Becoming a Juno Champion

Embedding gender equality in physics higher education in the UK and Ireland
The award of Juno Champion is made when a physics department or school provides evidence that they have embedded the Juno principles across the whole department or school and that the work they are doing is having an impact.

These guides have been developed to provide practical advice and examples to help you, as a department or school of physics, to achieve your goal of Juno Champion.

We have developed a series of Information Sheets that provide information and advice about the Champion process.

Alongside this, we have developed a series of good practice guides. The first set covers each of the five Juno principles in turn, highlighting good practice extracts from our current Champion departments. These are designed to help you articulate and evidence how you have embedded the Juno principles in your department or school. All of these examples of good practice have been successfully implemented in physics departments or schools. The second set will cover specific areas of good practice in more depth and we will add to these over time to build a comprehensive resource for you as a physics department when implementing Juno or Athena SWAN.

The information is presented in a way that is easy to access and comprehend, so that you can choose whatever guide suits your current needs most. You can read them in any order.

We recognise that each department will be at a very different point on their Juno journey. Likewise, each of our current Juno Champions has a very different profile and had differing circumstances to address when submitting for Juno Champion. Some Champion departments are small, and could easily demonstrate how well communication worked on an informal level across the whole department; however, these departments also had to evidence how they formalised procedures. Some Champion departments are very large and, while they had the benefit of larger and more visible numbers of women and a higher level of resources for Juno activities, they had to evidence how Juno was embedded across the whole department, sometimes in complicated group structures. Some of our Champion departments had, or still have, very low numbers of women, and had to evidence how their efforts were making a difference in a time of austerity, with recruitment freezes and little staff movement across the higher education sector.

The one thing that all of our Champions have in common is the determination to embed the Juno principles from the highest levels of the department down, and the most junior levels up. They demonstrated how they engaged the whole department in their Juno work and how everyone, not just the female staff, were benefitting from both practical changes to policies and procedures, and genuine departmental culture change. Our Juno Champions were not afraid to try new initiatives to decide what was going to work for them and what they still needed to improve.

Throughout the Champion process, emphasis is placed on physics action and departmental change, so it is crucial that your data, both qualitative and quantitative, your work to embed the principles and the action plan are physics-specific, and involve action across the whole department. Where you are using central university policies, it is important that you identify the impact of these at the departmental level.

For example, if it is a university requirement that all interviewees have undertaken equality and diversity training, you should comment on how you ensure that this happens in your department. Your department may go beyond the minimum...
expected by the university and it is important that you highlight where this happens.

We are aware that some departments continue to have issues around accessing central data in a format that is meaningful to them and we would advise any department in this position to talk to their senior management about the importance of such data sets in both Juno and Athena SWAN applications.

There are many ways that you can evidence how the principles are having an effect in your department. Much of this will be qualitative as changes to baseline data may take many years.

You can use a variety of methods, including (but not limited to): the results of annual staff surveys; surveying staff on a particular issue (such as a new policy or procedure); asking for informal feedback from particular groups of staff (e.g. senior managers, women, research assistants), organising focus groups to discuss a particular issue in more depth; or implementing a way of identifying common issues raised during appraisal or promotion processes. Important considerations when evidencing impact include thinking about the added value of what you have done. Have there been unexpected positive outcomes as a result of implementing something new? There may also have been unintended consequences and addressing these is an important part of your application.

The IOP Diversity Team is here to support you through all parts of the process of applying for Champion. We can:
- put you in touch with other similar departments so that you can network and share issues, good practice or concerns;
- provide a buddy or mentor from a Champion department who can attend some of your Juno Committee meetings and help you move forward on some issues;
- come and talk to your Juno Committee informally about Juno and the processes required;
- provide advice, guidance and feedback on draft applications and/or action plans;
- develop further national data sets or good practice guides as requested.

Not only will all the advice and guidance help you with your Juno journey, but you can use it to further your Athena SWAN ambitions too.

Contact information:
Institute of Physics Diversity Team
76 Portland Place
London W1B 1NT
Tel +44 (0)20 7470 4842
E-mail juno@iop.org
www.iop.org/diversity
We have outlined below how the best Champion applications are structured. We think that this enables the Juno Assessment Panel to see the full range of work that you have done across the five principles.

Introduction to the department
We recommend that you provide an outline of the department, its size and scale, numbers of staff and students, and its structure, including the research group structure (if there is one), the key people in the department and what their role has been in Juno. It is also a good idea to provide brief details of how line management operates in the department. How are line managers assigned? Do the roles rotate? While all of this has been covered in your Practitioner application, it is important that you update the information as appropriate.

Outline the Juno Committee and how its work and profile has changed since Practitioner, including how it has decided its priorities and how it continues to be resourced. All levels of staff, including senior management and postdocs, should be involved and there should be representation from all groups, sub-divisions or sub-disciplines, depending on your departmental structure. If you are a very large department with a large number of groups, you may not be able to have them all represented on your committee. However, you will have to demonstrate how they all have a way of engaging with the Juno work in the department.

It is important to provide information on how the Juno work feeds into the wider departmental decision-making and how all staff are made aware of the work of the Committee.

Progress since Practitioner
We recommend that you include a section that outlines progress since the Practitioner award, together with the key actions from the Practitioner Action Plan that have been implemented and how they have effected change in the department. Your Practitioner application will have focused on Principle 1 and we would not expect that information to be repeated directly, although a brief summary of the work is essential. You should remind the panel of your key data and highlight any further quantitative information that you have gathered since Practitioner. This is especially important if you had gaps in your data set.

It is important to recognise how far you have come on your Juno journey and reflect on all the positives and progress that you have made, not just worry about the things that you haven’t achieved yet. Evidencing how you communicate progress to the whole department is an important part of the process. It is too easy to make Juno updates a long list of all the things that you still have to do, but by dedicating some time to reflecting on progress and distance travelled, you can keep the momentum and positivity to your work going. Reflecting on the positives will also help you realise why some areas may have stalled completely or where progress has not been as fast as planned, and you can reflect on the reasons why this has happened in a constructive way.

The five principles
Address the five principles in turn and describe how you have addressed work for each of these.

The Champion Action Plan
The aim of your Champion Action Plan is to detail what the priorities are for your department over the three years of your Champion status, to either take you to Champion renewal or to work towards Athena SWAN Gold.

It is helpful to provide an initial commentary to your action plan, which outlines the department’s overall vision for where your action plan will take you and what the department’s priorities are.
CASE STUDY: Progress since Practitioner

Introduction

Our case for progressing to Juno Champion, presented in this document, rests on the advances that we have made since -----, when we made our successful submission for Juno Practitioner. These advances centre on:

- embedding many aspects of the Juno Principles in the working of the school, taking note in particular of the new challenges and opportunities offered by three major changes in the running of the university;
- our efforts in investigating issues of PhD and postdoc satisfaction and career plans; and
- our progress against our Juno Practitioner Action Plan, including several new initiatives.

The Juno Practitioner submission contained a great deal of statistical and survey information, and statistics are still being gathered and analysed regularly, but in the intervening 18 months we have concentrated on improving our procedures for gathering statistics, further engaging research staff and PhD students in the way that the school works, and understanding the views of the school members via focus groups.

Significant changes in the organisation of