Academic Promotion Processes Survey (Table 3.5) make clear that there has been large impact of these collective changes on promotion of women to Professor. In the three rounds (2016/17 to $2018 / 19$ ) with the new system there have been 82 promotions to professor (53F:29M, $64.6 \% \mathrm{~F}$ ). In the previous three years there were 43 professorial promotions ( $11 \mathrm{~F}: 32 \mathrm{M}$, $25.6 \%$ F). This sea-change has impacted strongly to increase \%F professors (see §4.1(i)). <br> It is difficult to disentangle which of the above changes have had impact, but survey feedback suggested criteria-based system and support (especially promotion mentoring) valued by female applicants and encouraged applications. Example feedback: <br> 'I definitely fit the profile of a woman who was over ready for promotion but unconfident to apply. I would have applied earlier if the new processes had been in place' <br> 'I really appreciate the opportunity to detail how parental leave had impacted my career under each of the criteria.' | $\checkmark$ |

It is clear from Tables 5.1.16-5.1.19 that the change has had large impact on promotion of women to professor (and see above box), across the whole University and within STEMM/AHSSBL, with $65 \%$ of professorial promotions women since the change. At AP level $49 \%$ of the promotions have been women in total over the last three years,
but with a smaller proportion in STEMM, and smaller than the population at Lecturer/G7 (Table 4.1.2). We will monitor this and see if actions AP2019:B1.1, B1.2, H1.1 have effect

An inequality with respect to contract type (T only/R only/T\&R) was noted already in Table 4.1.28 and action AP2019:H3.1 proposed.

Table 5.1.16 Academic and research staff promotion (whole University), Associate Professor [Source:
Governance]

|  | Applications |  |  |  | Successful cases |  |  |  | Success rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | M | Tot | F \% | F | M | Tot | F \% | F | M |
| 2015/16 |  |  |  | 44.4\% |  |  |  | 48.1\% | 81.3\% | 75.0\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 42.9\% |  |  |  | 60.0\% | 100.0\% | 71.4\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 48.1\% |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 76.9\% | 74.1\% |
| R only |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% | N/A | 100.0\% |
| 2016/17 |  |  |  | 54.2\% |  |  |  | 55.3\% | 53.8\% | 52.8\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 73.3\% |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 27.3\% | 40.0\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 50.0\% |  |  |  | 56.3\% | 64.3\% | 57.1\% |
| R only |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | N/A | N/A | 0.0\% |
| 2017/18 |  |  |  | 43.9\% |  |  |  | 40.0\% | 55.2\% | 60.6\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 70.0\% |  |  |  | 61.5\% | 57.1\% | 65.0\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 32.6\% |  |  |  | 29.6\% | 53.3\% | 58.7\% |
| 2018/19 |  |  |  | 55.6\% |  |  |  | 52.2\% | 60.0\% | 63.9\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 71.4\% |  |  |  | 73.3\% | 73.3\% | 71.4\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 49.0\% |  |  |  | 41.9\% | 52.0\% | 60.8\% |

Table 5.1.17 Academic and research staff promotion (whole University), Professor [Source: Governance]

|  | Applications |  |  |  | Successful cases |  |  |  | Success rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | M | Tot | F \% | F | M | Tot | F \% | F | M |
| 2015/16 |  |  |  | 38.1\% |  |  |  | 25.0\% | 37.5\% | 57.1\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 33.3\% |  |  |  | N/A | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 43.8\% |  |  |  | 30.0\% | 42.9\% | 62.5\% |
| R only |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% | N/A | 100.0\% |
| 2016/17 |  |  |  | 56.8\% |  |  |  | 60.0\% | 36.0\% | 34.1\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 85.7\% |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 66.7\% | 57.1\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 51.4\% |  |  |  | 45.5\% | 27.8\% | 31.4\% |
| R only |  |  |  | 50.0\% |  |  |  | N/A | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 2017/18 |  |  |  | 58.2\% |  |  |  | 71.4\% | 62.5\% | 50.9\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 80.0\% |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 50.0\% | 40.0\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 53.3\% |  |  |  | 66.7\% | 66.7\% | 53.3\% |
| 2018/19 |  |  |  | 54.5\% |  |  |  | 61.5\% | 80.0\% | 70.9\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 50.0\% |  |  |  | 55.6\% | 83.3\% | 75.0\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 57.1\% |  |  |  | 63.3\% | 79.2\% | 71.4\% |
| R only |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | N/A | N/A | 0.0\% |

Table 5.1.18 Academic and research staff promotion (STEMM), Associate Professor [Source: Governance]

|  | Applications |  |  |  | Successful cases |  |  |  | Success rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | M | Tot | F \% | F | M | Tot | F \% | F | M |
| 2015/16 |  |  |  | 35.0\% |  |  |  | 41.2\% | 100.0\% | 85.0\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 50.0\% |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 50.0\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 35.3\% |  |  |  | 40.0\% | 100.0\% | 88.2\% |
| R only |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% | N/A | 100.0\% |
| 2016/17 |  |  |  | 35.1\% |  |  |  | 47.6\% | 76.9\% | 56.8\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 66.7\% |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 66.7\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 33.3\% |  |  |  | 47.4\% | 81.8\% | 57.6\% |
| R only |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | N/A | N/A | 0.0\% |
| 2017/18 |  |  |  | 37.1\% |  |  |  | 30.4\% | 53.8\% | 65.7\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 66.7\% |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 66.7\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 26.9\% |  |  |  | 23.5\% | 57.1\% | 65.4\% |
| 2018/19 |  |  |  | 43.9\% |  |  |  | 37.0\% | 55.6\% | 65.9\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 66.7\% |  |  |  | 71.4\% | 83.3\% | 77.8\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 37.5\% |  |  |  | 25.0\% | 41.7\% | 62.5\% |

Table 5.1.19 Academic and research staff promotion (STEMM), Professor [Source: Governance]

|  | Application |  |  |  | Successful cases |  |  |  | Success rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | M | Tot | F \% | F | M | Tot | F \% | F | M |
| 2015/16 |  |  |  | 20.0\% |  |  |  | 12.5\% | 50.0\% | 80.0\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | N/A | N/A | 0.0\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 28.6\% |  |  |  | 16.7\% | 50.0\% | 85.7\% |
| R only |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% | N/A | 100.0\% |
| 2016/17 |  |  |  | 47.6\% |  |  |  | 44.4\% | 40.0\% | 42.9\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 50.0\% |  |  |  | 44.4\% | 40.0\% | 45.0\% |
| R only |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | N/A | N/A | 0.0\% |
| 2017/18 |  |  |  | 54.8\% |  |  |  | 68.2\% | 88.2\% | 71.0\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 100.0\% |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 66.7\% | 66.7\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 50.0\% |  |  |  | 65.0\% | 92.9\% | 71.4\% |
| 2018/19 |  |  |  | 52.4\% |  |  |  | 64.3\% | 81.8\% | 66.7\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 33.3\% |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 100.0\% | 66.7\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 58.8\% |  |  |  | 66.7\% | 80.0\% | 70.6\% |
| R only |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | N/A | N/A | 0.0\% |

Table 5.1.20 Academic and research staff promotion (AHSSBL), Associate Professor [Source: Governance]

|  | Application |  |  |  | Successful cases |  |  |  | Success rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | M | Tot | F \% | F | M | Tot | F \% | F | M |
| 2015/16 |  |  |  | 56.3\% |  |  |  | 60.0\% | 66.7\% | 62.5\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 40.0\% |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 100.0\% | 80.0\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 70.0\% |  |  |  | 80.0\% | 57.1\% | 50.0\% |
| R only |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% | N/A | 100.0\% |
| 2016/17 |  |  |  | 73.5\% |  |  |  | 64.7\% | 44.0\% | 50.0\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 72.7\% |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 25.0\% | 36.4\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 73.9\% |  |  |  | 69.2\% | 52.9\% | 56.5\% |
| 2017/18 |  |  |  | 51.6\% |  |  |  | 52.9\% | 56.3\% | 54.8\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 72.7\% |  |  |  | 71.4\% | 62.5\% | 63.6\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 40.0\% |  |  |  | 40.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% |
| 2018/19 |  |  |  | 71.0\% |  |  |  | 73.7\% | 63.6\% | 61.3\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 75.0\% |  |  |  | 75.0\% | 66.7\% | 66.7\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 68.4\% |  |  |  | 72.7\% | 61.5\% | 57.9\% |

Table 5.1.21 Academic and research staff promotion (AHSSBL), Professor [Source: Governance]

|  | Application |  |  |  | Successful cases |  |  |  | Success rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | M | Tot | F \% | F | M | Tot | F \% | F | M |
| 2015/16 |  |  |  | 54.5\% |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 33.3\% | 36.4\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 50.0\% |  |  |  | N/A | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 55.6\% |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 40.0\% | 44.4\% |
| 2016/17 |  |  |  | 65.2\% |  |  |  | 83.3\% | 33.3\% | 26.1\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 85.7\% |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 66.7\% | 57.1\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 53.3\% |  |  |  | 50.0\% | 12.5\% | 13.3\% |
| R only |  |  |  | 100.0\% |  |  |  | N/A | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 2017/18 |  |  |  | 62.5\% |  |  |  | 83.3\% | 33.3\% | 25.0\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 71.4\% |  |  |  | 100.0\% | 40.0\% | 28.6\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 58.8\% |  |  |  | 75.0\% | 30.0\% | 23.5\% |
| 2018/19 |  |  |  | 55.9\% |  |  |  | 60.0\% | 78.9\% | 73.5\% |
| T only |  |  |  | 55.6\% |  |  |  | 57.1\% | 80.0\% | 77.8\% |
| T\&R |  |  |  | 56.0\% |  |  |  | 61.1\% | 78.6\% | 72.0\% |

Full-time/Part-time comparisons. Part time applications have increased under the new system (2016/17 onwards, Table 5.1.22) but success rates have fallen (PT success rate is $48 \%$ averaged over last three years), and are 7 p.p. lower than FT success rates. Tables 5.1.22-23 show gender split, female PT success rate below male at AP and P. Additionally to the survey we ran a small focus group (7, but many PT) with feedback that promotions guidance about PT staff (predominantly female) gives excessive decision-maker discretion, leading to AP2019:H9.1.

Table 5.1.22 Success rates by full-time/part-time mode: all applications

| Year | Full-time |  |  |  | Part-time |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Successful |  | Unsuccessful |  | Successful |  | Unsuccessful |  |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| $2013 / 4$ | 51 | $70 \%$ | 22 | $30 \%$ |  | $50 \%$ |  | $50 \%$ |
| $2014 / 5$ |  | $76 \%$ |  | $24 \%$ |  | $75 \%$ |  | $25 \%$ |
| $2015 / 6$ |  | $69 \%$ |  | $31 \%$ |  | $60 \%$ |  | $40 \%$ |
| $2016 / 7$ | 55 | $50 \%$ | 56 | $50 \%$ |  | $36 \%$ |  | $64 \%$ |
| $2017 / 8$ | 65 | $58 \%$ | 47 | $26 \%$ |  | $56 \%$ |  | $44 \%$ |
| $2018 / 9$ | 81 | $68 \%$ | 39 | $32 \%$ |  | $50 \%$ |  | $50 \%$ |

Table 5.1.23 Academic and research staff promotion by full-time/part-time mode (whole University), Associate Professor

| Mode | Year | Application |  |  |  | Successful cases |  |  |  |  | Success rate |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | M | Total | F \% | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{M}$ | Total | F \% | F | M |  |
| FT | $2016 / 17$ |  |  |  | $51.5 \%$ |  |  |  | $54.1 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ | $53.1 \%$ |  |
| FT | $2017 / 18$ |  |  |  | $39.3 \%$ |  |  |  | $36.4 \%$ | $54.5 \%$ | $61.8 \%$ |  |
| FT | $2018 / 19$ |  |  |  | $52.3 \%$ |  |  |  | $48.8 \%$ | $61.8 \%$ | $71.0 \%$ |  |
| FT | Total | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 . 2 \%}$ |  |
| PT | $2016 / 17$ |  |  |  | $83.3 \%$ |  |  |  | $100 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| PT | $2017 / 18$ |  |  |  | $70.0 \%$ |  |  |  | $57.1 \%$ | $57.1 \%$ | $100 \%$ |  |
| PT | $2018 / 19$ |  |  |  | $85.7 \%$ |  |  |  | $100 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| PT | Total |  |  |  | $\mathbf{7 8 . 3 \%}$ |  |  |  | $\mathbf{7 2 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 \%}$ |  |

Table 5.1.24 Academic and research staff promotion by full-time/part-time mode (whole University), Professor

| Mode | Year | Application |  |  |  | Successful cases |  |  |  | Success rate |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | M | Total | F \% | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{M}$ | Total | F \% | F | M |
| FT | $2016 / 17$ |  |  |  | $56.1 \%$ |  |  |  | $57.1 \%$ | $34.8 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ |
| FT | $2017 / 18$ |  |  |  | $58.0 \%$ |  |  |  | $73.1 \%$ | $65.5 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ |
| FT | $2018 / 19$ |  |  |  | $53.8 \%$ |  |  |  | $62.2 \%$ | $82.1 \%$ | $58.3 \%$ |
| FT | Total | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 9 \%}$ |
| PT | $2016 / 17$ |  |  |  | $66.7 \%$ |  |  |  | $100 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| PT | $2017 / 18$ |  |  |  | $60.0 \%$ |  |  |  | $50.0 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| PT | $2018 / 19$ |  |  |  | $66.7 \%$ |  |  |  | $50.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| PT | Total |  |  |  | $\mathbf{6 3 . 6 \%}$ |  |  |  | $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 0 \%}$ |

There are separate reward processes for A\&R staff below G7, including a merit-based promotion routes. Table 5.1.32 shows gender balance averaged over the last three years.

Table 5.1.25 Reward outcomes for Academic and Research staff below Grade 7

| Reward Committees Outcomes for <br> Academic and Research Staff | Type of Award by Gender |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Merit-based <br> Promotion |  | Salary Progression |  | Grand <br> Total |
|  | Female | Male | Female | Male |  |
| $2016 / 17$ |  |  |  |  | 33 |
| $2017 / 18$ |  |  |  |  | 26 |
| $2018 / 19$ |  |  |  |  | 29 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 88 |


| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 H9.1 | Revisit promotion guidelines in respect of part-time staff, consult PT staff through larger focus <br> group/survey, monitor closely in the 2019/20 round the PT/FT, M/F balance, especially at AP. |

(iv) Staff submitted to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) by gender ( 48 words)

Provide data on staff, by gender, submitted to REF versus those that were eligible. Compare this to the data for the Research Assessment Exercise 2008. Comment on any gender imbalances identified.

Table 5.1.33 Staff submitted to the RAE 2008, by gender [Source: PSO]

| Area | Female |  |  | Male |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not <br> submitted | Submitted | Submitted <br> $\%$ | Not <br> submitted | Submitted | Submitted <br> $\%$ |
| STEMH |  |  | $93 \%$ | 25 | 285 | $87 \%$ |
| AHSSBL | 31 | 112 | $78 \%$ | 24 | 159 | $92 \%$ |
| Grand Total |  |  | $85 \%$ | 49 | 444 | $90 \%$ |
| \% returned <br> nationally |  |  | $47 \%$ |  |  | $67 \%$ |

Table 5.1.34 Staff submitted to the REF 2014, by gender [Source: PSO]

| Area | Female |  |  | Male |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not <br> submitted | Submitted | Submitted <br> $\%$ | Not <br> submitted | Submitted | Submitted <br> $\%$ |
| STEMH | 22 | 120 | $85 \%$ | 36 | 279 | $89 \%$ |
| AHSSBL | 27 | 114 | $81 \%$ | 30 | 125 | $81 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 49 | 234 | $83 \%$ | 66 | 404 | $86 \%$ |
| \% returned <br> nationally |  |  | $51 \%$ |  |  | $\mathbf{6 7 \%}$ |

Unlike the sector as a whole, UoR had no significant differences in submitted and non-submitted populations with respect to gender at the institutional level, and Reading had a much higher submission rate than the sector overall, and improved its gender gap in submission rate between 2008 and 2014.

### 5.2 CAREER TRANSITION POINTS: PROFESSIONAL AND SUPPORT STAFF ( 280 words $\mathbf{=} \mathbf{2 2 6 + 5 4}$ )

(i) Induction (54 words)

Describe the induction and support provided to new all staff at all levels. Comment on the uptake of this and how its effectiveness is reviewed.

P\&S staff have the same central induction as academic staff, described in section 5.1 (ii). We have excellent attendance (Table 5.2.1) and feedback is extremely positive
"....fun and informative. The interactive session provided a great opportunity to meet a diverse range of colleagues and gave me the feeling that I belonged to something bigger"

Table 5.2.1 Attendance of P\&S staff at central induction

|  | Females | Males | Total P\&S staff <br> attending |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2016 / 2017$ | 232 | 84 | 316 |
| $2017 / 2018$ | 218 | 95 | 313 |
| $2018 / 2019$ | 184 | 82 | 266 |

(ii) Promotion

Provide data on staff applying for promotion and comment on applications and success rate by gender, grade and full-time and part-time status. Comment on any evidence of a gender pay gap in promotions at any grade.

As with many other universities, P\&S roles are based on institutional need. Roles (for all staff in Grades 1-8) that have undergone substantive and material changes can be evaluated using the HERA scheme. Regrading committees are convened twice yearly to consider any applications and there is an appeals process if applications are unsuccessful. Full information, dates, application forms and a flowchart are available on the HR intranet site. Table 5.2.2 demonstrates outcomes. Gender pay gaps, including for P\&S, are discussed in 4.1(v) and actions proposed.

Table 5.2.2 P\&S Re-grading Applications

|  | Applications |  | Successful Applications |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Re-grade to | Female | Male | Female | Male |
| 2016-2017 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| 2017-2018 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| 2018-2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Total over 3 years | 36 | 21 | 34 |  |
| Success rate |  |  | 94\% | 81\% |

More female applications are made, and success rates are higher for these. For both males and females more applications are made by individuals at higher grades.

In Career Development Focus Groups and our Career Development Survey, there is increasing recognition by P\&S staff that career progression is achieved by applying for new posts, rather than through a promotion system.

We have a reward and recognition scheme in place which includes consolidated salary increase for staff who demonstrate excellent performance (Table 5.2.3). Reward Committees meet twice a year. The Reward Committee for centralised staff considers all Function applications across the University and this improves consistency in the quality of cases and equitable decisions. Full information, dates, application forms and a flowchart are available on the HR intranet site.

Staff Survey 2017: percentages agreeing with the question

| Question/ statement | UoR | M | F |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I am aware of the University's arrangements for recognising and rewarding good <br> performance | $69 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
| I am aware of the benefits offered by the University | $71 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $73 \%$ |

Table 5.2.3 P\&S Reward Outcomes

| Reward Committees P\&S Outcomes |  |  | Grand <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Salary Progression (accelerated increment/contribution point) |  |  |
| 2016/2017 | Female | Male |  |
| Professional \& Support Staff (Functions) |  |  |  |
| Professional \& Support Staff (School-based) |  |  |  |
| 2017/2018 |  |  |  |
| Professional \& Support Staff (Functions) |  |  |  |
| Professional \& Support Staff (School-based) |  |  |  |
| 2018/2019 |  |  |  |
| Professional \& Support Staff (Functions) |  |  |  |
| Professional \& Support Staff (School-Based) |  |  |  |
| 1 M promotion to a research adjacent role in School |  |  |  |
| Total | 142 | 37 | 179 |

There are significantly more awards made to females, even when taking into account the higher proportion of $\mathrm{P} \& \mathrm{~S}$ females. An action has been assigned to explore this.

## New actions

AP2019 H4.1
Explore why more women are receiving awards and whether any action needed, bringing paper to ASIG (and Staffing Committee as appropriate).
5.3 Career development: academic staff 825+496+200=1521
(i) Training

Describe the training available to staff at all levels. Provide details of uptake by gender and how existing staff are kept up to date with training. How is its effectiveness monitored and developed in response to levels of uptake and evaluation?

Our PD and CQSD teams provide a wide variety of learning and development opportunities, including courses, online learning, e-learning and blended learning options

Training is also provided locally within and for Schools (and Functions) with the opportunity to attend external development provision as necessary. Feedback from our 2017 Staff Survey was positive (Table 5.3.1)

Table 5.3.1 Staff Survey 2017: percentages agreeing with question

|  | UoR | M | F |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I have received sufficient training to enable me to do my job well | 80 | 81 | 83 |

This year we introduced a learning management system, UoRLearn (Figure 5.3.1).

| Closed out actions |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Training | In 2019 introduced a University wide learning management system UoRLearn <br> - Brings all learning and development opportunities into one place. <br> - All staff can access UoRLearn and book training. <br> - Gives managers oversight of their team's L\&D <br> - Gives PD effective data and analysis to inform future development planning |

Figure 5.3.1 Communication of UoRLearn

| University of Reading | Staff portal <br> Intormation for staff \| 26 October 2019 |  | Go |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staft home News and events Notices Wellbeing |  |  |  |
| 4 Uek livins | People Plan Programme - UoRLearn Wednesday, 29 May 2019 |  | Stest news for |
| * News lunie |  |  | b Inonlth and I itn <br> Scipnkes tuitlimy upezte <br> * Let Heard: discass alul delamite wir h ithe SalT トanuly <br> - Auply for set oul and unction mont cundury |
| nimw for kraft |  |  |  |
|  | As a insparisic to your foodlacke birough dia ataff swivey and fecus nrouns, Peopile Develnoment, mgerhar wirh lesanirg raans from zernce the University have introduced a new Learning Managmement System. It is called $\mid \mathrm{loR} / \mathrm{marn}$ and LEARNING AND reolvses Tront lcaming for staif ksaming ond DEVELOPMENT |  |  |
| Campus suthora |  |  |  |
| obltuarias |  |  |  |
| tepme |  |  |  |
| A HANPIG H/AR <br> - Ifiveraby <br> *alill <br> *: Nallh have <br> - 「xtaman Finaker | develapmeth As sudy yos tan no lenger Leok en to learring ard developmert vias Emclovee Set Service. instead you can thed llofl farn here. |  | Things to do now |
|  |  |  | -5.umikasury |
|  |  |  | contact |
|  |  |  | antuniminumutrmix |
|  |  |  |  |

Staff are also kept aware of new and ongoing development opportunities via the staff portal page of the intranet (Figure 5.3.2), targeted emails from PD, CQSD and items in internal communications such as In Brief and Leaders' Brief.

Figure 5.3.2 Communication of training courses


An extensive training programme is available for A\&R staff with a broadly gender-balanced uptake across STEMM and AHSSBL shown in Tables 5.3.2, 5.3.3 and 5.3.4.

Table 5.3.2 Training uptake of academic and research staff (whole University)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 3623 | 2520 | 6143 | $58.98 \%$ |
| 2016 | 4239 | 2823 | 7062 | $60.03 \%$ |
| 2017 | 3581 | 1756 | 5337 | $67.10 \%$ |
| 2018 | 1306 | 869 | 2175 | $60.05 \%$ |
| 2019 | 3623 | 2311 | 5934 | $61.05 \%$ |

Table 5.3.3 Training uptake of academic and research staff (STEMM)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 1863 | 1674 | 3537 | $52.67 \%$ |
| 2016 | 1877 | 1649 | 3526 | $53.23 \%$ |
| 2017 | 1521 | 1031 | 2552 | $59.60 \%$ |
| 2018 | 505 | 460 | 965 | $52.33 \%$ |
| 2019 | 1431 | 1322 | 2753 | $51.98 \%$ |

Table 5.3.4 Training uptake of academic and research staff (AHSSBL)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 1653 | 730 | 2383 | $69.37 \%$ |
| 2016 | 2041 | 1029 | 3070 | $66.48 \%$ |
| 2017 | 1673 | 673 | 2346 | $71.31 \%$ |
| 2018 | 715 | 390 | 1105 | $64.71 \%$ |
| 2019 | 1928 | 905 | 2833 | $68.06 \%$ |

A snapshot of training courses is shown below covering career development (Table 5.3.5, Set 1 AR) with uptake in Tables 5.3.6, 5.3.7 and 5.3.8 and diversity and inclusion (Table 5.3.9 Set 2 AR) with uptake in Tables 5.3.10, 5.3.11 and 5.3.12. There are no apparent gender concerns relating to the uptake of training in any areas, though there is a slightly lower uptake by females in STEMM when compared to AHSSBL.

Table 5.3.5. Set 1 A\&R Training for career development

|  |
| :--- |
| Applying for academic promotion to associate professor or professor |
| Aurora celebrations |
| Aurora women's leadership development programme |
| Certificate in research career management: an introduction |
| Grade 6 career development workshop |
| I want that job |
| Interview skills |
| Leadership development |
| Leadership@reading: leading change |
| Making the most of your PDR - research staff only |
| Making the most of your PDR (reviewees) |
| Moving to a university lectureship |
| Moving towards a career in industry |
| PDR training for reviewees |
| PDR training for reviewees (school-based) |
| PDR training for reviewers |
| PDR training for reviewers (school based) |
| Personal growth: understanding yourself and others |
| Preparing for promotion to associate professor/ professor <br> Promotion training for applicants <br> Research staff development - stakeholder mapping for research staff <br> Springboard women's development programme <br> StellarHE <br> TEL for all: technology as a springboard to inclusive practice <br> The art of job applications for research staff <br> What do research staff do next? the alternatives to an academic career <br> Women @ reading: building your career resilience |

Table 5.3.6 Training uptake of academic and research staff - Set 1

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 252 | 149 | 401 | $62.84 \%$ |
| 2016 | 152 | 81 | 233 | $65.24 \%$ |
| 2017 | 149 | 66 | 215 | $69.30 \%$ |
| 2018 | 67 | 46 | 113 | $59.29 \%$ |
| 2019 | 116 | 109 | 225 | $51.56 \%$ |

Table 5.3.7 Training uptake of academic and research staff - Set 1 (STEMM)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 151 | 109 | 260 | $58.08 \%$ |
| 2016 | 90 | 62 | 152 | $59.21 \%$ |
| 2017 | 84 | 46 | 130 | $64.62 \%$ |
| 2018 | 33 | 26 | 59 | $55.93 \%$ |
| 2019 | 57 | 88 | 145 | $39.31 \%$ |

Table 5.3.8 Training uptake of academic and research staff - Set 1 (AHSSBL)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 95 | 27 | 122 | $77.87 \%$ |
| 2016 | 58 | 14 | 72 | $80.56 \%$ |
| 2017 | 61 | 20 | 81 | $75.31 \%$ |
| 2018 | 32 | 20 | 52 | $61.54 \%$ |
| 2019 | 55 | 21 | 76 | $72.37 \%$ |

Table 5.3.9 Set 2 A\&R Diversity and Inclusion Training

| Athena swan: encouragement and opportunity to represent department session 1 focus group |
| :--- |
| Athena swan: encouragement and opportunity to represent department session 2 focus group |
| Athena swan: part-time/flexible working and career development opportunities session 1 focus group |
| Athena swan: part-time/flexible working and career development opportunities session 2 focus group |
| Athena swan: workload model HoS focus group |
| Becoming an ally to UoR LGBT+staff and students: info and sign-up session |
| Contributing to a diverse \& inclusive workplace |
| Cultural awareness - doing business in East Asia |
| Curriculum framework conference lunch and workshop - making practice inclusive and accessible |
| Curriculum framework conference workshop - integrating a culturally diverse cohort: issues, challenges and |
| suggestions |
| Deaf awareness and culture - the IWLP experience |
| Disability and MFL teaching and learning |
| Diversifying leadership |
| Diversity seminar: understanding and disrupting the persistence of racial inequality in higher education |
| Dyslexia and other specific learning difficulties: impact at university |
| Embedding inclusivity in the curriculum |
| Inclusive curriculum design |
| Inclusive teaching |
| Inclusive teaching strategies |
| Integrating a culturally diverse cohort: issues, challenges and suggestions |
| Integrating a culturally diverse cohort: issues, challenges and suggestions (UoRM) |
| Is gender balance the answer to the construction industry's problems? |
| Making practice inclusive and accessible (UoRM) |
| Mental health awareness |
| Mental Health First Aid England course |
| Mind the gap: collaborative working on skills development |
| Mind the gap: understanding the black, Asian \& minority ethnic (BME) attainment gap |
| Recruitment \& selection - new manager |


| Recruitment \& selection - new manager (school-based) |
| :--- |
| Recruitment \& selection - refresher |
| Recruitment and selection |
| Recruitment and selection panel interviews |
| Recruitment and selection panel interviews (1 to 1) |
| Recruitment and selection panel interviews (school based) |
| Recruitment and selection panel interviews for senior academics (school based) |
| Responding to cultural difference |
| Stonewall one-day allies programme |
| Supporting disabled students' success through inclusive teaching |
| Supporting international students and responding to cultural difference |
| Supporting students with mental health difficulties |
| Supporting students with mental health difficulties (school based) |
| T\&L policy: supporting disabled student success in a new funding era (post 2016 DSA cuts) |
| T\&L showcase: addressing the BME attainment gap: showcasing examples of racially/ethnically inclusive curricula |
| T\&L showcase: mental health resilience: designing and delivering a wellbeing programme (SLL resilience <br> masterclasses) <br> T\&L showcase: teaching in a culturally diverse world <br> Teaching \& Learning conference - engaging everyone: addressing the diversity \& inclusion expectations <br> Teaching \& learning conference workshop - creating accessible teaching and learning resources <br> Teaching \& learning conference workshop - embedding inclusivity in the curriculum <br> Teaching \& learning conference workshop - inclusive assessment and feedback <br> TEL: accessibility (for library staff) <br> TEL: accessibility retreat (part 2) <br> TEL: accessibility: accessible blackboard content (part 1) <br> TEL: accessibility: accessible blackboard content (school based) <br> TEL: accessibility: Ally for administrators <br> TEL: T\&L for all: accessibility and beyond: let's play with ally <br> The lives of older lesbians: sexuality, identity \& the life course <br> Transgender awareness training <br> Unconscious bias (1-1 training) <br> Unconscious bias in decision making <br> Unconscious bias in decision making (school-based) <br> University of Reading termly diversity and inclusion lecture <br> What does increased diversity of students mean for your teaching <br> Women @ reading: building your career resilience <br> Women @ reading: building your personal boardroom <br> Women @ reading: juggling everything <br> Women @ reading: the experience of not belonging in the workplace <br> Women in leadership @ reading <br> Women in leadership @ reading: creating presence |

Table 5.3.10 Training uptake of academic and research staff - Set 2 (whole University)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 347 | 200 | 547 | $63.44 \%$ |
| 2016 | 349 | 177 | 526 | $66.35 \%$ |
| 2017 | 374 | 158 | 532 | $70.30 \%$ |
| 2018 | 64 | 38 | 102 | $62.75 \%$ |
| 2019 | 216 | 118 | 334 | $64.67 \%$ |

Table 5.3.11 Training uptake of academic and research staff - Set 2 (STEMM)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 166 | 147 | 313 | $53.04 \%$ |
| 2016 | 183 | 129 | 312 | $58.65 \%$ |
| 2017 | 136 | 101 | 237 | $57.38 \%$ |
| 2018 |  |  |  | $50.00 \%$ |
| 2019 | 59 | 66 | 125 | $47.20 \%$ |

Table 5.3.12 Training uptake of academic and research staff - Set 2 (AHSSBL)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 168 | 51 | 219 | $76.71 \%$ |
| 2016 | 131 | 39 | 170 | $77.06 \%$ |
| 2017 | 158 | 53 | 211 | $74.88 \%$ |
| 2018 |  |  |  | $68.85 \%$ |
| 2019 | 139 | 52 | 191 | $72.77 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Our new Leadership Framework has been developed following feedback from the 2017 Staff Survey and the subsequent People Plan Project (section 7). The 3Rs (Resourceful, Responsible, Respectful) are now being interwoven into all of our management programmes, some included, with attendance in Table 5.3.13

Table 5.3.13 Examples: Leadership and Management courses and attendance (AR) 2016-2019

|  | M | F |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Level 4 ILM accredited development programme (5 x 1 day modules, $5 \times 90$ minute <br> action learning sets and self-directed learning | 6 | 15 |
| Learning to Lead (4 x 1 day modules) with action learning sets | 1 | 1 |
| Leading High Performance (3 x 0.5 day modules) | 1 | 4 |
| Management Skills for new line managers | 12 | 1 |
| Leading Academic Teams for Research Division Leads, School Directors of T\&L, <br> Heads of Department, Programme Directors and equivalent academic roles. | 4 | 11 |
|  |  |  |

Some of our development courses with a particular focus on D\&I, with attendance, are included in Table 5.3.14. These are widely advertised (Figure 5.3.2 and 5.3.3)

Table 5.3.14 Examples: development courses with a focus on D\&I and attendance (A\&R)

| Programme | Attendees <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ | Attendees <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ | Attendees <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 8} / \mathbf{1 9}$ | Attendees <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ | TOTAL by <br> programme |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aurora | 8 females | 5 females | 5 females | 5 females | $\mathbf{2 3}$ females |
| Springboard | 19 females | $6^{*}$ females | 7 females |  | $\mathbf{3 2}$ females |
| Diversifying <br> Leadership |  | 1 |  | Applications <br> pending | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| StellarHE | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | $\mathbf{3}$ |

University mentors and sponsors are allocated to delegates.
We run a celebratory event for Aurora delegates annually. This is opened by the Vice-Chancellor and the D\&I Dean. This year's speakers included a Diversifying Leadership attendee. We have also held follow-up sessions for Springboard delegates every 18 months. The two September 2016 events welcomed a total of 65 females (AR and $P \& S$ ), and the two events in January 2018 a total of 31 females (AR and $P \& S$ ). We have identified actions to track effectiveness of our development courses (AP 2019 H5.1) and benefit from participants' learning (AP 2019 H5.2).

Figure 5.3.3 Communication of development courses


Our women's network Women@Reading (W@R) runs an annual programme of developmental events open to all staff (Table 5.3.15) though attendees are mostly female.

The Imposter Syndrome was initially run as a one-off event and offered again due to high demand. It is now run regularly as part of our open programme for all staff.

Table 5.3.15 Women@Reading annual programme

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Title | Date | No. of attendees |
| The Imposter Syndrome | $22 / 03 / 16 ; 13 / 04 / 16$ | 42 (23 \& 19) |
| Juggling Everything | $10 / 06 / 16$ | 35 |
| Creating Presence | $29 / 06 / 16$ | 27 |
| Building your career resilience | $27 / 10 / 16$ | 33 |
| The experience of not belonging in the workplace | $13 / 03 / 17$ | 27 |
| Building your personal boardroom | $21 / 02 / 18$ | 20 |
| Thinking Fast \& Slow | $20 / 03 / 18$ | 48 |
| Mindfulness at Work | $03 / 05 / 18 \times 2$ | 62 (29 \& 33) |
| Women in the Army | $29 / 05 / 18$ | 17 |
| Event Planning | $14 / 05 / 19$ | 25 |
| Growing your confidence | $17 / 06 / 19$ | 50 |
|  |  | 386 |

> "These talks are simply amazing and I am so grateful they are being organised! I find them truly inspirational and helpful and I wish there were more!"
"The key roles for your network was not only helpful for thinking about my career but also the people who help me to fulfil my role and responsibilities..."

We have delivered unconscious bias training both face-to-face and then online for several years. Following recent research that unconscious bias training is less effective than previously thought, online training is followed by discussion groups to all those staff involved in assessing REF input either on panels or appeals.

We have committed to undertake a large project of work to develop a blended learning D\&l development programme, in conjunction with The Pacific Institute and members of our DICOP. RISE (Ready for an Inclusive Supportive Environment) runs over a period of 16 weeks and will be available to all staff at the University. The programme objectives include:

- Embracing inclusivity by confidently role modelling University behaviours
- Actively addressing and promoting a diverse workforce

Table 5.3.16 RISE pilot group.

| Female academic | Female PS | Male academic | Male PS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 8 | 2 | 2 |

All staff involved in teaching and learning are appropriately supported. The FLAIR Framework combines a pathway for doctoral researchers, the Academic Practice Programme (APP) for staff relatively new to teaching and a nontaught CPD Route for experienced staff. The CPD scheme is accredited by the Higher Education Academy and allows us to award all four categories of HEA Fellowship (Table 5.3.17). Achievement is gender balanced and widely celebrated (Figure 5.3.4).

Table 5.3.17 Associate Fellows, Fellows, Senior Fellows and Principal Fellows of the HEA

| Staff | 1 October 2016 <br> to 30 September <br> 2017 |  |  | 1 October 2017 <br> to 31 March <br> 2018 | 1 April 2018 to 31 <br> March 2019 | Ist April 2019- |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male |
| Academic | 31 | 23 | 9 | 7 | 48 | 32 | 16 | 15 |

Figure 5.3.4 Communicating Success

| University of Reading | Staff portal <br> Information for staff \| 26 October 2019 | Go |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Soff home ${ }^{\text {News and events \| Notices \| Wellbeing }}$ |  |  |
| + Itan lumur | Celebrating Staff Success in Achieving HEA Fellowship through the FLAIR Framework <br> Tuesday, 22 January 2019 $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ accepced 'badge of quality' $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ taucht Academic Practuce Hroaramme, or the UVU Sicheme. <br>  | contuswivi |
| * Plevwf: Inintity Nawe for castf Ftapla Comvis authorz Rlılıaะม แ** |  | - I1exirh sned I fo <br>  <br> - I3 \| Hivint hlownav <br>  <br> - A 1 lur <br>  |
| Ilot toics |  | Thangeto do now |
| a paspla y\|en <br> - Univerals <br> organirasonal chvit <br>  <br> 276\# <br> r Fanll Ferint <br> + In lime <br> " Luamernal berank |  | - Whamat ivicy |

Our ECRs have a tailored development programme (§5.3) with training courses. Table 5.3 .18 shows uptake.

Evaluation information, collected at the end of every session, shows that the majority of delegates rate the courses as excellent or good for their overall quality and impact.

Table 5.3.18 uptake of courses by PDRAs between August 2018 - July 2019

| Course Title | Female | Male | Total | \% <br> female |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Centaur and open access surgery (1-1 session) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 33 |
| Communicating your research: five simple ideas | 20 | 16 | 36 | 56 |
| Costing for research proposals | 10 | 4 | 14 | 71 |
| Engaging with policymakers | 18 | 15 | 33 | 55 |
| Introduction to altmetric explorer | 3 | 2 | 5 | 60 |
| Introduction to bibliometrics | 3 | 4 | 7 | 43 |
| Introduction to the scival research intelligence tool | 4 | 3 | 7 | 57 |
| Introduction to writing successful research proposals | 7 | 3 | 10 | 70 |
| Managing your digital researcher profile (1-1 session) | 4 | 1 | 5 | 80 |
| Moving Towards A Career In Industry (external expert <br> speakers) | 5 | 1 | 6 | 83 |
| Moving to a Lectureship | 10 | 5 | 15 | 67 |
| Orcid identifiers - what are they and why do i need one? | 3 | 3 | 6 | 50 |
| Overview of research funding (humanities and social sciences) | 11 | 7 | 18 | 61 |
| Overview of research funding (sciences) | 9 | 4 | 13 | 69 |
| Research data management surgery @ earley gate (1-1 help <br> session) | 1 |  |  | 400 |
| Research data management surgery @ whiteknights (1-1 help <br> session) | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50 |
| Research data management: an introduction | 6 | 2 | 8 | 75 |
| Research impact | 5 | 4 | 9 | 55 |
| Stakeholder mapping | 17 | 10 | 27 | 63 |
| Scholarly publishing: requirements and opportunities | 13 | 7 | 20 | 65 |
| Using social media to communicate and enhance your <br> research | 20 | 10 | 30 | 67 |
| Writing a data management plan | 24 | 12 | 36 | 67 |
| Writing for non-academic audiences | 20 | 9 | 29 | 69 |
| Sentaur, ref \& funders' open access policies for publication | 13 | 12 | 25 | 52 |
| Researchfish | 26 | 22 | 48 | 54 |
| Total | 254 | 159 | 413 | 62 |

Closed out actions and impact from Bronze submission

| AP2016:E3 | We have a modern engaging and high impact D\&I training programme targeted at different <br> cohorts e.g. leaders, managers, recruiters, new starters via different delivery modes (online, <br> face to face and action learning) | $\checkmark$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AP 2016: E4 | We continually improve and update our programmes based on consultation with attendees, <br> external experts and new research e.g. unconscious bias training | $\checkmark$ |
| AP 2016:E7 | We are proactively supporting cohorts following attendance at development programmes <br> such as Springboard and Aurora | $\checkmark$ |

## Action Plan

| AP2019 H5.1 | Identify and implement methods for assessing impact of Springboard, StellarHE, Diversifying Leadership, <br> Aurora, Stonewall Leadership programme on individual and institution, including career progress of <br> participants (via academic promotion process, professorial pay review, rewards processes, new roles <br> taken up) |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 H5.2 | Building on existing active Springboard graduates network, develop additional mechanisms to support <br> graduates of other programmes in H5.1, taking into account participants feedback |

(ii) Appraisal/development review 200

Describe current appraisal/development review for academic staff at all levels across the whole institution. Provide details of any appraisal/development review training offered and the uptake of this, as well as staff feedback about the process.

We encourage line managers to have regular 1:1 conversations throughout the year with team members, and an annual PDR between the staff member and their line manager is scheduled in less busy periods. Development needs can be identified via the PDR and we encourage HoSs to feedback arising needs to their HR Partner or PD.

Our 2017 staff survey results showed the following on PDRs (Table 5.3.19) and our recent Career Development Survey fed back areas for improvement from both AR and P\&S staff (section 5.4) Action AP 2019 G4.1 and G4.3:

Table 5.3.19 Staff Survey 2017: percentages responding positively

|  | UoR | M | F |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Have you had a Performance Development Review (PDR) in the last 12 months? | $75 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| Was your PDR useful for you? | $68 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| Did you agree clear objectives as part of your PDR? | $85 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $84 \%$ |
| Did the PDR leave you feeling your work is valued by the University of Reading? | $64 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $69 \%$ |
| As part of your PDR did you agree a plan for your personal development needs? | $74 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| If you didn't have a PDR in the last 12 months would you have liked to have one? | $43 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $48 \%$ |

We do not capture data on PDR completion (Action AP2019:G4.2).
We provided mandatory training for reviewers/ line managers and staff when the PDR process was reviewed in 2014. Uptake of more recent reviewee and reviewer training is shown in Tables 5.3.20 and 5.3.21

Table 5.3.20 PDR training for AR reviewees

|  | Total attending (including PS staff- see 5.4 (i)) | AR males | AR females |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2016 / 2017$ | 50 | 4 | 7 |
| $2017 / 2018$ | 15 | 1 | 2 |
| $2018 / 2019$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 5.3.21 PDR training for AR reviewers

|  | Total attending (including PS staff- see 5.4 (i)) | AR males | AR females |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2016 / 2017$ | 114 | 14 | 15 |
| $2017 / 2018$ | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| $2018 / 2019$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |

We recognised some time ago that PDRs are an area for improvement. Numbers on PDR training will be reestablished as part of the significant actions that we have identified below.

Supplementary to PDRs, all UEB members and $78 \%$ ( 24 M :21F) of the Leadership Group took part in a development $360^{\circ}$ feedback questionnaire in 2016. UEB members undertook a 360 feedback in August 2019.

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019: G4.1 | Carry out an in-depth review with reviewers and reviewees to determine barriers to Personal <br> Development Review (PDR) completion and culture relating to regular manager and employee <br> conversations. |
| AP2019: G4.2 | Learning from the review in G4.1, develop effective mechanisms for measuring PDR completion rates and <br> quality of PDRs. |
| AP2019: G4.3 | Following G4.1, G4.2, we relaunch the PDR, making clear its purpose, how it works, how individual PDRs <br> link into wider goals and ultimately University strategy, and emphasising the importance of follow-up <br> through the year. |

(ii) Support given to academic staff for career progression 496

Comment and reflect on support given to academic staff including postdoctoral researchers to assist in their career progression.

Our 2017 staff survey results showed the following on career development (Table 5.3.22):
Table 5.3.22 Staff Survey 2017: percentages responding positively

|  | UoR | M | F |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I feel that I am given the same opportunities to develop as other staff | $78 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $79 \%$ |
| Overall, I feel that the University of Reading provides appropriate <br> development opportunities | $77 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $79 \%$ |
| I am satisfied with my current level of learning and development | $75 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $76 \%$ |

The University is committed to the development of its research staff and is a signatory to the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers. We were one of the first ten Universities in the UK to win its HR Excellence in Research Award, which we have retained for eight years (Figure 5.3.5).

Figure 5.3.5 Communication of Retention of HR Excellence in Research Award


We have significantly improved the support offered to early career research staff since our last submission:

- RSC (8 PDRAs 4F:4M) meets termly and advocates the interests of PDRAs across the University.
- RSC feeds in to University Research Committee and enables two way communication
- PDRAs can now apply for travel grants to attend Conferences
- Research Staff Conference (every two years). Gender balance relating to speakers. Topics have included: promotion, development, funding Opportunities and 'the World of Media'
- 60 PDRAs attended in 2019 ( $57 \%$ female). $85 \%$ respondents rated the conference as excellent/good.
- Introduced Research Staff Development Strategy
- Introduction of a handbook for PIs explaining their responsibilities in managing PDRAs and supporting them in their career development, including flexible working
- Introduction of a briefing pack for PDRAs outlining what PDRAs can expect from their PI in terms of management and support.
- A 'Research Staff Career Planner', designed and approved by URC. Provides a template for all PDRAs to identify steps to achieve their career goals
- Introduction of a 'Research Staff Development Prompter', which outlines all the personal and career development opportunities for PDRAs within UoR
- Introduction of a mentoring scheme specifically for research staff
- Every year, a Researcher Development Booklet is sent to all academic and research staff. This provides a comprehensive programme of development opportunities (uptake in Table 5.3.18) and external resources e.g. Researcher Development Framework.
- Dedicated budget for Researcher Development to fund external speakers.
- Prizes for ECRs and these celebrated (Fig 5.3.6)

| Closed out actions and impact from Bronze Action Plan |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| AP2016:C4 | Since 2016, there have been a total of .. PDRAs promoted from grade 6 to grade $7($. <br> AP2016:C5 | females, . males) |  |  |$\quad$| Feedback confirms that training is meeting development needs of ECRs and there is |
| :--- |
| balanced uptake by genders |$\quad$| AP2016:C10 |
| :--- |

Figure 5.3.6 Celebrating achievements of Early Career Researchers


There are a number of mentoring schemes, in addition to one specifically for research staff.
PD provide training for those people who would like to volunteer to be a mentor (Table 5.3.23)
Table 5.3.23 Successful mentoring workshop

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A\&R Female | A\&R Male | Total |
| $2016 / 17$ | 15 | 14 | 29 |
| $2017 / 18$ | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| $2018 / 19$ | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Grand Total | 24 | 22 | 46 |

New academic staff are provided with a mentor for the duration of their probation (3 years) and we offer mentoring throughout careers. We do not currently capture numbers of mentors or mentees on our scheme or routinely assess impact (Action AP2019:G5.1)

We have an internal coaching network and supervision and development sessions for our coaches. All of our coaches are professionally qualified. In addition, we have external coaches for senior leaders. We have an action to evaluate impact (AP 2019: G5.2).

Action AP2019 G5.3 builds on the positive mentoring and coaching schemes that currently run.

| Closed out actions and impact from Bronze submission |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AP 2016:E5 | The academic mentoring policy has been updated in line with central policy. The <br> research staff mentoring policy has also been updated | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| AP 2016:E6 | We have a thriving Women@Reading network with a strong well-advertised events <br> programme | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |


| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019:G5.1 | Continue to build the network of mentoring representatives from each School and Function, sharing <br> best practice across the University at termly meetings. Provide support to those Schools and Functions <br> seeking to establish or improve their local mentoring schemes, via this network or directly as <br> appropriate, including assisting them to set up recording systems for local mentoring relationships and <br> methods for evaluation of its impact. |
| AP2019:G5.2 | Continue to record formal centrally-administered coaching relationships, whether via the internal <br> coaching network or bought in for senior leaders, monitoring these to ensure coaches are well-matched <br> and evaluation of the impact on the person is undertaken |
| AP2019:G5.3 | Further raise awareness of coaching and mentoring opportunities including by inviting staff who are <br> also qualified coaches to join the network, and continuing to add those who attend a mentor course <br> with people development to the list of available mentors. |

5.4 Career development: professional and support staff 915
(i) Training

Describe the training available to staff at all levels. Provide details of uptake and how existing staff are kept up to date with training. How is its effectiveness monitored and developed in response to levels of uptake and evaluation?

All training opportunities described in section 5.3(i), unless specific to AR staff by its nature, are also available to P\&S staff. Uptake is shown in Tables 5.4.1, 5.4.2 and 5.4.3.

Our Career Development Focus Groups with P\&S staff highlighted that training courses are viewed very positively and in our Career Development Survey, of P\&S staff, $82 \%$ F and $78 \% \mathrm{M}$ reported that the training had a beneficial impact on their role. PD work with P\&S staff to develop bespoke courses to meet the needs of different Functions.

Table 5.4.1 Training uptake of Professional \& Support Staff (whole University)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 5966 | 2573 | 8539 | $69.87 \%$ |
| 2016 | 10294 | 3503 | 13797 | $74.61 \%$ |
| 2017 | 7524 | 2283 | 9807 | $76.72 \%$ |
| 2018 | 2157 | 903 | 3060 | $70.49 \%$ |
| 2019 | 5987 | 3135 | 9122 | $65.63 \%$ |

Table 5.4.2 Training uptake of Professional \& Support Staff (STEMM)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 1538 | 579 | 2117 | $72.65 \%$ |
| 2016 | 2599 | 826 | 3425 | $75.88 \%$ |
| 2017 | 1169 | 239 | 1408 | $83.03 \%$ |
| 2018 | 252 | 64 | 316 | $79.75 \%$ |
| 2019 | 1022 | 412 | 1434 | $71.27 \%$ |

Table 5.4.3 Training uptake of Professional \& Support Staff (AHSSBL)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 1647 | 301 | 1948 | $84.55 \%$ |
| 2016 | 3094 | 553 | 3647 | $84.84 \%$ |
| 2017 | 1362 | 476 | 1838 | $74.10 \%$ |
| 2018 | 465 | 143 | 608 | $76.48 \%$ |
| 2019 | 1333 | 779 | 2112 | $63.12 \%$ |

A snapshot of training courses is shown below and includes career development (Table 5.4.4, Set 1 PS) with uptake in Tables 5.4.5, 5.4.6 and 5.4.7 and D\&I (Table 5.4.8 Set 2 PS) with uptake in Tables 5.4.9, 5.4.10 and 5.4.11. More females undertake training. This exceeds the higher proportion of female P\&S staff at the University.

Table 5.4.4. Set 1 P\&S

| Aurora celebrations |
| :--- |
| Aurora women's leadership development programme (days 1-5) |
| Grade 6 career development workshop |
| I want that job |
| Interview Skills |
| Leadership Development |
| Leadership@reading: Leading Change |
| Making the most of your PDR job chat (reviewees) |
| PDR training for reviewees |
| PDR training for reviewers |
| Personal growth: understanding yourself and others |
| Springboard women's development programme |
| StellarHE |
| Women @ reading: building your career resilience |

Table 5.4.5 Training uptake of Professional \& Support Staff - Set 1 (whole University) [Source: Trent]

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 524 | 97 | 621 | $84.38 \%$ |
| 2016 | 792 | 82 | 874 | $90.62 \%$ |
| 2017 | 277 | 35 | 312 | $88.78 \%$ |
| 2018 |  |  |  | $92.94 \%$ |
| 2019 | 133 | 24 | 157 | $84.71 \%$ |

Table 5.4.6 Training uptake of Professional \& Support Staff - Set 1 (STEMM) [Source: Trent]

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 2015 |  |  |  | $92.22 \%$ |
| 2016 |  |  |  | $93.17 \%$ |
| 2017 |  |  |  | $96.15 \%$ |
| 2018 |  |  |  | $81.25 \%$ |
| 2019 |  |  |  | $97.67 \%$ |

Table 5.4.7 Training uptake of Professional \& Support Staff - Set 1 (AHSSBL) [Source: Trent]

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 2015 |  |  |  | $94.21 \%$ |
| 2016 |  |  |  | $94.64 \%$ |
| 2017 |  |  |  | $82.69 \%$ |
| 2018 |  |  |  | $94.12 \%$ |
| 2019 |  |  |  | $72.22 \%$ |

Table 5.4.8 Set 2 P\&S

| Becoming an ally to UoR LGBT+staff and students: info and sign-up session |
| :--- |
| Contributing to a diverse \& inclusive workplace |
| Cultural awareness - doing business in East Asia |
| Diversifying leadership |
| Diversity seminar: understanding and disrupting the persistence of racial inequality in higher <br> education <br> Dyslexia and other specific learning difficulties: impact at university <br> Inclusive teaching <br> Integrating a culturally diverse cohort: issues, challenges and suggestions (uorm) <br> Is gender balance the answer to the construction industry's problems? <br> Mental health awareness <br> Mental health first aid England course <br> Mind the gap: collaborative working on skills development <br> Mind the gap: understanding the black, Asian \& minority ethnic (BME) attainment gap <br> Recruitment \& selection - new manager <br> Recruitment \& selection - refresher <br> Recruitment and selection panel interviews <br> Responding to cultural difference <br> Stonewall one-day allies programme <br> Supporting disabled students' success through inclusive teaching <br> Supporting international students and responding to cultural difference <br> Supporting students with mental health difficulties <br> TEL: accessibility (for library staff) <br> TEL: accessibility: accessible blackboard content <br> TEL: accessibility: ally for administrators <br> The lives of older lesbians: sexuality, identity \& the life course <br> Transgender awareness training <br> Unconscious bias in decision making <br> University of reading termly diversity and inclusion lecture <br> Women @ reading: building your career resilience <br> Women @ reading: building your personal boardroom <br> Women @ reading: juggling everything <br> Women in leadership @ reading <br> Women in leadership @ reading <br> Women in leadership @ reading: creating presence |

Table 5.4.9 Training uptake of Professional \& Support Staff - Set 2 (whole University)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 541 | 122 | 663 | $81.60 \%$ |
| 2016 | 818 | 163 | 981 | $83.38 \%$ |
| 2017 | 898 | 205 | 1103 | $81.41 \%$ |
| 2018 | 181 | 48 | 229 | $79.04 \%$ |
| 2019 | 429 | 172 | 601 | $71.38 \%$ |

Tale 5.4.10 Training uptake of Professional \& Support Staff - Set 2 (STEMM)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 |  |  |  | $87.10 \%$ |
| 2016 | 153 | 36 | 189 | $80.95 \%$ |
| 2017 |  |  |  | $95.35 \%$ |
| 2018 |  |  |  | $90.91 \%$ |
| 2019 | 53 | 32 | 85 | $62.35 \%$ |

Table 5.4.11 Training uptake of Professional \& Support Staff - Set 2 (AHSSBL)

| Year | Female | Male | Total | Female \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 | 179 | 31 | 210 | $85.24 \%$ |
| 2016 |  |  |  | $93.02 \%$ |
| 2017 | 188 | 57 | 245 | $76.73 \%$ |
| 2018 |  |  |  | $66.67 \%$ |
| 2019 | 107 | 67 | 174 | $61.49 \%$ |

We have good attendance on courses by P\&S staff (Table 5.4.12, 5.4.13) with excellent feedback (Figure 5.4.7)
Table 5.4.12 Leadership and Management attendance

|  | M | F |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Level 4 ILM accredited development programme (5 x 1 day modules, 5 x 90 minute <br> action learning sets and self-directed learning | 25 | 55 |
| Learning to Lead (4 x 1 day modules) with action learning sets | 4 | 6 |
| Leading High Performance (3 x 0.5 day modules) | 1 | 12 |
| Management Skills for new line managers | 1 | 12 |
| Inclusive Leader | 4 | 8 |

Table 5.4.13 Development courses with a focus on D\&I and attendance (P\&S)

| Table 5.4.13 | Attendees <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ | Attendees <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ | Attendees <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 1 9}$ | Attendees <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ | TOTAL by <br> programme |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Programme | 3 females | 7 females | $5^{*}$ females | 7 females | $\mathbf{2 2}$ females |
| Aurora | 42 females | $17^{* *}$ females | 54 females |  | $\mathbf{1 1 3}$ females |
| Springboard | 1 | 1 | TBC - <br> application <br> s pending | $\mathbf{3}$ |  |
| Diversifying <br> Leadership | 1 | $\mathbf{2}$ |  |  |  |
| StellarHE |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |

[^10] until she was able to attend and she will be doing so as part of the 19/20 intake.
${ }^{* *}$ We were only able to run one cohort due to trainer unavailability.

Figure 5.4.7 Feedback from staff


P\&S staff are encouraged to achieve accreditation through the FLAIR CPD scheme and successful applicants have been from many Functions including CQSD, PD, HR, Library, MCE, SAS and TS (numbers in Table 5.4.14).

Table 5.4.14 P\&S Associate Fellows and Fellows of the HEA

| Staff | 1 October 2016 to 30 <br> September 2017 |  | October 2017 to 31 <br> March 2018 |  | 1 April 2018 to 31 <br> March 2019 | Ist April 2019- ongoing |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male |
| P\&S | 10 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 1 |

(ii) Appraisal/development review

Describe current professional development review for professional and support staff at all levels across the whole institution. Provide details of any appraisal/development review training offered and the uptake of this, as well as staff feedback about the process.

The same PDR process applies to P\&S staff as described in section 5.3 (ii) with numbers attending training below (Table 5.4.15, 5.4.16).

Our Career Development Focus Groups with P\&S staff highlighted areas for improvement relating to the PDR process, including, in some cases, a lack of rigour, oversight or focus on career development. Significant actions have been identified above (Actions AP 2019 G4.1, G4.2, G4.3)

Table 5.4.15

| PDR training <br> for reviewees | Total attending | Total PS females | Total PS males |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2016 / 2017$ | 50 | 22 | 17 |
| $2017 / 2018$ | 15 | 8 | 4 |
| $2018 / 2019$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 5.4.16

| PDR training <br> for reviewers | Total attending | Total PS females | Total PS males |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2016 / 2017$ | 114 | 69 | 16 |
| $2017 / 2018^{*}$ | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| $2018 / 2019$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(iii) Support given to professional and support staff for career progression 670

Comment and reflect on support given to professional and support staff to assist in their career progression.

Our Career Development Focus Groups with P\&S staff and qualitative feedback in our Career Development Survey (Figure 5.4.8) highlighted that there is interest in knowing how other $\mathrm{P} \& \mathrm{~S}$ staff have developed their careers at the University(Action AP 2019 H6.1), what job vacancies may be available in other Functions (Actions AP 2019 H6.2) and an appetite for more job tasters, job swaps and secondments (Figure 5.4.9) across Functions (Action AP 2019 H6.3).

Figure 5.4.8 Invitation to participate in Career Development Survey


All career development opportunities described in section 5.3(iii), unless specific to AR staff by its nature, are also available to PS staff. In many areas, new staff are allocated a buddy or mentor for at least the first six months.
'the new starter buddy system has been really beneficial and made me feel very comfortable settling into the role and getting to know my way around the campus and location. I have also enjoyed the valuable training and learning within the area where I work'

Mentoring is available as P\&S careers develop. Numbers of trained mentors are shown in Table 5.4.17. Actions relating to mentoring and coaching are described in section 5.3.

Table 5.4.17

|  | Professional Services |  | Grand Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Female | Male |  |
| Successful mentoring workshop |  |  |  |
| $2016 / 17$ | 14 | 12 | 26 |
| $2017 / 18$ | 14 | 2 | 16 |
| $2018 / 19$ | 7 | 3 | 10 |
| Grand Total | 35 | 17 | 52 |

Figure 5.4.9 Secondment Scheme

| 판) Uneading of | Staff portal <br> information for statl \| 26 Octoter 2010 | search Uni | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  |  |  |  |

We have utilised the apprenticeship scheme in a number of areas including IT, TS and HR. A recent example of this is our recently qualified apprentice HR administrative assistant, who has taken a secondment role for 12 months into Campus Jobs, dealing with short-term working opportunities for students. We have recently recruited a new Leadership and Talent Development Manager who will be supporting expansion of our apprenticeship activity (Action AP 2019 H8.1)

During a major restructure of professional and administrative support staff in 2016, many roles in specific support areas such as Finance, ES, SAS and TS were standardised and new generic job descriptions were developed and assessed.
Our ES teams across the University are now part of ESCOP where regular meetings facilitate sharing of good practice and developing knowledge and skills.

Our TS Function has been active in promoting career development of technical staff Figure 5.4.11 and 5.4.12), including:

- A clear and documented career path has been implemented for technical staff. This provides the opportunity to progress from trainee/assistant positions to Director level.
- We have technical staff who, either through management responsibilities or applying specialist research skills, are at grades equivalent to lecturers and associate professors, and, in the case of the Director (F), equivalent to a professor/Head of School. This is unusual in the sector.
- We were awarded Employer Champion status by the Science Council following our programme of professional registration for technical staff (Figure 5.4.10) and we have worked with the Institute of Science to accredit our Arts technicians as Registered Practitioners.
- We were one of the founding signatories when the Technician Commitment was launched in 2016 and feedback from our return in 2018 described some of our practices as sector leading (Action AP 2019 H7.1)
- The Director of Technical Services is a board member of the NTDC (HEFCE funded collaboration with the University of Sheffield).
- Training budget covers professional registration fees for all technical staff


## Impact of above actions

Since 2016, approximately $20 \%$ of TS staff have applied for and been successful in securing roles at a higher grade, with many of our first cohort of trainees being upgraded to technician roles.

Figure 5.4.10

## Technical staff receiving Registered Science Technician awards

 from CEO of the Royal Society of Biology.

| Actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP 2019 H6.1 | Enhance awareness that there are opportunities for P\&S staff to progress in their careers within the <br> University, (including through moving between roles/Functions), e.g. through Staff Portal campaign <br> showcasing examples. |
| AP 2019 H6.2 | Establish additional mechanisms to publicise job vacancies and similar cross-Function opportunities to <br> enhance internal take-up. Explore introduction of annual University-wide "Function Awareness <br> Workshops", in which we showcase to the University and staff what the Functions do, their staff/careers, <br> and job opportunities. |
| AP 2019 H6.3 | Scope out the introduction across P\&S of managed job-swaps, job-tasters, secondments, and work- <br> shadowing schemes to enable staff mobility around the University, enhance understanding of the <br> University functions, and broaden staff perspectives on next career steps. |
| AP 2019 H7.1 | Close out actions in the 2020 Technician Commitment Action Plan and develop and implement the 2020- <br> 23 Action Plan. Showcase actions related to gender/ethnicity/intersectional equality internally and <br> externally via the Technician Commitment Initiative |
| AP 2019 H8.1 | Draft proposals to go to UEB to better utilise apprenticeships for current staff so they can actively learn <br> new skills and work as part of wider/different teams, and, where beneficial, to increase our external <br> recruitment of apprenticeships (learning from best practice in some of our functions) |

Figure 5.4.11

'I came to the University in 2016 and took up a technical role in Microbiology. Shortly afterwards, I was promoted to the role of Senior Technician and I now work for Technical Services on a parttime basis whilst also undertaking my PhD. During my time here, I have been encouraged to become a Registered Scientist and I have recently been successful in my application as an Associate Fellow of the HEA'


## Figure 5.4.12

'I came to the University three years ago and took up a trainee technical role in Meteorology. I have been promoted to a Senior Technician. I have been offered many training opportunities including courses in Data logging and health and safety (I am currently undertaking the NEBOSH course). In addition, I am now a Registered Science Technician and Associate Fellow of the HEA'

### 5.5 Flexible working and managing career breaks 1133

(i) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: before leave

Explain what support the institution offers to staff before they go on maternity and adoption leave.
Staff Survey results are positive relating to pregnancy/maternity and paternity leave in general (Table 5.5.1)
Table 5.5.1 Staff Survey 2017

|  | UoR | F | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I feel the University of Reading acts fairly, regardless of race, gender, religion, sexual <br> orientation, pregnancy/maternity/paternity, disability or age with regard to recruitment | $94 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| In the last 12 months I have not been made to feel uncomfortable whilst working for the <br> University because of my race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, pregnancy /maternity <br> /paternity, disability or age by another member of staff | $90 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $93 \%$ |

Leave entitlements are described below. In addition to the formal requirements for risk assessments (focus groups highlighted that these are out of date: Action AP2019 FL7.1 to update them) carried out at Function/School level, expectant mothers / adopting parents are also able to meet with HR to discuss legal and policy issues around maternity/adoption entitlements. Focus groups reported that such meetings are extremely beneficial. Line managers are encouraged to ensure they meet regularly with expectant mothers in the run up to leave periods to discuss and manage workload and commitments.

Improved communication and policy awareness, particularly among line managers, has been identified as a need in focus groups and several actions aim to address this and to help managers to deepen and regularize the approach to regularly assessing workload (Actions AP2019 F3.1) and to effectively use the reimbursement detailed below (Actions AP 2019 F1.1, F1.2).
(ii) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: during leave

Explain what support the institution offers to staff during maternity and adoption leave.
Expectant mothers or main adopters are entitled to 52 weeks leave with occupational pay for 18 weeks, subject to continuous employment for 26 weeks by qualifying week. Our policies make it clear that we expect to maintain reasonable contact with employees during periods of maternity leave; the level of contact is at the discretion of the employee in discussion with their line manager. Employees can claim full pay for KIT days. There is widespread use of KIT days for those taking longer than 18 weeks leave
(iii) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: returning to work

Explain what support the institution offers to staff on return from maternity or adoption leave. Comment on any funding provided to support returning staff.

Closed out actions and impact from Bronze submission
AP 2016: F1 Schools and Functions are now reimbursed the full cost of an employee taking AP 2016: F2 maternity/adoption leave and SPL

Up to $25 \%$ of this funding is ring-fenced to aid return e.g. Use of the $25 \%$ is flexible; examples of use include hiring a teaching assistant, attending conferences/training, and reduced teaching (Figure 5.5.1).
Additional achievements
Parent and Family Network has been set up by staff (Figure 5.5.2)

Figure 5.5.1 Use of the reimbursement


I've kept growing in my skill sets and was promoted while working part time. I have a five-year-old daughter and one-year old twins. I recently returned from maternity leave and have embarked on the Aurora Development Programme (my space was held for my return) and my additional childcare costs are covered by the new reimbursement that is now available.

Figure 5.5.2 Communication of Parent and Family Network


Our Family Leave focus groups highlighted a lack of awareness of our new Parent and Family network (Action AP 2019 F2.1) and the location of breastfeeding facilities (Action AP 2019 F6.1). Feedback also prompted actions to additionally support returners with additional resources (AP 2019 F4.1).
(iv) Maternity return rate

Provide data and comment on the maternity return rate in the institution. Data and commentary on staff whose contracts are not renewed while on maternity leave should be included in this section.

Return rates for the six-month period following maternity leave are high. While 2015 data shows considerable loss of staff in the 18-month period post-return, 2016 shows some reduction in this loss rate. As the 18-month retention figures become available for 2017-2019, attention is needed as to whether this trajectory of improvement continues (Tables 5.5.2-5.5.7).

Table 5.5.2 Count of maternity leave incidences for Academic and research staff (whole University) [Source: Trent]

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| On Leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instances of completed leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Returners | $96 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| Stayed at least 6 months | $87 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $96 \%$ | N/A | N/A |
| Stayed at least 12 months | $78 \%$ | $100 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stayed at least 18 months | $78 \%$ | $92 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Table 5.5.3 Count of maternity leave incidences for Academic and research staff (STEMM) [Source: Trent]

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| On Leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instances of completed leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Returners | $93 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
| Stayed at least 6 months | $80 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $91 \%$ | N/A | N/A |
| Stayed at least 12 months | $67 \%$ | $91 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stayed at least 18 months | $67 \%$ | $91 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Table 5.5.4 Count of maternity leave incidences for Academic and research staff (AHSSBL) [Source: Trent]

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| On Leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instances of completed leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Returners | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Stayed at least 6 months | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | N/A | N/A |
| Stayed at least 12 months | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Stayed at least 18 months | $100 \%$ | $92 \%$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

Table 5.5.5 Count of maternity leave incidences for Professional \& Support staff (whole University) [Source: Trent]

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| On Leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instances of completed leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Returners | $92 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $97 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
| Stayed at least 6 months | $82 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $82 \%$ | N/A | N/A |
| Stayed at least 12 months | $76 \%$ | $88 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stayed at least 18 months | $76 \%$ | $86 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Table 5.5.6 Count of maternity leave incidences for Professional \& Support staff (STEMM) [Source: Trent]

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| On Leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instances of completed leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Returners | $63 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $100 \%$ | N/A | N/A |
| Stayed at least 6 months | $63 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $67 \%$ | N/A | N/A |
| Stayed at least 12 months | $50 \%$ | $62 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stayed at least 18 months | $50 \%$ | $62 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Table 5.5.7 Count of maternity leave incidences for Professional \& Support staff (AHSSBL) [Source: Trent]

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| On Leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instances of completed leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Returners | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Stayed at least 6 months | $89 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $71 \%$ | N/A | N/A |
| Stayed at least 12 months | $78 \%$ | $80 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stayed at least 18 months | $78 \%$ | $80 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |

(v) Paternity, shared parental, adoption, and parental leave uptake

Provide data and comment on the uptake of these types of leave by gender and grade for the whole institution. Provide details on the institution's paternity package and arrangements.
Table 5.5.8 Count of paternity and shared parental leave incidences (whole University) [Source: Trent]

| Absence Type | Classification | Area | Grade | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Paternity | A\&R staff | AHSSBL | Grade 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | A\&R staff | AHSSBL | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | A\&R staff | AHSSBL | Grade 9 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | A\&R staff | AHSSBL | Sessionals |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | A\&R staff | STEMM | Grade 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | A\&R staff | STEMM | Grade 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | A\&R staff | STEMM | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | A\&R staff | STEMM | Grade 9 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | A\&R staff | STEMM | Other |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | AHSSBL | Grade 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | AHSSBL | Grade 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | AHSSBL | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | AHSSBL | Grade 9 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | AHSSBL | Sessionals |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | STEMM | Grade 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | STEMM | Grade 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | Other | Grade 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | Other | Grade 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | Other | Grade 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | Other | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | Other | Grade 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | Other | Grade 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | P\&S staff | Other | Grade 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity | A\&R staff | AHSSBL | Grade 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Parental Leave | A\&R staff | Other | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Parental Leave | AHSSBL | Grade 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Parental Leave | A\&R staff | STEMM | Grade 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Parental Leave | A\&R staff | STEMM | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Parental Leave | A\&R staff | STEMM | Grade 9 |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Parental Leave | A\&R staff | STEMM | Other |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Parental Leave | A\&R staff | AHSSBL | Grade 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Parental Leave | P\&S staff | STEMM | Grade 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Parental Leave | P\&S staff | Other | Grade 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Parental Leave | P\&S staff | Other | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Parental Leave | P\&S staff | Other | Grade 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Parental Leave | P\&S staff | Other | Grade 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Adoption | Other | Grade 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adoption |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Closed out actions and impact from Bronze submission

AP 2016: E8 (i) In 2016 we implemented a programme of positive messaging on Shared Parental Leave for fathers (Figures 5.5.3 and 5.5.4). Evidence suggests this action will be contributing to tackling one of the reported components of low take-up, a gendered embarrassment/reluctance about requesting leave ${ }^{11}$

Figure 5.5.3 Positive messaging relating to fathering

| University of Reading | Staff portal | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staff home News and events Notices Wellteing |  |  |
| - UoR home | Father's Day: colleagues share parental leave experiences <br> Friday, 14 June 2019 | Leltex newy fer ywill |
| 4 Nawz home |  | Inversu' |
| Newne tor statt |  | , part |
| Peopit <br> Campuy untivis <br> Oviturnice | Gunday 16 June was I ather's Lay and a good to me to remind colloaqucs ocross the University obout Shered I'girental Lcave (sill). |  |
| Hot toplex |  | finaluy |
| - Imous licen |  | Thinges to do new |
| - 17 17 avan organlestiseal chert <br>  | mavemity or acoption Isखve, in a fickole way. InC <br>  <br> Dr Dan Jones with his daughter |  |
|  |  <br>  Unveraty etafi member and mest the eligibility critent, then the fires tu vesks of combirad | , |

Figure 5.5.4 Other fathers who have also spoken about their experiences of shared parental leave on our Staff Portal


Despite promising impact on attitudes, increasing take-up remains challenging (Table 5.5.8). Shared parental leave is taken up less than paternity leave. In focus groups, fathers/partners report a tendency for leave in earlier months (attracting higher pay) to be used by mothers, while partners take leave later with lower/no pay, presenting a welldocumented structural affordability problem ${ }^{3}$. Feedback suggests accessing occupational pay is difficult; current University policy offers partners occupational pay only where the mother returns to work in under 18 weeks, which we acknowledge, imposes a limitation. University agency over the deeper affordability issue is limited. However, significantly, the University has committed to enhancing paternity/partner/adoption leave from the statutory two weeks to four weeks (Action 2019 F5.1).
${ }^{1}$ House of Commons Women and Equalities Committee, March 2018. Fathers and the Workplace. First Report of Session 2017-19, HC358, p10. https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmwomeq/358/358.pdf
${ }^{2}$ House of Commons Women and Equalities Committee, March 2018. Fathers and the Workplace. First Report of Session 2017-19, HC358, p10. https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmwomeq/358/358.pdf
${ }^{3}$ Birkett, H. and Forbes, S., September 2018. Shared Parental Leave: Why is take-up so low and what can be done? Birmingham Business School, University of Birmingham. www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/business/research/wirc/spl-policy-brief.pdf

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP 2019 F1.1 | Improve mechanisms for reporting and monitoring allocation of reimbursements for cost of <br> maternity/adoption/SPL to Schools and Functions and use of (up to for non-academic staff) 25\% <br> contribution for returners, including sub-accounts for Schools and Functions that record spends. |
| AP 2019 F1.2 | Improve communication of these mechanisms, including sharing with leadership group and beyond <br> (including signposting via Parent and Family webpages) case studies of making effective use of these <br> funds to support returners (and see FL3). |
| AP 2019 F2.1 | Complete development of Parent and Family Network web pages that enable communication, mutual <br> support of parents and sharing of good practice. |
| AP 2019 F3.1 | Develop a Manager Support guide which includes case studies and FAQs for supporting staff before and <br> on return from paternity, adoption or SPL leave, including around flexible working arrangements (and see <br> FW1). |
| AP 2019 F4.1 | Conduct an analysis of what support, additional to that already provided by line managers and/or HR, is <br> available to those returning to work from any form of extended absence, to enable them to feel confident <br> about returning to the workplace. Investigate options and resources, including online support packages, <br> to address any needs identified |
| AP 2019 F5.1 | Increase length of paid paternity/partner/adoption leave from 2 weeks to 4 weeks. <br> AP 2019 F6.1Increase awareness and number of parent room facilities to support breastfeeding mothers on their <br> return to work. Highlight baby change facilities, including a map on the Parent and Family Network <br> webpages and info on our standard campus maps. |
| AP 2019 F7.1 | Review and update risk assessments for pregnant and breastfeeding staff including guidance for <br> laboratory workers. |

## (vi) Flexible working

Provide information on the flexible working arrangements available.

| Achievements | $\checkmark$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| General message on all job adverts encouraging job share/flexible working | $\checkmark$ |
| Sessions by Deans D\&I Sessions by Deans D\&I with leadership group on job share, including discussions <br> with a selection of current job share people | $\checkmark$ |
| Our work featured in HEFCE good practice guide + at ECU conference | $\checkmark$ |
| Examples of job share (and other flexible working) on Faces of Reading | $\checkmark$ |

Staff benefit from formal and informal flexible working. Our 'Examples of flexible working arrangements' HR document describes how some of these flexible working arrangements operate. In addition we use Lecturer Unavailability forms for teaching activities. Informal practices are used extensively where working remotely, varying start and finish times and moving days around (when part-time) are possible. Formal requests are more common when changes may impact hours or provision of teaching, research or an associated activity (Table 5.5.9).

Table 5.5.9 Formal requests for flexible working

|  | Approved | Declined | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2016 / 2017$ | Not available | Not available | Not available |
| $2017 / 2018$ |  |  |  |
| $2018 / 2019$ |  |  |  |

The results from the Staff Survey (Table 5.5.10) indicate that there is a generally positive perception concerning the University's willingness to accommodate flexible working, both formally and informally. However, we have not
progressed as much as we would have liked and in addition, our focus groups highlighted inconsistencies in the way we manage flexible working hence our significant actions in this area (AP 2019 E1.1-6).

Table 5.5.10 Staff Survey 2017 results relating to flexible working: percentages answering positively

|  | Female | Male |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I am aware of the formal flexible working arrangements at the University | $78 \%$ | $79 \%$ |
| I am able to take advantage of flexible working on an informal basis | $81 \%$ | $82 \%$ |
| I believe that if I requested flexible working arrangements, my request would be considered <br> fairly | $84 \%$ | $84 \%$ |


| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP 2019 E1.1 | Update existing guidance materials and documentation to support employees and line managers in <br> considering the full range of flexible and agile working options available, providing case studies to <br> illustrate successful flexible working arrangements across the University and including specific reference <br> to support around periods of extended leave |
| AP 2019 E1.2 | Provide visible and diverse examples of staff working flexibility, illustrating the benefits and compromises, <br> and enhance visibility of the associated HR policies, processes and guidance. See action plan for further <br> details |
| AP 2019 E1.3 | Work to encourage all senior managers, starting with the leadership group, to become positive about <br> flexible working. This will include concretely a workshop with the leadership group sharing experiences <br> on flexible working, including bringing in examples of people flexibly working (like we brought in job share <br> examples before), exercises on discussion/sharing of experiences, and input from IT (including on <br> technology for supporting remote working). |
| AP 2019 E1.4 | Embed consideration of working arrangements within the PDR process. |
| AP 2019 E1.5 | Communicate expectations within each School/Function that: <br> i) working patterns (including those of colleagues working flexibly around childcare responsibilities) and <br> other commitments (including those of international partners) are routinely taken into consideration <br> when organising meetings, so that participants invited are able to attend; |
| AP 2019 E1.6 | ii) where meetings cannot accommodate everyone, make arrangements for updating those unable to <br> attend. |
| Implement new technologies such as Microsoft Office 365 and Teams, to enable staff to collaborate <br> effectively internally and externally from a wider range of devices and locations, enabling further options <br> for agile and flexible working. The introduction of these new technologies will be accompanied by <br> guidance and training to ensure staff understand and make use of the technologies as appropriate to <br> their role and working hours. |  |

(vii) Transition from part-time back to full-time work after career breaks

Outline what policy and practice exists to support and enable staff who work part-time to transition back to full-time roles when childcare/dependent or caring responsibilities reduce.
Our flexible working policy enables staff to request temporary and permanent changes to working patterns though we do not routinely transition from part-time back to full-time. Good practice has included a Finance Partner prompting a manager to safeguard funds to give a returnee the option to return to full-time within one year of returning.
(viii) Childcare

Describe the institution's childcare provision and how the support available is communicated to staff.
Comment on uptake and how any shortfalls in provision will be addressed.

Details of childcare provision at the University are accessible via the University webpages. The Little Learners Nursery, run by RUSU can take 106 children and accepts children of students and staff of UoR (Figure 5.5.5). Opening hours are Monday to Friday 08:00-18:00 and focus group feedback was mixed about whether additional childcare during Open Days would be beneficial (Action AP 2019 F8.1). The University has run a Childcare Voucher scheme for many years, however the scheme has recently changed in line with the Government's changing of the tax efficiencies. The number of members is shown in Table 5.5.10

Figure 5.5.10 Staff who have taken up the childcare voucher scheme

| Number of people | Academic | PS | Grand Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | 73 | 104 | 177 |
| Male | 71 | 35 | 106 |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{1 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 3}$ |

Figure 5.5.5 Some of our parents who use the nursery

"Having a University nursery on campus made such a difference to me and my family, especially when returning from maternity leave! My husband was able to pick up the kids from nursery and, in later years when he started work on campus, we took turns for pick up enabling us to have the best of both worlds in spending time with the kids but also being able to progress our careers"

We have also identified a need to remove barriers to conference training for staff with childcare responsibilities (Actions AP 2019 E5.1, 5.2 and 5.3).
(ix) Caring responsibilities

Describe the policies and practice in place to support staff with caring responsibilities and how the support available is proactively communicated to all staff.

The University recognises that employees with dependants may wish to take time off, in addition to paid annual leave, to look after family members. Policies explaining Parental Leave, Compassionate Leave, Unpaid Leave and Flexible Working are available on the HR website. As with raising awareness of the support available for those with children, we will similarly extend this to those with other caring responsibilities (Action AP 2019 F9.1).

| AP 2019 F8.1 | Following up on focus group feedback, determine through further specific consultation whether being <br> present at Open Days on Saturdays causes difficulties for parents. If consultation warrants this, bring <br> proposals to Staffing Committee/D\&IAB/UEB to offer free childcare for staff (and possibly students) <br> present at Open Days, either by providing a crèche or paying for childcare costs. |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP 2019 F9.1 | Ensure materials to support flexible and agile working (see E1.1) include guidance for those with other <br> family caring responsibilities (such as eldercare) and reflect the multitude of working arrangements <br> already available within the University. |
| AP 2019 E5.1 | Change our travel and expenses policy to make clear that additional childcare costs made necessary by <br> attending a training course or conference (costs additional to the routine everyday costs of childcare) are <br> an allowable expense. |
| AP 2019 E5.2 | Advertise this through the usual communication channels and on the Parent and Family Webpages, and <br> advertise that many research funders (including all UK Research Councils), allow bidding for these costs <br> as a part of travel costs on grants. |
| AP 2019 E5.3 | Undertake a survey (e.g. via School/Function D\&I leads) to establish: i) spend on these childcare costs; ii) <br> extent to which we are accessing childcare funds from research funders. |

### 5.6 Organisation and culture (1141 words)

(i) Culture

Demonstrate how the institution actively considers gender equality and inclusivity. Provide details of how the charter principles have been, and will continue to be, embedded into the culture and workings of the institution and how good practice is identified and shared across the institution.

Our mechanisms for actively considering gender equality are the D\&I structures, champions, leads/teams set up since 2015 (Fig 2.2, Table 3.3). Good practice is shared through DICOP, ASPSG, D\&IAB and through LG sessions (e.g. Athena SWAN, flexible working, job-share, 2016-2017).

This work is supplemented by large effort on visibility/culture change, through:

- D\&l leads/teams in Schools/Functions (AP2019:A2.6)
- Support for School AS (§5.6(xii))
- funding for D\&I initiatives (Fig 5.6.1, Table 5.6.4)
- many consciousness-raising/inspirational D\&I events (e.g. Fig 5.6.3)
- supporting D\&I Networks (mentoring/funding) (Table 5.6.2, Fig 5.6.1)
- large staff effort on gender-equality external engagement (Table 5.6.3)
- Faces of Reading (§5.6(x))

Evidence of impact includes Staff Survey identifying D\&I as area of strength (Table 5.6.1), indeed as area perceived most positively by all job groups (Fig 3.2).

D\&I will be at heart of new University strategy (VC letter, actions below).

Table 5.6.1 Staff Survey 2017: percentages agreeing with statements

|  | UoR | F | M |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I believe the University of Reading is committed to equality of opportunity for all of its <br> staff | $91 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $94 \%$ |
| The University of Reading respects people equally regardless of their gender | $92 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| I am aware of the University's priorities for Diversity and Inclusion | $91 \%$ | $92 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| I feel proud to work for the University of Reading | $85 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $85 \%$ |

Table 5.6.2. Our Equality and Diversity Networks: those created since last AS submission in bold

| Name | When created |
| :--- | ---: |
| Women@Reading |  |
| LGBT+ Staff Network | Pre-2015 |
| Race Equity and Cultural Diversity Network | Pre-2015 |
| Staff Disability Network | 2016 |
| Parent and Family Network | 2017 |

Table 5.6.3. Sample of our external/public engagement on gender equality

| Name | Activity | Year(s) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Workshop on unconscious bias for OFCOM and Amnesty | $2016-17$ |
|  | Vote100 Impact Programme Principal Contributor, Astor100 National <br> Programme Lead | $2015-2020$ |
|  | 8-week gender-focused programme with DWP, 10-week gender-focused <br> programme with Whitley Community Development Association | 2019 |
|  | Editor of Special Issue 'Perspectives on Women in Higher Education Leadership <br> from around the World', Journal Administrative Sciences | $2017-18$ |
|  | Role Model for sessions at the Aurora Leadership Development Programme | $2017-2020$ |
|  | IDAHOT lecture at Intersectional Centre for Inclusion and Social Justice <br> (Canterbury Christchurch University) | 2017 |
|  | UK Gender Equality Law Expert for European Network of Legal Experts in <br> Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination for the EU Commission | $2016-2020$ |
|  | 'In conversation' series sponsored by the Institute of Advanced Legal <br> Studies/the Women's Library LSE - Women's Legal Landmarks authors talk <br> about their landmark to public audience. | 2019 |
|  | Invited member of 'Women in Science Q\&A Panel' at the NEPC | 2018 |
|  | 'Finding Your Voice': organiser and host of Jess Phillips MP visit and public talk, <br> convenor/speaker 'Celebrating Forgotten Women' public event | 2017 |
|  | Invited keynotes on D\&I at Government Office for Science and Technology, <br> Athena SWAN 10th anniversary keynote lecture at University of York, <br> Department of Chemistry | $2017-2018$ |
|  | Talks on Reading Athena SWAN experience at Queen Mary, Bath, UWE, <br> External Athena SWAN friend Sheffield Hallam | $2016-2019$ |
|  | Joint talk at AdvanceHE/ECU Conference on "Normalising Flexible Working <br> and Job-Share" | 2017 |
|  |  |  |

Figure 5.6.1 Our Equality and Diversity Networks feature as May in our 2019/20 D\&I Calendar


Figure 5.6.2 Call (twice a year) for bids for local D\&I initiative funding

| Proniversivo of | Staff portal <br> Information for staff \| 26 October 2019 | Go |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staff home News and events Notices Wellbeing |  |  |
| Jor home | Funding available for diversity initiatives Monday, 05 August 2019 <br> The Unlveraley is currently accepeine blds ror funding between EJv0 and E1, 000 tor projects $\qquad$ Lxamples of how the tuncing could be used inclues sulporting etaff time for piryerte, rovering rocte fine <br>  |  |
| th. |  |  |
| News for |  |  |
| Camsus auther, |  |  |
| thana.a.n.". |  |  |
| ust replet |  |  |
| - meprarim |  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> on sixubilily. <br>  <br>  | Thustocone |
| , |  | Contact Us |
| - Mastid |  |  |
| numat |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Table 5.6.4 Examples of gender-focussed projects receiving D\&I funding

| December 2017 | SLL <br> HUM | Feminism 100: Debates and Celebrations-three <br> connected student-facing events. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| December 2017 | CQSD | Debunking myths: exploring gendered responses to <br> the FLAIR CPD scheme |
| August 2018 | HBS | Visual impact of message for Diversity and Athena <br> SWAN |
| August 2019 | LAW | Setting up student focus group: How to commemorate <br> the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act 1919 |
| August 2018 | HBS | Tackling gender bias in recruitment |
| November 2018 | HUM | Sexuality and gender: radical revisioning through <br> cross-cultural philosophical dialogue |
| August 2019 | SMPCS | International Women in Mathematics Day 2020 <br> August 2019 <br> SLL |
| August 2019 | LAW | "The Disappearance of Miss Bebb"" - a play about <br> challenging inequalities. |

Fig 5.6.3. Our Flagship D\&I Annual Public Lectures.
The Edith Morley Lecture (Edith Morley the 1st UK female professor, appointed Professor of English Language at Reading in 1908)


| Year | Speaker | Further information |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $12^{\text {th }}$ March 2019 | Laura Bates | Author of 'Everyday Sexism' and the Sunday Times <br> bestseller 'Girl Up' |
| $5^{\text {th }}$ March 2018 | Polly Vacher MBE | Polly Vacher is alumna of the University and a <br> pioneering English aviator |
| $10^{\text {th }}$ March 2017 | Penny Mordaunt MP | Penny is alumna of UoR and MP for Portsmouth <br> North. |
| $8^{\text {th }}$ March 2016 | Karen Blackett OBE, <br> CEO of MediaCom UK | In 2014 Karen Blackett was the first woman to top the <br> PowerList 100 of most influential black Britons |

The Wolfenden Lecture (Wolfenden a former VC and lead for the 1957 Wolfenden Report)


| Year | Speaker(s) | Title |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16^{\text {th }}$ May 2019 | Hannah and Jake Graf | Our Trans Lives: life, love and Lorraine |
| $24^{\text {th }}$ May 2018 | Peter Tatchell | Section 28: A Poisonous Law and Legacy |
| $4^{\text {th }}$ May 2017 | Ruth Hunt | LGBT Equality: Past, Present and Future |
|  |  |  |


| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 A1.1 | Ensure that respect for diversity is captured as a core value in the new University vision to be <br> launched 2020 |
| AP2019 A1.2 | Embed diversity and inclusion actions, targets, and consideration across the detail of the new University <br> strategy. |
| AP2019 A1.3 | VC to join 30\% Club and its Higher Education Working Group |
| AP2019 I5.1 | We will introduce an annual University D\&I award, selected via nominations from across the <br> University, and presented at the annual meeting of the University Court. |
| AP2019 A2.6 | All 17 Functions appoint D\& leads (for some smaller functions shared across several functions), leading <br> thinking on local D\&I actions, matching the leads established across Schools |

(ii) HR policies (94 words)

Describe how the institution monitors the consistency in application of its HR policies for equality, dignity at work, bullying, harassment, grievance and disciplinary processes. Describe actions taken to address any identified differences between policy and practice. Include a description of the steps taken to ensure staff with management responsibilities are up to date with their HR knowledge.

HR colleagues are involved in formal discipline/grievance cases, responsible for consistency in application of policies. HR Partners work closely in support of managers/leaders; learning and development needs identified are addressed through one-to-one development or training interventions.

Table 5.6.5 Staff Survey 2017, with Capita HEI Sector Benchmark

|  | UoR | F | M | HEI Benchmark |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I'm not currently being harassed or bullied at work | $97 \%$ | $97 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $95 \%$ |

Table 5.6.6. Formal disciplinary or grievance cases involving an element of harassment and/or bullying

| Date | Grievance | Disciplinary |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Oct 16 - Sept 17 |  |  |
| Oct 17 - Sept 18 |  |  |
| Oct 18 - Sept 19 |  |  |
| Not all cases were upheld. Not all outcomes indicated that harassment or bullying had taken place. <br> Informal discussions, or cases where issues have been resolved by mediation, are not included. |  |  |

Increase in formal grievance cases in 18/19 (Table 5.6.6) may be impact of: November 2018 launch of revised harassment/bullying policy; University/RUSU 2018-19 \#NeverOK campaign against harassment/bullying/discrimination and promoting reporting/support (Figure 5.6.9).

Table 5.6.5, supplemented by confidential survey/1-2-1 interviews in summer 2019 (Table 3.5. Figure 5.6.10) of staff who had experienced harassment/bullying but not reported, has prompted actions below.

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 I4.1 | Run a session with the Leadership Group on harassment and bullying, making clear: i) the huge impacts <br> of harassment/bullying and not addressing this effectively (e.g. this might use, with permission, <br> anonymous quotes from our own staff survey and/or our own AS H\&B survey/interviews, to make clear <br> the impacts within UoR); ii) the importance of dealing effectively with this, and advice and coaching on <br> how to do this. As part of this bring out issues around particular protected characteristics, e.g. sex, <br> disability. |
| AP2019 I4.2 | Provide additional, in-depth training for those handling investigations into complaints which involve <br> allegations of harassment and bullying. |
| AP2019 I4.3 | Continue to improve staff awareness of the University's Harassment \& Bullying policy and reporting <br> arrangements, including the development and promotion of the \#NeverOK campaign. |
| AP2019 I4.4 | Raise awareness of the additional support available, including the University's Harassment Advisor team <br> and Employee Assistance Programme, as part of our \#NeverOK campaigning. |
| AP2019 I4.5 | Develop additional mechanisms to encourage a 'No Bystander' culture where all colleagues feel able to <br> challenge behaviour and understand ways in which they can take action and/or be supported, drawing <br> on good practice from elsewhere (e.g. the Active Bystander programme used at Imperial and other HE <br> institutions). |
| AP2019 I4.6 | Develop additional mechanisms, drawing on good practice from elsewhere, for raising awareness of the <br> forms which harassment and bullying can take, especially across the body of line managers, and <br> improving understanding of the impact this behaviour can have on individuals, for example through the <br> development of additional training interventions. |
| AP2019 I4.7 | Further develop the use of mediation at the University through the training of a wider pool of internal <br> mediators |

Figure 5.6.9. Advertising our Harassment Advisors as part of 2018-19 \#NeverOK campaign


Figure 5.6.10. Call for volunteers to talk about experiences of harassment/bullying not reported

| Poive uneadiving | Staff portal <br> Information for staff \| 26 October 2019 | -6o |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staft home News and events Notices Wellteing |  |  |
| 4 Uor home | Reminder: Athena SWAN: Tell us whether harassment and bullying reporting works for you <br> Thursday, 16 May 2019 <br> The University is currently proparing its Athena Swan | Letert news tor stan |
| 4 Newn home <br> Newn for refff Peopla Cumpua mullive Obitumrian |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Hol lopics | subulizaiun ut sereniler euvality and we have treated a <br> tcen (the siclf-Assessment Icam) to rescanch and |  |
|  | write the reoort and its associated action plan. Bub- <br> groups anc forusing on sponafice reporting arras; the <br>  <br> policies and data. Ihis sub-group is led by Dr Maddi <br> Roblonte (HR) and we are writing to ask fol your lielp. <br> We are asking colleagues to talk to us it they have experiencent harmogment andior hullying in <br> the part hut darmitd not to purgu* a somplaint. Wia slrwaty hava anonymous kummary data | Thun tomm nnw |
|  |  | 4evert |
| - Mimarir mimexamn tor |  |  |
| $\because$ Slur revur |  | mur |
|  |  |  |

(iii) Proportion of heads of school/faculty/department by gender

Comment on the main concerns and achievements across the whole institution and any differences between STEMM and AHSSBL departments.

Data provided for Schools (Tables 5.6.7, 5.6.8) and Functions (Table 5.6.9).
Table 5.6.7 Proportion of Heads of School by Gender and Year

|  | Female |  |  | Male |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $2016 / 2017$ | $2017 / 2018$ | $2018 / 2019$ | $2016 / 2017$ | $2017 / 2018$ | $2018 / 2019$ |
| HBS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IoE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ISLI |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SACD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SAGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SAPD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SBE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SBS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SCFP |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HUM |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LAW |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SMPCS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPCLS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPEIR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female \% | $33 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5.6.8 Proportion of School Management Groups by Gender 2019/2020

| School | School Management Group |  |  | Head of School |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Female | Male | Total | F |  |  |
| HBS |  |  |  | $44 \%$ |  |  |
| IoE |  |  |  | $75 \%$ |  |  |
| ISLI |  |  |  | $65 \%$ |  |  |
| SACD |  |  |  | $69 \%$ |  |  |
| SAGES |  |  |  | $67 \%$ |  |  |
| SAPD |  |  |  | $40 \%$ |  |  |
| SBE |  |  |  | $50 \%$ |  |  |
| SBS |  |  |  | $38 \%$ |  |  |
| SCFP |  |  |  | $52 \%$ |  |  |
| HUM |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LAW |  |  |  | $57 \%$ |  |  |
| SLL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SMPCS |  |  |  | $78 \%$ |  |  |
| SPCLS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPEIR |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5.6.9 Proportion of Directors of Functions by Gender: Nov 2019

| Function | F | M |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ASE |  |  |
| CC |  |  |
| Commercial |  |  |
| CQSD |  |  |
| IT |  |  |
| Estates |  |  |
| Finance |  |  |
| Governance |  |  |
| GRA |  |  |
| HR |  |  |
| ULCS |  |  |
| MCE |  |  |
| PSO |  |  |
| Procurement | $44 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| Student Services |  |  |
| Technical Services |  |  |
| Total |  |  |
| Percentage |  |  |

Female proportion HoS has increased from $33 \%$ to $37 \%$ with new HoS job-share. HoS roles are re-advertised every six years, with open recruitment across the University (making clear job-share welcomed) and pipelines are strong for female progression to HoS in all Schools (Table 5.6.8). There is good female leadership representation across Functions (Table 5.6.9).
(iv) Representation of men and women on senior management committees ( 65 words)

Provide data by gender, staff type and grade and comment on what the institution is doing to address any gender imbalance.

Actions taken include: pushing target of at least $30 \%$ of either gender (Table 4.1.36); use of job-share (UEB), supported by session on job-share with LG; pro-active advertisement for Lay Members of Council with D\&I experience. We do not break down membership by staff-type/grade (Action AP2019:I2.2).

Closed out actions and impact from Bronze Action Plan
AP 2016:E2 $\quad$ Our target (at least 30\% of either gender) has been achieved for all senior management committees except S\&FC (Table 5.6.10)

Table 5.6.10 Proportion of Committee Membership who are Female (not yet at 30\% of either gender in red)

| Committee | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 1 9}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Council | $34 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| S\&FC | $17 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| UBTLSE | $56 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| UBRI | $50 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Senate | $38 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| UEB | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $25 \%(37.5 \%$ from 1/1/20, VC Letter) |
| Remuneration | N/A | N/A | $33 \%$ | $40 \%$ |

(v) Representation of men and women on influential institution committees

Provide data by committee, gender, staff type and grade and comment on how committee members are identified, whether any consideration is given to gender equality in the selection of representatives and what the institution is doing to address any gender imbalances.

We push our target of 30\%F on key committees (Table 4.1.36), e.g. D\&I Dean working with VC and LG, Governance writing to committee chairs. Through AS focus groups (Table 3.5) we identified perceived barriers to being involved in committee work with potential gender-balance implications. We are now advertising opportunities to join committees of influence (Figure 5.6.10).

Figure 5.6.10. Open recruitment to new research committees 13/11/19


Table 5.6.11. Proportion of Committee Membership who are Female (not yet at 30\% of either gender in red)

| Committee | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0 2 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Academic Probation | Not Known | $25 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Appointments and Governance | $13 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Audit | $11 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| D\&IAB | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $65 \%$ |
| Honorary Degrees | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Investments | $0 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Personal Titles | $8 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Planning Group | $10 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| Postgraduate Research Studies | $40 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| Re-grading | $29 \%$ | $/$ | $57 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
| Student Experience | $43 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $69 \%$ |
| Staffing | $30 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $54 \%$ |


| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 I2.1 | We will include within the terms of reference for all our key committees a statement of commitment <br> to our targets for gender and BAME representation on key committees. |
| AP2019 I2.2 | Develop a more comprehensive dataset of key committee composition, to include data on balance of <br> membership with respect to gender, ethnicity, Grade, staff type (academic/professional) balance of <br> membership. |
| AP2019 I2.3 | Share best practice in use of digital tools, including Microsoft Teams, that support document sharing, <br> flexible and remote working, from Research Governance to other committees. |
| AP2019 I2.4 | Capture best practice and training to reduce the barriers to being a member of a committee. |

(vi) Committee workload

Comment on how the issue of 'committee overload' is addressed where there are small numbers of men or women and how role rotation is considered.

Our committee gender target (Table 4.1.36) deliberately focuses on 'key' committees only, to avoid overload. Committee membership often linked to role, presenting challenges relating to rotation of members. We have committees, e.g. Reward Committee, where members are encouraged to send representatives to deputise, useful for development and reducing burden. Many committees have expectation that members will stand for fixed period only.
(vii) Institutional policies, practices and procedures

Describe how gender equality is considered in development, implementation and review. How is positive and/or negative impact of existing and future policies determined and acted upon?

The Policies and Procedures Group, chaired by University's UEB Champion for Disability, audits and develops policies and consults widely in its work regarding D\&I impacts, including with Dean D\&I, Equality and Diversity Networks. The AS AIT supports policy revision relating to AS Action Plan.

Closed out action and impact from Bronze Action Plan
AP2016 F1 $\quad$ AIT worked with HR/Finance/MCE on policy for full funding for maternity/SPL/adoption leave with requirement to spend part ( $25 \%$ for academic staff) on returner. Impact evidenced through survey of Heads of Schools/Functions. Examples include: training/membership with professional body to enable catch up with recent developments (Estates); extending maternity teaching cover into return period to reduce teaching load (SPCLS).
(viii) Workload model

Describe any workload allocation model in place and what it includes. Comment on whether the model is monitored for gender bias and whether it is taken into account at appraisal/development review and in promotion criteria. Comment on the rotation of responsibilities and if staff consider the model to be transparent and fair.

Staff Survey (Table 5.6.12) highlighted excessive workload is a problem. Comments in University Strategy Consultation (May 2019) and Career Development Survey (Table 3.5) emphasised concerns around: impacts of workload and administrative burden on staff capacity; lack of time for training. Our AS Family Leave focus groups flagged concerns regarding work allocation to part-time staff.

All aspects of workload are recognised in promotion processes, notably through Citizenship Criteria, and requirements reduced pro rata for part-time staff (see $\S 5.1$ (iii)). School D\&I leads/D\&I Network Leads appointed since 2016 have had 0.2FTE workload allowance.

Table 5.6.12. Staff Survey results relating to workload: percentages agreeing with statement

|  | UoR <br> total | F | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I never feel stressed at work | $9 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| The University of Reading provides good support to help me balance my work <br> and personal commitments | $74 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $76 \%$ |
| I feel I have a good work-life balance | $70 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
| I don't find my current workload too much and I am not struggling to cope | $61 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
| I don't feel I've had to put in a lot of extra time in the last 12 months to meet the <br> demands of my workload | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $29 \%$ |

The design/operation of workload models is delegated to Schools, with sharing of examples/good practice through HoS Group.

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 I3.1 | Review existing workload models with the outcome of developing clear guidance for best practice (e.g. <br> an institutional-wide template), including a steer on gender and wider diversity considerations, and share <br> good practice on workload models across the institution. |
| AP2019 I3.2 | Expand recent work on staff wellbeing to undertake a project focused on understanding the perceptions <br> and realities in relation to workloads for staff across the University and to propose relevant actions |

(ix) Timing of institution meetings and social gatherings

Describe the consideration given to those with caring responsibilities and part-time staff around the timing of meetings and social gatherings.

We seek to organise institutional meetings and social gatherings to support those with caring responsibilities (e.g. Figure 5.6.11), varying day of the week to accommodate part-time staff. We need to do more at a local level, particularly in Functions not covered by School AS, while recognising that some areas operate 24/7 and many meetings are over more than one time-zone with colleagues overseas.

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 E1.5 | Communicate expectations within each School/Function that: <br> iii) <br> working patterns (including those of colleagues working flexibly around childcare <br> responsibilities) and other commitments (including those of international partners) are <br> routinely taken into consideration when organising meetings, so that participants invited are <br> able to attend; <br> where meetings cannot accommodate everyone, we make arrangements for updating those <br> unable to attend. |

Figure 5.6.11. Typical University social gathering (26/5/19), timed 12:00-14:00.

(x) Visibility of role models (139 words)

Describe how the institution builds gender equality into organisation of events. Comment on the gender balance of speakers and chairpersons in seminars, workshops and other relevant activities. Comment on publicity materials, including the institution's website and images used.

Gender balance is considered centrally in: websites, e.g. Faces of Reading project (see box); intranet, press releases, event speakers (Table 5.6.13); naming of buildings (Fig 5.6.15); nominations for national honours (Table 5.6.15); research showcases (Fig 5.6.15).

| Closed out actions and impact from Bronze Action Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AP2016 D2(i) | We have created the "Faces of Reading" webpages, profiling 49 staff (25F:24M, 16 <br> BAME (9F:7M), 1 Trans (Fig 6.5)), each with picture and text profile, showcasing <br> diversity of: protected characteristics, roles (P\&S, A\&R), grades, working arrangements <br> (flexible working, two job-shares), family leave, etc. Impact has been created by linking <br> via banner on our main jobs page (plus links in letters to applicants), with page views <br> as Table 5.6.14. Inclusion of L-G-B-T visible role models praised in Stonewall WEI <br> feedback. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| AP2016 D2(ii) | We have named, after prominent former women professors and alumni, the Edith <br> Morley Building, the Polly Vacher Building, the Slingo Lecture Theatre (Figure 5.6.15). | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |

Table 5.6.13. Audit in 2019 of Role Model Gender Balance

| Intranet "Staff Portal" news articles in 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Females in articles | 176 | Males in articles | 144 | 55\%F |
| Females in images | 44 | Males in images | 23 | 66\%F |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Press releases in 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Females in release | 105 | Males in release | 123 | 46\%F |
| Females in image | 64 | Males in images | 66 | 49\%F |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Speakers at central University public events in 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Male | Female | Trans | Not known | \%F |
| 47 | 44 | 2 | 6 | 44\% |

Table 5.6.14. Page views and time on Faces of Reading reading.ac.uk/faces

|  | Unique page views | Average time on page (min:sec) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $1 / 5 / 17-1 / 5 / 18$ (12 months) | 7605 | $4: 20$ |
| $2 / 5 / 18-2 / 5 / 19$ (12 months) | 4557 | $3: 47$ |
| $3 / 5 / 19-3 / 11 / 19$ (6 months) | 2259 | $3: 45$ |

Figure 5.6.15 Naming ceremonies for The Edith Morley Building and the Polly Vacher Building


Table 5.6.15. National Honours Awarded to University Staff 2016-19

| Award | Recipient | Year | F | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| British Empire Medal | Head of Building Maintenance | 2016 |  |  |
| OBE | Professor and Head of ISLI | 2017 |  |  |
| MBE | Lecturer in Creative Writing | 2018 |  |  |
| OBE | Professor of Hydrology | 2019 |  |  |

Figure 5.6.16. Postcard advertising the 2019 Fairbrother Lecture by a PhD student; this lecture the flagship annual showcase for our PGRs.


| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 I6.1 | We will refresh our Faces of Reading and will showcase these with a physical exhibition in the library <br> foyer exhibition space in the centre of campus. |

(xi) Outreach activities

Provide data on the staff involved in outreach and engagement activities by gender and grade. How is staff contribution to outreach and engagement activities formally recognised? Comment on the participant uptake of these activities by school type and gender.

Our central outreach team (Table 5.6.16), working with staff/students across the University, offers a range of events, programmes, activities for school/college students on and off campus.

Table 5.6.16 Gender and Grade of Outreach Team

|  | Male | Female |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| G8 |  |  |
| G7 |  |  |
| G6 |  |  |
| G5 |  |  |
| Interns |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |

Reading Scholars Scheme is our central widening-participation programme: 300 year- 12 students and 110 year-10 students in 2018/2019 (Table 5.6.17). Year 12 participants visit for three days plus a three-day summer school.

Table 5.6.17 Gender split of Reading Scholars

| Year | Female \% | Male \% | Not known \% |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $2016 / 2017$ | $65.6 \%$ | $34.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $2017 / 2018$ | $73.4 \%$ | $24.9 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| $2018 / 2019$ | $73.9 \%$ | $24.5 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ |

In 2018-19 we engaged with approximately 6,750 students in our under-16s outreach. We model LGBT+ diversity through our staff, and LGBT+/LGBT+ Ally lanyards, and have regular feedback from LGBT+ participants that this is appreciated. We have poor gender-balance in student volunteers/ambassadors (Table 5.6.18).

Table 5.6.18 Student outreach volunteers in schools

| Year | Female \% | Male \% | UK | EU/International |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2016 / 2017$ | $82 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| $2017 / 2018$ | $83 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| $2018 / 2019$ | $83 \%$ | $17 \%$ | Not known | Not known |

Table 5.6.19 illustrates typical school type for students attending Reading Scholars.
Table 5.6.19. School type for Year 10 Reading Scholars 2018

| School type attended | Percentage of students |
| :--- | ---: |
| Selective | $0 \%$ |
| Non-selective | $100 \%$ |
| Mixed | $87.50 \%$ |
| Single Sex - Girls | $12.50 \%$ |
| Single Sex - Boys | $0 \%$ |

Outreach work is included in workload models and recognised within Citizenship Criteria for promotion.

Unlike many other HEls, we do not yet run larger scale cross-institution science outreach/community events.

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 I10.1 | Trial mechanisms for attracting a better gender balance in student outreach volunteers/ambassadors, for <br> example recruitment reaching out to male-dominated UG courses. |
| AP2019 I7.1 | Pilot an annual family fun science day, with a significant women-in-science component, including show- <br> casing the fantastic work done by a number of our female scientists/engineers/ mathematicians at many <br> career stages. |

(xii) Leadership

Describe the steps that will be taken by the institution to encourage departments to apply for the Athena SWAN awards.

Continue current support (box) and add new actions.

## Actions and impact from Bronze Action Plan

AP2016 A3(i), $\quad$ Support has included:
B1, B2

- Dean D\&I session with LG on Athena SWAN
- 1-2-1 D\&I briefing sessions with each Head of School
- Ensuring appointment D\&I leads in every School
- Setting up DICOP; creation through DICOP of AS Do's and Don'ts
- Creation of AS Data Dashboard, updated every 6 months
- Initial Dean D\&I advice/input/guidance at start of application
- Feedback on draft submissions for all but one application

Feedback from 2019 DICOP survey on this support includes: "Dashboard very helpful ... data accessed easily and compared to sector", "Very helpful/timely feedback and sessions to go through comments [that] greatly improved application." Impact has included 4 Silver/3 Bronze awards/renewals since 2016.

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 I11.1 | Host centrally all successful AS applications on the Charter Marks page of the Diversity and <br> Inclusion website. |
| AP2019 I11.2 | Working with DICOP, update our guidance on preparing applications, and host this guidance on the D\&I <br> website. |
| AP2019 I11.3 | Investigate assigning former successful School Athena SWAN leads as mentors for AHSSBL SAT Chairs. |

6. SUPPORTING TRANS PEOPLE ( 379 words, total (i)-(iii))

Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words
(i) Current policy and practice

Provide details of the policies and practices in place to ensure that staff are not discriminated against on the basis of being trans, including tackling inappropriate and/or negative attitudes.

As action AP2016:G1 we introduced "Trans and Gender identity: Supporting Information and Procedures for Staff/Students", making clear our commitment to respecting individuals' right to self-identify in their gender identity, and detailing processes/practices to follow to ensure that trans students/staff have an inclusive experience and are supported through transitioning, e.g. with paid time off for appointments/treatment.

In our 2018 revision of our harassment/bullying policy/procedures we made it explicit that transphobia/misgendering are examples of harassment.

Both policies/procedures are signposted from main D\&I staff and student intranet pages, and regularly advertised as part of other actions to support trans inclusivity.

Since 2016 these have included:

- Creating and growing an LGBT+ Allies network (jointly with LGBT+ networks and RUSU), with recruitment/training every six months (Fig 6.4), and the uptake of thousands of LGBT+/LGBT+ Ally postcards/lanyards across campus
- High-profile University events bringing trans voices on to campus, including for Trans Day of Remembrance and IDAHOBIT, hosted by VC and LGBT+ networks (Figs 6.1-6.3)
- Bi-Annual Trans Awareness Sessions for staff/student (typically 25-50 per session)
- Set up the Thames Valley LGBT+ Employer Network, sharing good practice on LGBT+ inclusivity through termly meetings with 10-20 local employers
- Provided support and confidential advice for individuals who wish to transition
- Introduced the options of Mx or "no title" for our staff and student records
- Developed Gender Neutral Toilet Policy, marking them on campus maps (now 31 buildings on Whiteknights/London Road Campuses), while also retaining gendered facilities responding to staff/student feedback
- Launched University/RUSU Pronoun Badges, supported by comms and \#DiverseReading blog authored by UEB LGBT+ Champion plus student/staff LGBT+ representatives (Figure 6.5)
- Used the Faces of Reading website to promote trans role models (Figure 6.6)


## Impact from actions

As an impact from these and other actions we are a Stonewall 2019 Top100 Employer, requiring a high trans score in the Stonewall WEI

Figure 6.1. Flyers distributed across UoR for Wolfenden Lecture 2019 and "Jessica Lynn's Transgender Journey" (2018, and repeated 2019)


Figure 6.2 Publicising Flag-Raising/Speeches for Annual Transgender Day of Remembrance Ceremony


Figure 6.3 Publicising Annual IDAHOBIT Flag-Raising/Speeches


Figure 6.4 Pronoun badge pick-up point (left); advertising Bi-Annual LGBT+ Ally Info/Recruitment Event (right)


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { University of } \\ & \text { Reading } \end{aligned} \quad \text { Staff DOrtal }$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 InP hamh | Becoming an LGBT+ Ally, and Other Events through LGBT+ History Month <br> Tuesday, 29 January 2019 <br> I fhniary is I fill I llistary Manth, and maff mant <br>  <br>  interesting and vaned range of events, including our <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Lextr nwa for axtif <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  - mifl Amim <br>  I Hindolly मImatim <br> Thinfy th An nem <br> - dakenita teray <br> Espilatill 14. <br> - 1 Pasil <br>  $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{4}$ Newa home |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nateve ful mallf Ffonlim |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Campus authers <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hbl lupy붗 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - 「esple Ilep <br> - Hamembly Qumilativial tian <br>  yull <br> * : ilaff l an aill <br> - hulituri <br> - Folvenall bivither Buluy |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 6.5. Faces-of-Reading Profile: full profile (not shown) a colleague talks positively about experience of coming out as trans at UoR.

(ii) Monitoring

Provide details of how the institution monitors the positive and/or negative impact of these policies and procedures, and acts on any findings.

In our 2017 staff survey (§3(ii)) we asked about gender identity, enabling analysis of all responses by this characteristic (e.g. Table 6.1). No issues were raised in this analysis or in free-text responses.

We monitor annually summaries of incidents of harassment/bullying. No trans-related issues have been flagged in assessment period. We keep policies/procedures under review, taking feedback from LGBT+ networks, through termly LGBT+ Action Plan Group (see §2(i)).

Table 6.1 Staff Survey 2017, including Capita HEI Benchmark: percentages agreeing

|  | UoR (all staff) | UoR (Transgender staff) | HEI Benchmark |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I am not currently being harassed or <br> bullied at work | $97 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $95 \%$ |

(iii) Further work

Provide details of further initiatives that have been identified as necessary to ensure trans people do not experience unfair treatment at the institution.

Actions completed: see 6(i). New actions identified by LGBT+ Action Plan Group include:

| New actions |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 J1.1 | Building on initial guidance for the LGBT community about travelling safely abroad, produced <br> recently at the request of a D\&I lead, we will create more complete guidance, supported by <br> Stonewall and our own LGBT+ communities, and will communicate this widely to LGBT+ <br> staff/students and their managers/tutors. |
| AP2019 J1.2 | Enhance our Trans and Gender identity information/procedures/guidance, to give more explicit <br> and user-friendly support for staff/students, line managers/HR, including using a Q\&A format <br> regarding how colleagues can best support. |
| AP2019 J2.1 | We will continue, as per our Gender Neutral Toilet Policy, to expand our gender neutral toilet <br> provision, including provision in all new-build and refurbished buildings. |
| AP2019 B3.1 | Push on staff protected characteristics declaration via the sensitive data tab on Employee Self Service <br> within Trent, with a particular emphasis on race, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, where <br> "unknowns" are high. |

## FURTHER INFORMATION <br> Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words ( 276 words)

Please comment here on any other elements that are relevant to the application; for example, other gender-specific initiatives that may not have been covered in the previous sections.

Table 7.1. Staff Survey 2017 results relating to wellbeing: percentages agreeing to questions

|  | UoR | F | M |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I feel the University is interested in my physical wellbeing | $78 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $81 \%$ |
| I feel the University is interested in my mental wellbeing | $68 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
| The University provides support to help me maintain a healthy lifestyle and <br> feeling of wellbeing | $62 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $66 \%$ |

In response to our Staff Survey results in 2017 (Table 7.1), the University held focus groups in areas indicated as of concern (Table7.2).

Table 7.2. Focus Groups in 2017

| Topic | Total academic <br> attendees (F:M) | Total professional <br> attendees (F:M) | Total attendees |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Change | $11(7 \mathrm{~F}: 4 \mathrm{M})$ | $36(27 \mathrm{~F}: 9 \mathrm{M})$ | $47(34 \mathrm{~F}: 13 \mathrm{M})$ |
| Communications | $18(15 \mathrm{~F}: 3 \mathrm{M})$ | $50(39 \mathrm{~F}: 11 \mathrm{M})$ | $68(54 \mathrm{~F}: 14 \mathrm{M})$ |
| Wellbeing | $10(9 \mathrm{~F}: 1 \mathrm{M})$ | $57(47 \mathrm{~F}: 10 \mathrm{M})$ | $67(56 \mathrm{~F}: 11 \mathrm{M})$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{3 9}(31 \mathrm{~F}: 8 \mathrm{M})$ | $\mathbf{1 4 3}(113 \mathrm{~F}: 30 \mathrm{M})$ | $\mathbf{1 8 2}(144 \mathrm{~F}: 38 \mathrm{M})$ |

This resulted in convening of a University-wide People Plan Board, one stream tasked with wellbeing. Initiatives that emerged included a Wellbeing Week for staff in September 2019 (Figure 7.1) with more than 400 staff members engaged in a variety of wellbeing activities. Significantly, we have launched a Wellbeing Peer Support Network (Figure 7.2), volunteer staff trained to provide support to colleagues who may be experiencing challenges with emotional or mental wellbeing. More than 30 colleagues have signed up and the network launched October 2019. In addition, the University has supported reduction of membership fees at the on-site SportsPark (Figure 7.3) to encourage staff to join. We have also launched a campus Wellbeing Map for our Whiteknights Campus with maps being developed for other campuses (Figure 7.4).

Figure 7.1 Publicising Wellbeing Week

| University of <br> Reading <br> Staff portal <br> Information for staff \| 26 October 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staff home News and events Notices Wellbeing |  |  |  |  |
| - Uor heme | Take some time for you in 'Wellbeing Week' |  |  | Lutant nown tor ntutt |
| * Newar home |  |  |  | * Itsonli amilific <br> updule <br> - Uel Heurd: Jiceuge and diahara with the siratt ronim <br> * Apply tor Sirhosl ans funcrian mvant funlen! |
| News for stulf Noryul. Compua authora |  |  |  |  |
| Obltuarian |  |  |  |  |
| Howl trping |  |  |  | ithinye to do now |
| - l'oople I'len <br> - Mrquintiaviental blart: <br> - lincait mimmotualit <br> calt <br> + xalll\|run <br> * In Kncic <br> - \| stamal :|pazkar l'uicy |  <br> tirl lonpllinet hurm. <br> The Dribubl I lount ruanduliun ale cumbing in un <br> Tiestay 17 and Thuscday 19 Septemher ottering tree sessions on "Heart Age Awareness" <br> (booking details below.. Hoo on the interactive llealth kiosk in the JJ ihomoson foyer ffor fret) ard come olong is Wellbeing talks on Werincesdey 18 Scpternber <br> Gee involver and aer rewarried tor hongting vour own wellheing and sugrainability eftorts wirh |  |  |  |

Figure 7.2 Publicising Wellbeing Peer Support


Figure 7.4. Wellbeing Map


Figure 7.3 Publicising Reduced SportsPark Membership

| University of Reading | Staff portal | Go |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staff home New | nts Notices Wellbeing |  |
| 4 Hok hamm | Reduced SportsPark membership now available Wednesday, 03 July 2019 | Latest news for staff |
| 4 Nawra homa |  | - Health and Life <br> Sciences building update <br> - Get Heard: discuss and debate with the Staff Forum <br> - Apply for School and function event funding |
| Nowerro fun , ciaff |  membership fees for 'sportepyon ss our students. The maicrion oppilles ro all mero kevele of mamhorship offored. Ihe mont popular memhershup (which intlutles acoess to the WYIT anclall the tlasses) will comn down to foll.so ner month, a rediuction of $4: 1 \mathrm{wn}$. |  |
| Pasplia |  |  |
| Sumpuy uulliviy shluit man in.. |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Honl | This s्रives colledulues value fot merrey actese to a enmbenimatly sited aym. | Things to do now |
| - Muate Men <br> \& IIPIVAFRITY |  | - Submita story |
|  | The charge wincides with lie laurch of a new Active | ${ }^{\text {Contact Us }}$ |
| - Dravilt: Intormation for <br> - Stat 「orum <br> $\therefore$ En arat |  lifestyle for their phyaical ind mentel weil beinge. At the very core of the strotegy is a belicf that an actuve lifestyle is extremely positive for both of these. | - Email: ${ }_{\text {communications@readir }}$ |
|  |  |  |

Gender-specific aspects to this initiative include menopause and prostate cancer support. At the beginning of the year, our OH manager organised a national event for HE OH Practitioners. During the wellbeing week our Interactive Health Kiosk, visited by approximately 300 members of staff, made information/advice on the menopause available (Figure 7.5).

Talks from external experts on the menopause are planned in 2020 through our Women@Reading Network and discussions on the launch of our menopause café are underway. We will continue to raise awareness and support employees and managers in understanding potential impacts in the workplace. Guidance will be made available (AP2091:I9.1). Similarly, through our OH Manager we have started raising awareness of Prostate Cancer; so far leaflets and advice have been made available in our Estates Function.

| New action |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AP2019 19.1 | Increasingly raise awareness amongst employees and line managers of gender-related wellbeing, such as <br> aspects associated with the menopause and prostate cancer through information on the wellbeing webpages, <br> seminars and networking events |

Figure 7.5 Menopause information made available during Wellbeing Week


## University of Reading Athena SWAN Action Plan: January 2020 to April 2024

| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Governance |  |  |  |  |  |
| A1.1 | The University and D\&I Governance drives forwards change, embeds D\&। permanently, and ensures progress against Athena SWAN and other external benchmarking. | Ensure that respect for diversity is captured as a core value in the new University vision to be launched 2020 | Set tone from the top and make clear that D\&I work is considered important by the University (and will encourage D\&I work, since we set requirements for work across the University to link into our strategy). | March 2020 | VC | Diversity and inclusion and associated targets captured in the new University Strategy, leading to emphasis on D\&I in the strategy period |
| A1.2 |  | Embed diversity and inclusion actions, targets, and consideration across the detail of the new University strategy. |  | March 2020 | VC |  |
| A1.3 |  | VC to join 30\% Club and its Higher Education Working Group | Demonstrate commitment to diversifying our board. Provide route for us to hear about good practice, and to share our good practice (e.g. use of job-share on UEB). | January 2020 | VC | We have used membership to exchange good practice, including sharing our own experiences of board-level job-share. |
| A1.4 |  | Take stock in 2020 of progress against our D\&I targets (gender targets in Table 4.1.36), revisit our targets for 2026 agreed by UEB in 2015, and adopt through UEB and Council challenging new targets for gender equality through to 2026, which we then widely and publicly advertise, at the same time celebrating progress made against 2020 targets. | Government Equalities Office evidence-based guidance ${ }^{9}$ on reducing pay gaps recommends setting realistic and specific timebound targets. Locally we have seen targets set in 2020 prompt action and significant progress against | February-June $2020$ | Dean D\&I working with DVC/D\&IAB/UEB/Coun cil | Targets set in 2020. <br> Progress against those targets reported in annual D\&I reports in January and in next AS submission. |

[^11]| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | these targets (Table 4.1.36 and VC Letter) |  |  |  |
| A1.5 |  | Ask Schools/Functions to articulate in Five Year Plans what actions they are taking to support progress against University D\&I targets. |  | Annually from October 2020 | Dean D\&I working with DVC | Schools/Functions actions are supporting progress against university targets from A1.4. |
| A2.1 | We have in place effective structures to advance gender equality | Form new Athena SWAN implementation group (ASIG) to drive actions and ensure that this continues to be representative of Schools/Functions, with at least $30 \%$ male/female, representative of career stages, PT/FT, variety of work-life balance, caring responsibilities. | ASIG created that can drive forwards this action plan | January 2020 | Designated ASIG CoChairs (Dean D\&I/Director Technical Services) | Actions from this action plan are completed. <br> Action plan is regularly reviewed/updated, and progress monitored. <br> The ASIG interacts effectively and shares ideas, good practice, with other D\&I groups internally and |
| A2.2 |  | Formalise Athena Swan Professional Services (Sub)Group of SAT (ASPSG) as ongoing group that progresses P\&S actions and feeds in to DICOP and ASIG | This has been an effective group supporting development of this action plan and there is enthusiasm to continue, particular to support P\&Srelated actions. | March 2020 | ASIG Co-Chair (Director Technical Services) | xternally |
| A2.3 |  | Both Co-Chairs of ASIG to join D\&IAB | Groups working on D\&I can coordinate effectively | January 2020 | DVC (Chair of D\&IAB) |  |
| A2.4 |  | AISG to engage with internal equality and diversity networks throughout implementation stage, including through D\&IAB |  | At least twice a year 2019-2023 through joint participation in D\&IAB | ASIG Co-Chairs |  |
| A2.5 |  | AISG to engage externally throughout implementation stage, including through London West Athena SWAN Regional Network | We need to learn from best practice elsewhere | January 2020- <br> April 2024 | ASIG Co-Chairs |  |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | and Network of Equality, Diversity \& Inclusion Academic Leads. |  |  |  |  |
| A2.6 |  | All 17 Functions appoint D\&l leads (for some smaller functions shared across several functions), leading thinking on local D\&I actions, matching the leads established across Schools | We need D\&I work embedded across the University | By end academic year 2020-21 | Dean D\&I | All functions have D\&l lead by October 2021, these leads part of Diversity and Inclusion Community of Practice (DICOP): baseline: 5 Functions have these leads at $1 / 11 / 19$ ) |
| B | Data - Quantitative and Qualitative |  |  |  |  |  |
| B1.1 | We want to increase transparency of diversity and inclusion data related to gender and ethnicity to encourage and support effective action | Building on existing Athena SWAN dashboards available to Athena SWAN SAT teams, publish annually for each school (where there at least 5 in each sub-category to avoid identifying individual staff): <br> i) $\%$ of academic staff who are M/F, who are BAME/White; <br> ii) $\quad \%$ at Grades 6-9 who are M/F, BAME/White; <br> iii) comparison data for sector. | These actions, generated by the subgroup working on equal pay/gender pay gaps, are inspired by the success of the BBC 50/50 Project which has used similar communications to encourage and monitor change, inspiring internal competition. <br> The rationale is to encourage change by transparency of data, the change coming through: i) making the data available to raise profile and encouraging addressing of the associated issues; ii) stimulating pressure within particular schools and functions to do better. | Annually from January 2021 | Planning and Support Office | That this data is published and made available to Heads of Schools and Functions. <br> That Schools/Functions propose actions in Five Year Plans to tackle to reduce pay gaps. <br> That we see a reduction of the gender pay gap by at least 5 percentage points by 2024 (baseline 18.5\% median pay gap). |
| B1.2 |  | In advance of annual Five-Year Planning round, make available to Heads of Schools/Functions (where headcount is sufficiently large) local pay gap data (including for gender and race), together with guidance on actions that are being taken at University level to reduce pay gaps, and advice on potential actions at local level to increase $F$ |  | Annually from October 2020 | Planning and Support Office |  |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | and BAME staff representation and reduce pay gaps. |  |  |  |  |
| B2.1 | That we eradicate leaky pipelines across the University | Explore, through local Athena SWAN SATs in AHSSBL schools, the existence of leaky pipelines (in particular for men) from PGR to postdoc in AHSSBL schools, and the reasons behind these, with a view to remedial action. | Data suggests leaky pipeline (for men) from PGR to postdoc across AHSSBL as a whole (discussion below Table 4.1.3). | January 2020- <br> November 2021 <br> (doing this work <br> as part of local <br> School AS <br> applications, <br> Table 2.2) | D\&I leads in AHSSBL Schools | Understanding of the underlying issues that is sufficiently good to decide whether action needed and what action. |
| B3.1 | That we have data on staff that enables us to understand the different experiences of the University of different protected characteristics | Push on staff protected characteristics declaration via the sensitive data tab on Employee Self Service within Trent, with a particular emphasis on race, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, where "unknowns" are high. | Too many "unknowns" in data: discussion above Table 4.1.10. | January-March 2020, plus annual reminders | Diversity and Inclusion Advisors in HR | That we reach 90\% completion rates by 2026. |
| B4.1 | That we have complete leavers data on all our staff and investigate and act, as appropriate, on differences with respect to gender. | The leavers' form system is not currently working for Sessional Staff (very few forms completed). Review and update the leaver process, in particular to ensure that it is applied consistently to sessional staff ensuring good quality data going forwards. | Data (Table 4.1.30) make clear the leavers' form system is not currently working for Sessional Staff (very few forms completed). This action also dovetails with recommendations from recent "Working Group on Sessional Staff". | October 2020- <br> September 2021 | Asst Dir HR | That we have data on at least $80 \%$ of sessional staff who are leaving by 2024. |
| B4.2 |  | Roll out new online Leavers' Questionnaire (providing data on reasons for leaving and experience of UoR to supplement existing Leaver's Form completed by line manager). Review completion rates after 3 months, and then review new data provided on reasons for | We would detailed information on leavers' experiences of University of Reading and more detail on reasons for leaving, to supplement brief information in current Leaver's Form | January 2020 (rollout) <br> April 2020 <br> (review, and modify if needed) Annually from January 2021 | Asst Dir HR (rollout, review, and organising annual data report) ASIG and Staffing Committee (annual review of data) | That we reach at least 80\% completion rates by 2024. |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | leaving annually, with a view to addressing issues raised. |  | (review new data on leavers). |  |  |
| B4.3 |  | Investigate why there appears to be some excess (admittedly with low numbers) in \%F leaving because of end of fixed-term academic \& research contracts at G7 and G8. | Further exploration merited by data (compare last column of Table 4.1.31/32 with last column of Table 4.1.28). | October to December 2020 | ASIG | Understanding of the underlying issues that is sufficiently good to decide whether action needed and what action. |
| B5.1 | Increase female representation at P\&S Grade 9 in AHSSBL | Explore distribution of Grade 9 P\&S staff across AHSSBL schools to understand reasons for low \%F compared to Grade 8, and formulate actions as required. | Data (Fig 4.2.8) suggesting further investigation needed. | Summer term $2020$ | ASIG, working with PSO and local AHSSBL SATs (especially HBS) | Understanding of the underlying issues that is sufficiently good to decide whether action needed and what action. |
| B6.1 | Improve staff experience of the University through regular staff | Repeat full 2017 Staff Survey, run jointly with Capita | We need to understand staff engagement across | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Summer Term } \\ & 2020 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Asst Dir HR | Staff survey runs successfully in 2020 |
| B6.2 | feedback | Decide what form main UoR Staff Surveys will take from 2021 onwards | the full employee experience, including breakdown by protected characteristics, and changes from last full survey 2017 (and pulse version 2018) | Before December 2020 | Asst Dir HR, consulting including with Dean D\&I | We establish plans for ongoing staff engagement surveys through to at least 2024 that provide sufficiently detailed information for diversity and inclusion carter marks |
| B7.1 | We would like to know how our P\&S staff progress in their careers | Explore, with HR Systems, whether it is possible to establish system to track career progress of staff within University. | We know that many staff develop fantastic P\&S careers at UoR, moving between roles and/or Functions, but we don't have mechanisms to track these (and compare progress across protected characteristics). | $2020-21$ <br> academic year | Director of HR Systems, supported by AISG | The feasibility of doing this is established; if feasible, decision is made on resourcing; if resourced then plan established to roll out before 2024. |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | Recruitment |  |  |  |  |  |
| C1.1 | That we make fair decisions on starting salaries | As part of standard HR information on how our recruitment processes operate, provide a "guidance note on starting salaries" referencing the University's gender pay gap and its reporting, and the need to set salaries for new starters with awareness of salaries of existing staff. | Provide increased transparency and uniformity across the University regarding how we set starting salaries, and provide guidance to ensure that starting salaries respect the principle of equal pay for work of equal value. | March 2020 | Director HR | Guidance is introduced and New Starter Form introduced. <br> Feedback from recruiting managers that guidance helpful. <br> Data on starting salaries from academic year 202122 onwards shows no evidence of gender differential. |
| C1.2 |  | Adjust the New Starter Form on JobTrain recruitment system so that appointing managers required to justify starting salary (where above bottom of grade). | Feedback from consultation with UEB: there is evidence that if actions have to be justified they are fairer. | Summer 2020 | Asst Dir HR |  |
| C1.3 |  | Introduce and communicate a policy for the use of Market-Rate salary supplements. | It is important that, where market supplements are paid: a) there is a clear rationale, which respects the requirements of equal pay legislation; b) there is a clear and transparent process for sign-off; c) the market supplement element is clearly recorded and communicated to the person appointed; d) there are mechanisms to remove the market supplement, for example when market conditions change. | March 2020 | Director HR | Policy is introduced and communicated, particularly to HR Partners and LG members (e.g. in HBS) where market supplements are in use. |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C1.4 |  | As additional information to assist in arriving at fair decisions for starting salaries for more senior posts, make available to chairs of interview panels across the University for appointments at G7 or above: <br> i) Salaries in that school/function for similar roles, provided by the HoS/HoF (who would normally be on the panel) via the Manager Self Service function on Trent, to be soft rolled out in December; <br> ii) Exceptionally, where i) is not relevant, salaries for similar posts across the University to be provided through HoS/HoF conversation with HR Partner. | Chairs of interview panels should be aware of salaries of existing staff to enable offers in line with salaries paid to existing staff, to respect equal pay law, in particular avoiding pay gaps between new staff and existing loyal employees. This action complements and adds to action C1.1 (and would require a minor edit to the guidance in C1.1). | October 2020 | Heads of Schools/Functions (and HR Partners) | Data on starting salaries from academic year 202122 onwards shows no evidence of gender differential. |
| C2.1 | That we are attracting gender balance in applications, and that this is feeding into gender-balanced shortlists and appointments, including at senior levels. | Incorporate into existing Recruitment and Selection Procedure, guidance for managers and search committees in Schools on how best to encourage and enable a diverse range of applicants, seeking advice from their HR Partner as appropriate. Guidance will also remind recruitment panels and those involved in the shortlisting that they should also pay due regard to | We have gender imbalances in recruitment at the most senior levels and need to go out and seek the most diverse pool of applicants to redress these imbalances and recruit from the widest pool. The Government's Equality Office, in its evidence-based recommendations ${ }^{10}$ for | Summer 2020 | Asst Dir HR | At least 40\% women, 40\% men, recruited across the University as a whole at Grade 9 in both Academic and Research and Professional and Support separately, when averaged over the academic years 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23. Similarly at lower grades. |

[^12]| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | achieving a diverse shortlist whenever possible. In particular, the guidance will make clear an expectation for all Grade 9/Professorial appointments that, while there will be exceptions, we expect as a norm that search committees will attract both male and female candidates to shortlists. | closing gender pay gaps, advocates at least two women on every shortlist. |  |  |  |
| C2.2 |  | To share and develop the guidance in the previous action, work with the leadership group to share experiences and case studies of success in attracting diverse shortlists. | As above | June 2020- <br> March 2021 | Dean D\&I working with Asst Dir HR | As above |
| C2.3 |  | Undertake a trial in one School and in one Function of the use of the positive action tie-break provisions in Section 159 of the Equality Act in relation to sex where it is justified to do so, in particular where that sex is substantially underrepresented in the role and at the level at which the recruitment is being undertaken. Following the trial consider whether and how such provision could be built into policy and practice. | In a number of our schools and functions there are deep-seated and longestablished imbalances in gender representation that need a variety of actions to address. This action is inspired by a pilot scheme under development at Queen Mary University of London by their ED\&I lead and Asst Dir HR and would be carried out in coordination and collaboration with Queen Mary. | Academic year 2021-2022 | Asst Dir HR | Trial completed and recommendations brought to UEB by January 2023 regarding whether or how this this is built into policy and practice. |
| C3.1 | To reduce and eliminate gender imbalances across our functions | Via Function Leads (members of DICOP), share good practice associated with strategies for | We have (Section 4.2) large gender imbalances in certain functions and want | Summer term $2020$ | DICOP working with ASPSG | We can point to examples, by time of next AS submission in 2024, where |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | diverse recruitment across Functions that have been traditionally either male or female dominated. Explore and understand recruitment strategies, particularly how we widen the selection pool to increase the number of applicants of the underrepresented gender. | to share good practice on addressing these. |  |  | sharing of good practice has had impact in reducing gender imbalances. |
| D | Equal Pay/Gender Pay Gap |  |  |  |  |  |
| D1.1 | Eliminate gender and ethnicity pay gaps | Provide additional University-level pay data and analysis, either within our standard annual gender pay gap reports, or in other internal reporting, namely: <br> i) Ethnicity (BAME/White) and intersectional pay gap data, this published on D\&I website alongside other annual reports, or included in the existing gender pay gap report; <br> ii) More forensic detail analysing the reasons for year-to-year and longer timescale trends, this to be published at least internally. | We want to understand exactly where in our organisation gender/ethnicity pay gaps arise, so that we can direct actions effectively | Annually, starting March 2021, i); starting summer 2021, ii). | Asst Dir HR, supported by Dean D\&I | That we publish annually ethnicity and intersectional pay gap data (cf Tables 4.1.39-40). <br> That, from October 2021 onwards we develop a clear understanding of the significant areas where gender pay gaps arise and can monitor the impact or otherwise of actions we take. |
| D1.2 |  | To support the additional analysis in D1.1ii) we will appoint annually a student intern, employed through Campus Jobs, with data analysis skills, to work with HR and the |  | Annually, starting summer 2021 | Dean D\&I, working with Asst Dir HR |  |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Dean for D\&I, funded via the D\&I budget. |  |  |  |  |
| D2.1 | Reduce Professorial and Grade 9 Professional and Support gender pay gaps | Make available to the Professorial Annual Review group gender pay gap data for the cohort under consideration, plus details of the gender pay gap data for last year's cohort as it was immediately before and after Professorial Review. Discuss, led by the Dean D\&l, at the beginning of the first annual meeting, the role of Professorial Annual Review in addressing pay gaps, reflecting on this data. Following conclusion of the group meetings, the group and the Remuneration Committee of Council are informed of the effect, on the overall gender pay gap for the cohort under consideration, of the proposed increases in salaries. <br> Similarly for Senior Staff Annual Review. | This formalises what has essentially been trialled already this year in terms of data provision, and prethinking about gender pay gaps, before the Professorial Annual Review Group starts work, to encourage decisions that are fair to each individual and at the same time reduce the pay gap at Professorial level. | Annually, starting March 2020 | HR Manager Rewards and Benefits (data provision) + Dean D\&I | Reduce combined Professorial/Grade 9 gender pay gap to $5 \%$ or below by end 2020 (this one of existing targets for 2020, see Table 4.1.36): baseline $7.9 \%$ as at $1 / 8 / 18$. <br> Reduce further, to make progress against new targets to be set as Action A1.4, by next Athena SWAN submission in 2024. |
| D2.2 |  | Remove from Professorial Annual Review guidance the requirement that internally-promoted professors have to wait a year before pay review, so that our guidance becomes, e.g.: "Staff are not eligible for review within the first 12 months of appointment or internal promotion". | Data in Sections in 5.1(i), (iii) make clear that women comprise a substantially larger fraction of the staff promoted to professor than recruited externally. At the same time average initial salaries through external recruitment are larger than those through internal | From 2020/21 <br> Professorial <br> Annual review <br> Round | HR Manager Rewards and Benefits, working with Dean D\&I, DVC | Implementation of this change. <br> As an impact we expect to see increases in gender pay gap reductions from Professorial Annual Review (our modelling suggests that if we had had this in place in the last round the gender pay gap reduction over the |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | promotion. The combination of these factors is a driver for gender pay gaps in the professoriate. As a step to counteract this driver we will permit internally promoted professors to receive pay rises already on the anniversary of their promotion (while still excluding externally appointed staff from consideration). |  |  | cohort reviewed would have been 0.47 percentage points, rather than the actual reduction in the last round of 0.27 percentage points). |
| E | Flexible/Agile Working and Career Breaks |  |  |  |  |  |
| E1.1 | Reflecting on Focus Groups on Update existing guidance materials <br> and documentation to support <br> Flexible Working, we want to <br> achieve: <br> i) enhanced awareness of the full employees and line managers in <br> considering the full range of  <br> range of flexible working options flexible and agile working options <br> available; available, providing case studies to <br> ii) a proactive culture in which illustrate successful flexible <br> flexible working is promoted and working arrangements across the <br> valued; University and including specific <br> iii) fair, transparent and consistent reference to support around <br> decision-making for flexible working periods of extended leave. |  | Actions coming out of reflection on Flexible Working Focus Group feedback, and feedback on draft from Staffing Committee/UEB. | JanuaryDecember 2020 | Asst Dir HR, supported by ASIG | By 2024 85\% of staff or more responding to future staff surveys respond positively to the following questions (2017 Staff Survey baseline in brackets): <br> "I believe that if I requested flexible working arrangements, my request would be considered fairly" |
| E1.2 | requests, by line managers for all staff; <br> iv) high level <br> promotion/understanding/acceptanc <br> e of the benefits of flexibility in ways of working, embracing technology. | Provide visible and diverse examples of staff working flexibility, illustrating the benefits and compromises, and enhance visibility of the associated HR policies, processes and guidance. Concretely: |  | Summer 2020 <br> December 2020, <br> i) <br> January 2021- <br> Summer 2021, ii) | MCE, supported by Dean D\&I, Asst Dir HR, Equality and Diversity Network Groups, Staff Forum/UCU | (82\%) <br> "I am able to take advantage of flexible working on an informal basis" (80\%) "I am aware of the formal flexible working |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | i) Create additional profiles for Faces of Reading illustrating flexible working (including BAME profiles, cf. action in the Race Equality Charter Mark Action Plan). <br> ii) Establish, very visibly, webpages advertising both flexible working and working and parental leave. The distinguishing features will include: a) photo of VC plus quote from VC articulating VC support; b) clear, easily navigable links to detail of how these work on HR web sites; c) case studies from across the University making clear in each case that employees, at a very wide variety of levels in the University, are engaged in parental leave and/or flexible working. |  |  |  | arrangements at the University" (77\%) "The University of Reading provides good support to help me balance my work and personal commitments" (74\%) |
| E1.3 |  | Work to encourage all senior managers, starting with the leadership group, to become positive about flexible working. This will include concretely a workshop with the leadership group sharing experiences on flexible working, including bringing in examples of people flexibly working (like we brought in job |  | 2021-2022 <br> academic year | Dean for D\&I (or other AISG members) working with HR \& IT |  |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | share examples before), exercises on discussion/sharing of experiences, and input from IT (including on technology for supporting remote working). |  |  |  |  |
| E1.4 |  | Embed consideration of working arrangements within the PDR process. |  | 2021-22 <br> academic year, as part of review G4.1 | Asst Dir HR |  |
| E1.5 |  | Communicate expectations within each School/Function that: <br> v) working patterns (including those of colleagues working flexibly around childcare responsibilities) and other commitments (including those of international partners) are routinely taken into consideration when organising meetings, so that participants invited are able to attend; <br> vi) where meetings cannot accommodate everyone, we make arrangements for updating those unable to attend. |  | April 2020, and reminder thereafter at beginning of each academic year | Heads of School/Functions supported by Co-Chairs ASIG |  |
| E1.6 |  | Implement new technologies such as Microsoft Office 365 and Teams, to enable staff to collaborate effectively internally and externally from a wider range of devices and locations, enabling further options |  | January 2020 to December 2022 | Director of Information Technology, supported by HR and MCE |  |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | for agile and flexible working. The introduction of these new technologies will be accompanied by guidance and training to ensure staff understand and make use of the technologies as appropriate to their role and working hours. |  |  |  |  |
| E5.1 | Remove barriers to conference/training attendance for staff with children | Change our travel and expenses policy to make clear that additional childcare costs made necessary by attending a training course or conference (costs additional to the routine everyday costs of childcare) are an allowable expense. | As a matter of fairness (and to access Research Council and other funding for this) we need to spell out that this is an allowable expense, and then let people know. | March 2020 | Director of Finance | This policy change is made. Claims for these costs are being made, including from Research Councils, at a level that matches or exceeds other institutions with Silver AS Awards. |
| E5.2 |  | Advertise this through the usual communication channels and on the Parent and Family Webpages, and advertise that many research funders (including all UK Research Councils), allow bidding for these costs as a part of travel costs on grants. |  | March 2020 and ongoing annually | Co-chairs ASIG, working with PVC Research and Innovation and Finance |  |
| E5.3 |  | Undertake a survey (e.g. via School/Function D\&I leads) to establish: i) spend on these childcare costs; ii) extent to which we are accessing childcare funds from research funders. |  | March 2022, March 2024 | Head of Research Services, supported by ASIG, DICOP |  |
| F | Maternity/Paternity/Adoption/Parental Leave |  |  |  |  |  |
| F1.1 | That this substantial central funding around parental leave is used effectively and imaginatively to support returners. | Improve mechanisms for reporting and monitoring allocation of reimbursements for cost of maternity/adoption/SPL to Schools | Feedback from Family Leave Focus Groups, and from Heads of Schools/Function, that | $\begin{aligned} & \text { January - March } \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Head of Finance Planning and Strategy | Data in our next survey of Heads of Schools/Functions/returners in March 2021 that show |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | and Functions and use of (up to for non-academic staff) 25\% contribution for returners, including sub-accounts for Schools and Functions that record spends. | knowledge and understanding of the reimbursement system, and rules on its use to support returners, is patchy. |  |  | that all returners and being supported effectively, with an interesting variety of uses of the funding that we can showcase. |
| F1.2 |  | Improve communication of these mechanisms, including sharing with leadership group and beyond (including signposting via Parent and Family webpages) case studies of making effective use of these funds to support returners (and see FL3). |  | April-June 2020, with annual reminder thereafter in September each year | Co-chairs AISG, working with Asst Dir HR and MCE |  |
| F2.1 | That all parents and staff taking parental leave, and the line managers that support them, have access to effective support networks | Complete development of Parent and Family Network web pages that enable communication, mutual support of parents and sharing of good practice. | These particular suggestions arising from Family Leave Focus Groups and/or consultation with Parent and family Network. | Complete by <br> April 2020 | Parent and Family Network, supported by AISG and HR | Positive Feedback in Staff Survey in 2022 (over 90\% satisfied with support around family leave), this supported by positive qualitative comments in ASIG Family leave Focus groups in 2022. |
| F3.1 |  | Develop a Manager Support guide which includes case studies and FAQs for supporting staff before and on return from on paternity, adoption or SPL leave, including around flexible working arrangements (and see FW1). |  | 2021-2022 <br> academic year | Asst Dir HR supported by AISG |  |
| F4.1 |  | Conduct an analysis of what support, additional to that already provided by line managers and/or $H R$, is available to those returning to work from any form of extended absence, to enable them to feel confident about returning to the workplace. Investigate options and resources, including online support |  | 2021-22 <br> academic year | Asst Dir HR , supported by Parent and Family Network |  |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | packages, to address any needs identified. |  |  |  |  |
| F5.1 | That men and women at UoR play an equal role in parenting following birth/adoption | Increase length of paid paternity/partner/adoption leave from 2 weeks to 4 weeks. | This arising from Family Leave Focus Group discussion, regarding shared parental leave and barriers to fathers accessing paid leave given tendency for mothers to take all of most of initial (highly funded) SPL 18 week period. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { This to be } \\ & \text { effective from } \\ & 1 / 9 / 2020 \end{aligned}$ | HR Partner team | Uptake, by 2022, of the 4 weeks leave at a rate which equals or exceeds that of our comparator HEls with Silver Athena SWAN awards. Significant improvement in feedback in 2022 ASIG Family Leave Focus Groups (compared to 2019 Focus Groups) regarding enabling of engagement of fathers/adopters in care of child. |
| F6.1 | We want all staff to be supported and have appropriate facilities around pregnancy/breast-feeding | Increase awareness and number of parent room facilities to support breastfeeding mothers on their return to work. Highlight baby change facilities, including a map on the Parent and Family Network webpages and info on our standard campus maps. | Feedback from Focus Groups on Family Leave (Section 5.5 (iii)) and natural follow-on to recent project by Staff Forum that has started to put central facilities in place | $\begin{aligned} & \text { January-July } \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Staff Forum, supported by MCE, Parent and Family Network | Significant improvement in feedback in 2022 ASIG Family Leave Focus Groups (compared to 2019 Focus Groups) regarding support available for new mothers. |
| F7.1 |  | Review and update risk assessment procedures for pregnant and breastfeeding staff including guidance for laboratory workers. | Feedback from Focus Groups on Family Leave (Section 5.5(i)) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { January-July } \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Director of Health \& Safety and Occupational Health, supported by Co-Chair ASIG | Procedures updated, with positive feedback from Parent and Family Network |
| F8.1 | We have fair approach to use of staff on Open Days | Following up on focus group feedback, determine through further specific consultation whether being present at Open Days on Saturdays causes difficulties for parents. If | Feedback from Focus Groups on Flexible Working | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2020-21 } \\ & \text { academic year } \end{aligned}$ | ASIG Members | Consultation completed and any recommendations taken to Staffing Committee by December 2021 |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | consultation warrants this, bring proposals to Staffing Committee/D\&IAB/UEB to offer free childcare for staff (and possibly students) present at Open Days, either by providing a crèche or paying for childcare costs. |  |  |  |  |
| F9.1 | As E1.1 | Ensure materials to support flexible and agile working (see E1.1) include guidance for those with other family caring responsibilities (such as eldercare) and reflect the multitude of working arrangements already available within the University. | Feedback from Focus Groups on Family Leave | January- <br> December 2020 | Asst Dir HR | As E1.1 |
| G | Career Development |  |  |  |  |  |
| G1.1 | Understand and act on this data | Explore reasons for use of fixedterm contracts at G7-G9, and reasons for the gender imbalance. | Further exploration of discrepancies in data in Table 4.1.17 | Autumn 2020 | Co-chairs AISG, working with AISG | Decide whether action needed and agree any action with timescales by March 2021 |
| G2.1 | We want sector-leading approach to use of fixed-term contracts and sessional staff | Review University approach to use of fixed-term contracts and develop University-wide guidelines on approach to fixed-term contracts, transitioning staff from fixed-term to open-ended contracts. | We want transparent and fair guidelines, that reflect best practice at Reading and elsewhere, on use of fixed-term contracts and moving to open-ended contracts, and that these are widely understood | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2020-21 } \\ & \text { academic year } \end{aligned}$ | Director of HR, supported by ASIG | Guidelines developed and rolled-out by October 2021 |
| G2.2 |  | Advertise guidelines produced in G2.1, for example via web pages, and via guidance booklets for PIs and research staff. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2020-21 } \\ & \text { academic year } \end{aligned}$ | Director of HR, supported by ASIG and MCE |  |
| G3.1 |  | Complete, working collaboratively with UCU, the development of a | We want a clear framework for different types of work | $2020-21$ <br> academic year | Director HR, working with UCU, UEB | Policy agreed with UEB by December 2021 |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | new Policy for the Engagement of Sessional Staff across UoR in relation to a unified UoR framework for rates of pay and other terms and conditions. | undertaken by sessional staff and associated rates of pay, with appropriate processes for engagement and exit |  |  | Feedback that policy working on the ground by December 2022 Improved Staff Survey results fro Sessional Staff by 2024 on "Job Satisfaction" and "Pay and Benefits" |
| G4.1 | We want all our staff supported in thinking about their personal and career development and their work objectives and how to achieve them | Carry out an in-depth review with reviewers and reviewees to determine barriers to Personal Development Review (PDR) completion and culture relating to regular manager and employee conversations. | The 2017 Staff Survey reported that only $75 \%$ of staff had a PDR in the last 12 months (Capita HEI sector benchmark 82\%). It also identified opportunities for improvement relating to PDRs. These related to the delivery of PDRs, their usefulness, and whether the exercise resulted in employees feeling that their work is valued by the University. <br> Our AS career development focus groups and career development survey have supported these findings. | Autumn 2020 | Asst Dir HR, supported by AISG and other relevant teams. | Staff Survey feedback on PDRs positive by 2024. <br> Specifically, at least 90\% report that PDR has taken place in last 12 months (2017 baseline 72\%). <br> At least 80\% report that in PDR: plan for personal development agreed (baseline 74\% 2017); PDR useful (baseline 68\%); PDR left you feeling valued (baseline 64\%). |
| G4.2 |  | Learning from the review in G4.1, develop effective mechanisms for measuring PDR completion rates and quality of PDRs. |  | Spring 2021 | Asst Dir HR |  |
| G4.3 |  | Following G4.1, G4.2, we relaunch the PDR, making clear its purpose, how it works, how individual PDRs link into wider goals and ultimately University strategy, and emphasising the importance of follow-up through the year. |  | Autumn 2022 | Asst Dir HR |  |
| G5.1 | We provide a mentoring and coaching service to staff which is effectively managed and can assess its impact on individuals and the organisation | Continue to build the network of mentoring representatives from each School and Function, sharing best practice across the University at termly meetings. Provide support to those Schools and Functions seeking to establish or | There are very effective local mentoring schemes in a number of schools and we want to support these centrally and to build a good practice network to | 2019-20 and ongoing | Asst Dir HR | Proliferation of school and function-based mentoring networks and regular sharing of good practice. Data on update and impact. |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | improve their local mentoring schemes, via this network or directly as appropriate, including assisting them to set up recording systems for local mentoring relationships and methods for evaluation of its impact. | spread their use across the University |  |  |  |
| G5.2 |  | Continue to record formal centrally-administered coaching relationships, whether via the internal coaching network or bought in for senior leaders, monitoring these to ensure coaches are well-matched and evaluation of the impact on the person is undertaken. | To manage and develop our central coaching provision we need to be able to establish impact | 2019-20 and ongoing | Asst Dir HR | Good data held centrally on coaching uptake and impact |
| G5.3 |  | Further raise awareness of coaching and mentoring opportunities including by inviting staff who are also qualified coaches to join the network, and continuing to add those who attend a mentor course with people development to the list of available mentors. | We need to develop the pool further to fully meet needs | 2020 (summer term) | Asst Dir HR | Growth in pool of mentors and coaches |
| H | Promotion/Rewards |  |  |  |  |  |
| H1.1 | Achieve gender balance across all of Grades 7-9 | Local STEMM Athena SWAN SATs to remind their HoS and local promotion committee each year in advance of the promotions round of the gender balance at Grades 79 over the last 3 years, to bear this in mind when thinking through | We want promotion committees to be aware of existing gender imbalances as they think through promotion cases | Annually in September | School D\&I Leads |  |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | promotion cases for the coming year. |  |  |  |  |
| H2.1 | That both male and female BAME staff, across all ethnicities, are supported to progress to the highest levels in the organisation | Set up a joint project group with the Race Equality Action Plan Team to investigate barriers to progression in increasing BAME staff at grades G7-G9, taking into account intersectional factors including intersectionality with respect to distinct ethnicities, and to determine if existing actions in Themes 4 and 5 of our Race Equality Action Plan 2018-202111 are sufficient. | Data in Section 4, including intersectionality data, makes clear that, while there has been significant progress against University gender D\&I progression targets, progress on BAME targets is poor | April 2020 <br> (creation of group) <br> September 2020 (group reports on recommended modifications to actions) January 2021 onwards (revised actions rolled out) | Dean D\&। | ASIG/RE-ACT agree on new joint actions by November 2020, seeking UEB approval as needed. <br> Actions are rolled out and make impact against new targets to be agreed as A1.4. |
| H3.1 | All academic and research staff streams (Teaching, Teaching \& Research, Research) have equal access to promotion opportunities | Explore, e.g. through focus groups in two of the Schools with the largest research staff numbers (including SMPCS which has over a third of the research staff including many R staff in higher grades) why there have been no successful Research staff G7-G8 and G8-G9 promotions in the last three years, with a view to recommendations for any needed tweaks to the promotions process for this group of staff. | This driven by evidence from data in Section 4. | 2020-21 <br> academic year, completed so as feed into promotions round 2021-22 | Dean D\&I, delegating work to the relevant Heads of School and their D\&/ leads | We see, by next AS submission, promotions of Research-focussed academic staff in proportion to their representation in the population. |
| H4.1 | Fair pay increases and reduction in gender pay gap | Explore why more women are receiving awards and whether any action needed, bringing | Analysis (Table 5.2.3) suggests women much more likely to receive | April-September 2020, bringing paper to October | HR Manager Rewards and Benefits, supported by ASIG | Recommendations brought forwards by October 2020. |

[^13]| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | paper to ASIG (and Staffing Committee as appropriate). | additional increments and similar. | $\begin{aligned} & 2020 \\ & \text { ASIG/Staffing } \\ & \text { Committee } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Any actions agreed with timescale for implementation. |
| H5.1 | We want to be able to track effectiveness of our substantial investments in leadership programmes and support their graduates to gain ongoing benefit from the learning | Identify and implement methods for assessing impact of Springboard, StellarHE, Diversifying Leadership, Aurora, Stonewall Leadership programme on individual and institution, including career progress of participants (via academic promotion process, professorial pay review, rewards processes, new roles taken up) | We have many examples of staff being promoted to leadership positions after attending these programmes, but no systematic data on this (which might be used, for example, to increase investment in these schemes). | 2020-21 <br> academic year to develop appropriate methods, and then annually for implementation | HR Leadership and Talent Development Manager | Effective means for tracking impact of these programmes developed, leading to clear impact story in next AS submission |
| H5.2 |  | Building on existing active Springboard graduates network, develop additional mechanisms to support graduates of other programmes in H5.1, taking into account participants feedback | Springboard network working well, and there is a ground-up push for support for graduates of other leadership programmes. | January to December 2021, to set this in train, then annual monitoring | HR Leadership and Talent Development Manager | Additional mechanisms are in operation with positive feedback. |
| H6.1 | We want our P\&S staff to build successful and varied careers at UoR, making the most of possibilities to move from one role to another | Enhance awareness that there are opportunities for P\&S staff to progress in their careers within the University, (including through moving between roles/Functions), e.g. through Staff Portal campaign showcasing examples. | We have great examples of people making their careers here at Reading, including moving up to Grade 9/LG, but don't celebrate these as role models | $2020-21$ <br> academic year, with repeat in 2022-23 academic year | Director of Technical Services, working with ASPSG | Future Staff Surveys (e.g. 2022) show increased awareness of career development opportunities and (subject to outcome of B8.1), we start to see by 2024 increased internal P\&S |
| H6.2 |  | Establish additional mechanisms to publicise job vacancies and similar cross-Function opportunities to enhance internal take-up | Ensure P\&S staff are aware of opportunities for internal mobility and are encouraged to take these up | 2020-21 <br> academic year to establish effective mechanisms, then ongoing implementation | Director of Technical Services, working with ASPSG | mobility and progression. |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Explore introduction of annual University-wide "Function Awareness Workshops", in which we showcase to the University and staff what the Functions do, their staff/careers, and job opportunities. |  | $2020-21$ <br> academic year | ASPSG working with Staff Forum |  |
| H6.3 |  | Scope out the introduction across P\&S of managed job-swaps, jobtasters, secondments, and workshadowing schemes to enable staff mobility around the University, enhance understanding of the University functions, and broaden staff perspectives on next career steps. | Enhance opportunities for P\&S internal mobility, and understanding of different roles/functions across the University | $2020-21$ <br> academic year | Director of Technical Services, working with Asst Dir HR and ASPSG | Report going to Staffing Committee by December 2021 proposing new mechanisms for P\&S staff mobility |
| H7.1 | Our Technician Function develops as a sector-leading example, including in its actions to recruit and support a diverse workforce | Close out actions in the 2020 Technician Commitment Action Plan and develop and implement the 2020-23 Action Plan. Showcase actions related to gender/ethnicity/intersectional equality internally and externally via the Technician Commitment Initiative. | This action plan (see box, page XX) supports career development, visibility, sustainability of the Technician Function, with many actions that will serve as good practice related to gender/ethnicity diversity and equality. | June 2020 <br> (completion of current plan) 2020-23 <br> (development and implementation of Phase II plan) | Director of Technical Services | Closing out of actions on Phase I (2020) and Phase II (2024) <br> Gender/ethnicity equality actions completed are taken up by other Functions internally, other technician teams (externally). |
| H8.1 | Our P\&S staff have the best possible career development opportunities | Draft proposals to go to UEB to better utilise apprenticeships for current staff so they can actively learn new skills and work as part of wider/different teams, and, where beneficial, to increase our external recruitment of apprenticeships (learning from best practice in some of our functions) | We want to support the career development of our staff and make best use of Apprenticeship Levy funding | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2020-21 } \\ & \text { academic year } \end{aligned}$ | Asst Dir HR, \& HR Leadership and Talent Development Manager | Proposals submitted to UEB by November 2021, are approved, and roll-out to report on for next Athena SWAN submission |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H9.1 | We treat part-time staff in academic promotions fairly, making appropriate reductions in volume of work | Revisit promotion guidelines in respect of part-time staff, consult PT staff through larger focus group/survey, monitor closely in the 2019/20 round the PT/FT, M/F balance, especially at AP. | Generated by quantitative and qualitative data in Section 5.1(iii). | By July 2020, looking at 2019/20 promotion data. | ASIG | We understand fully any issue and make any needed adjustment to the promotion guidelines. |
| 1 | Organisation and Culture |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11.1 | We have gender balance across our key committees | Work to diversify UEB, and other key committees, to achieve at least $35 \%$ of either gender by 202612. | We need diverse committees to represent our diverse population and to enhance our decision making | January each year, measure progress in D\&। Annual Report | VC (for UEB), Governance | That we meet this target for all our key committees by 2026, with substantial progress by next AS submission in 2024. |
| 12.1 | We have gender balance across our key committees | We will include within the terms of reference for all our key committees from a statement of commitment to our targets for gender and BAME representation on key committees. | This is intended to serve as an aide memoire to the chair and wider committee when thinking about committee composition. E.g. a possible phrasing is: "The committee, in seeking and selecting its membership, will be mindful of the University's targets to ..." | Starting <br> September 2020, as new academic year starts and ToR renewed. | Head of Governance | This appears in all key committee ToR; we see progress against these targets in D\&I annual reports each January; we hit new targets to be set as A1.4. |
| 12.2 |  | Develop a more comprehensive dataset of key committee composition, to include data on balance of membership with respect to gender, ethnicity, Grade, staff type (academic/professional) balance of membership | Feedback from Focus Groups on Inclusivity in Committees. | For D\&I Annual Report 2021, and annually thereafter | PSO, supported by ASIG | This data set is available and updated annually. |

[^14]| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12.3 | Our committee work supports flexible and remote working | Share best practice in use of digital tools, including Microsoft Teams, that support document sharing, flexible and remote working, from Research Governance to other committees | Feedback from Focus Groups on Inclusivity in Committees. | Autumn 2020 | ASIG | Widespread use of digital tools to support committee work |
| 12.4 | We want a wide range of staff to access committee membership | Capture best practice and training to reduce the barriers to being a member of a committee. | Feedback from Focus Groups on Inclusivity in Committees. | Autumn 2020 | ASIG | Best practice and training shared |
| 13.1 | We want fair and transparent workload models across the University, building on best practice, that recognise all important contributions to our work, and do not indirectly discriminate against any protected characteristic | Review existing workload models with the outcome of developing clear guidance for best practice (e.g. an institutional-wide template), including a steer on gender and wider diversity considerations, and share good practice on workload models across the institution. | There is some existing sharing of best practice in use of workload models through Head of Schools Group, but no institutionwide guidance at the moment. Feedback, e.g. from Staffing Committee and Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Board, was that this would be very welcome. | 2020-21 and <br> 2021-22 <br> academic years, to dovetail with other workloadrelated actions in University's Five year Plan | Chair of Ad Hoc working group (to be drawn from UEB), this working group to have AIT/DICOP/HR and other representation. | Guidance produced and evidence that it is being widely utilised, e.g. through conversations of Heads of Schools/Functions with their UEB line managers about managing their staff's workloads. |
| 13.2 |  | Expand recent work on staff wellbeing to undertake a project focused on understanding the perceptions and realities in relation to workloads for staff across the University and to propose relevant actions | This complements wider University work, currently being framed as part of the University strategy to seek to reduce and manage workloads | 2021-22 <br> academic year, and part of 2022-23 academic year, dovetailing with I3.1 | Director HR | Report with recommendations that can feed into the wider work I3.1 |
| 14.1 | Come close to eradicating harassment and bullying within UoR and ensure that, when incidents occur, staff know where to access effective support | Run a session with the Leadership Group on harassment and bullying, making clear: i) the huge impacts of harassment/bullying and not addressing this effectively (e.g. this might use, with permission, | Our subgroup thinking about harassment and bullying made a call across all staff for input from those with experience of harassment and bullying | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2020-21 } \\ & \text { academic year } \end{aligned}$ | ASIG members including Co-Chairs and Asst Dir HR | Future Staff Surveys show improved bullying and harassment results. Specifically: |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | anonymous quotes from our own staff survey and/or our own AS H\&B survey/interviews, to make clear the impacts within UoR); ii) the importance of dealing effectively with this, and advice and coaching on how to do this. As part of this bring out issues around particular protected characteristics, e.g. sex, disability. | who had decided not to make a complaint, leading to 20 ( $16 \mathrm{~F}: 4 \mathrm{M}$ ) one-to-one interviews. <br> These actions stem from reflection on that feedback, on 2017/18 Staff Survey results, and on additional feedback from consultation on draft action plans, including with UEB. (Specifically 14.1 derives from Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Board discussion and feedback.) |  |  | $98 \%$ or more report "I'm not currently being harassed or bullied at work" (baseline 96\%, 2018 pulse Staff Survey, in line with $96 \%$ in Capita HEI Benchmark) <br> $80 \%$ or more report that they "are aware of the University's Harassment Advisors" (baseline 35\% 2017 Staff Survey) <br> Improved qualitative feedback in a rerun in 2023 of our call out for one-toone interviews. |
| 14.2 |  | Provide additional, in-depth training for those handling investigations into complaints which involve allegations of harassment and bullying. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2020-21 } \\ & \text { academic year } \end{aligned}$ | Asst Dir HR, working with Head of Legal |  |
| 14.3 |  | Continue to improve staff awareness of the University's Harassment \& Bullying policy and reporting arrangements, including the development and promotion of the \#NeverOK campaign. |  | January- <br> December 2020 and ongoing | \#NeverOK Project team (including Dean D\&I, Asst Dir HR, MCE, RUSU) |  |
| 14.4 |  | Raise awareness of the additional support available, including the University's Harassment Advisor team and Employee Assistance Programme, as part of our \#NeverOK campaigning. |  | JanuaryDecember 2020 and ongoing | \#NeverOK Project team (including Dean D\&I, Asst Dir HR, MCE, RUSU) |  |
| 14.5 |  | Develop additional mechanisms13 to encourage a 'No Bystander’ culture where all colleagues feel able to challenge behaviour and |  | January- <br> December 2020 <br> (scope options/run trial) | \#NeverOK Project team (including Dean D\&I, Asst Dir HR, MCE, RUSU) |  |

[^15]| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | understand ways in which they can take action and/or be supported, drawing on good practice from elsewhere (e.g. the Active Bystander programme used at Imperial and other HE institutions). |  | Jan 2021- Dec 2022 roll out on larger scale. |  |  |
| 14.6 |  | Develop additional mechanisms, drawing on good practice from elsewhere, for raising awareness of the forms which harassment and bullying can take, especially across the body of line managers, and improving understanding of the impact this behaviour can have on individuals, for example through the development of additional training interventions. |  | JanuaryDecember 2020 | \#NeverOK Project team (including Dean D\&I, Asst Dir HR, MCE, RUSU) |  |
| 14.7 |  | Further develop the use of mediation at the University through the training of a wider pool of internal mediators |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2020-21 } \\ & \text { academic year } \end{aligned}$ | Asst Dir HR |  |
| 15.1 | Make clear that D\&I work valued and raise its profile | We will introduce an annual University D\&I award, selected via nominations from across the University, and presented at the annual meeting of the University Court. | This another element of raising the profile of D\&l work and of high-level commitment to this. | Spring 2021 (1st award), with preparatory work in the 6 months leasing up. | VC and VC's Office | The award happens, with significant associated publicity around the nomination process and the award itself. |
| 16.1 | Raise awareness, internally and externally, of the diversity of our staff and the roles they do | We will refresh our Faces of Reading and will showcase these with a physical exhibition in the library foyer exhibition space in the centre of campus. | This another element of raising the profile of D\&I work, and of celebrating the diversity of our staff, and of projecting this diversity out to our own | Summer 2020- <br> December 2020 <br> (website) <br> January- <br> December 2021 <br> (physical <br> exhibition) | MCE, supported by Dean D\&I, Asst Dir HR, Equality and Diversity Network Groups, Staff Forum/UCU | Number (and duration) of views of the Faces of Reading website. Number of click-throughs from the banner on our main Job Vacancies site. |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | staff and to prospective staff and students. |  |  | Number of physical views of the exhibition. |
| 17.1 | That we attract more women into science (including as UGs as UoR), that we raise awareness of UoR in the community, and have fun! | Pilot an annual family fun science day, with a significant women-inscience component, including show-casing the fantastic work done by a number of our female scientists/engineers/ mathematicians at many career stages. | This will enhance our outreach into the local community, encouraging engagement with UoR and attracting women into science, in particular to study at UoR. | Summer 2021, and then repeat annually if successful | PVC Research \& Innovation, working with Events. | Strong attendance at pilot, strong local publicity, and significant participation in running this from across the University. Positive feedback from attendees. |
| 18.1 | We provide useful and effective inductions, and use our excellent induction materials more widely | Raise awareness of availability of Induction Board Game for Schools and Functions as a way to keep up with changes that new staff are made aware of at induction | We make the most effective use of our excellent Induction Board Game (finalist in Training Awards). | April 2020 and annually thereafter | HR Learning and Development Manager | Record of how this has been used in Schools and Functions. |
| 18.2 |  | Through DICOP undertake a review of inductions at School and Function level and share good practice. | Spread good practice regarding local inductions | Spring term 2021 | HR Learning and Development Manager, working with DICOP | Report on sharing of good practice and impact of this |
| 19.1 | Improve the support of our staff | Increasingly raise awareness amongst employees and line managers of gender-related wellbeing, such as aspects associated with the menopause and prostate cancer through information on the wellbeing webpages, seminars and networking events | Feedback from focus groups that this desirable | $2021-22$ <br> academic year | Asst Dir HR | Information is readily available. |
| 110.1 | Our outreach teams have good gender balance | Trial mechanisms for attracting a better gender balance in student outreach volunteers/ambassadors, for example recruitment reaching out to male-dominated UG courses. | Current team is femaledominated: we want both male and female role models | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2020-21 } \\ & \text { academic year } \end{aligned}$ | Head of Global Recruitment (UK and Outreach) | Better gender balance achieved in 2020-21, and mechanisms trialled to roll out in subsequent years |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 111.1 | Provide support to School AS teams to make their job easier and success more likely | Host centrally all successful AS applications on the Charter Marks page of the Diversity and Inclusion website. | We want to enhance further our support for School AS and the success rate of applications | By March 2020 | VC's Office (Exec Support for Dean D\&I) | Increased Athena SWAN success rates, in particular Athena SWAN awards to AHSSBL schools |
| 111.2 |  | Working with DICOP, update our guidance on preparing applications, and host this guidance on the D\&I website. |  | Spring term 2020 | HR Diversity and Inclusion Advisors |  |
| 111.3 |  | Investigate assigning former successful School Athena SWAN leads as mentors for AHSSBL SAT Chairs. |  | Spring term 2020 | Dean D\&I |  |
| J | Supporting Trans People |  |  |  |  |  |
| J1.1 | That trans staff/students and their line managers/supervisors/tutors are provided with clear and helpful guidance | Building on initial guidance for the LGBT community about travelling safely abroad, produced recently at the request of a School/Function D\&l lead, we will create more complete guidance, supported by Stonewall and our own LGBT+ communities, and will communicate this widely to LGBT+ staff/students and their managers/tutors. | There are large safety and other issues for LGBT+ staff/students travelling abroad, and a need identified by our LGBT+ Action Plan Group (see Section 6(iii)) to provide better information to support decisions around travelling. | JanuarySeptember 2020 | LGBT+ Action Plan Group, working with HR, Heath \& Safety Coordinators (Technical Services), Procurement, and with guidance from Stonewall | Guidance created and positive feedback from users and from external review by Stonewall |
| J1.2 |  | Enhance our Trans and Gender identity information/procedures/guidance, to give more explicit and userfriendly support for staff/students, line managers/HR, including using a Q\&A format regarding how colleagues can best support. | Feedback from our most recent Stonewall WEI submission | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2020-21 \\ & \text { academic year } \end{aligned}$ | HR Diversity and Inclusion Advisors, supported by LGBT+ Action Plan Group | Guidance created and positive feedback from users and from external review by Stonewall |


| Ref | Ultimate goal/long term aspiration | Description of action | Rationale | Timeframe and milestones | Responsibility | Success criteria and outcomes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J2.1 | That everyone has easy and convenient access to toilet facilities with which they are comfortable. | Continue, as per our Gender Neutral Toilet Policy, to expand our gender neutral toilet provision, including provision in all new-build and refurbished buildings, while retaining in parallel gendered provision. | This is as per our policy, agreed with UEB following consultation, which seeks to support our LGBT+ community, especially people identifying as nonbinary, gender-fluid, other gender identities. | Ongoing through 2020-23 | Director of Estates (newbuild/refurbishment) LGBT+ Action Plan Group (existing buildings) | Gender-neutral toilets added as part of all new build/refurbishment in the assessment period. <br> Additionally, gender-neutral toilets added in at least one further building per year (baseline 31 buildings). |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ HESA salary ranges by year:
    https://www.hesa.ac.uk/files/Data summary HESA Staff excluding atypical FPE1.pdf

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ VC 9/2/2016 press release https://www.reading.ac.uk/news-archive/press-releases/pr665986.html, and see Table 4.1.36.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ http://www.reading.ac.uk/web/files/Diversity/University of Reading REC Action PLan 2018 FINAL.pdf

[^3]:    New actions
    AP2019 H3.1
    Explore, e.g. through focus groups in two of the Schools with the largest research staff numbers (including SMPCS which has over a third of the research staff including many R staff in higher grades) why there have been no successful Research staff G7-G8 and G8-G9 promotions in the last three years, with a view to recommendations for any needed tweaks to the promotions process for this group of staff.

[^4]:    ${ }^{4}$ From Table 4.1.1.

[^5]:    ${ }^{5}$ Table 4.1.2.

[^6]:    ${ }^{6}$ Table 4.1.3.

[^7]:    7 https://www.reading.ac.uk/internal/diversity/diversity-reports.aspx
    ${ }^{8}$ References used included: 2018 Fawcett Society briefing; 2018 House of Commons Briefing Paper; Government Equalities Office guidance Four Steps to Developing a Gender Pay Gap Action Plan, Eight ways to understand your organisation's gender pay gap, and Reducing the gender pay gap and improving gender equality in organisations: Evidence-based actions for employers.

[^8]:    *the majority of 'other' are students who are employed by Campus Jobs. These are now being moved to a dedicated payroll

[^9]:    New action
    AP2019 B5.1 $\quad$ Explore distribution of Grade 9 P\&S staff across AHSSBL schools to understand reasons for low \%F compared to Grade 8, and formulate actions as required.

[^10]:    **One successful applicant was unable to attend due to pregnancy. We advised her that her place would remain open

[^11]:    ${ }^{9}$ Reducing the gender pay gap and improving gender equality in organisations: Evidence-based actions for employers.

[^12]:    ${ }^{10}$ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment data/file/731288/Gender-Pay-Gap-actions .pdf

[^13]:    ${ }^{11}$ http://www.reading.ac.uk/web/files/Diversity/University of Reading REC Action PLan 2018 FINAL.pdf

[^14]:    ${ }^{12}$ We will revisit this target (see Action A1.4) in 2020, having just in the last few days already increased UEB composition from $28 \%$ to $37.5 \%$ from $1 / 1 / 20$.

[^15]:    ${ }^{13}$ Our current mechanisms are the section on intervening as a bystander in our introductory D\&I online training, that all new staff are required to do, and the longer face-to-face sessions within our RISE training.

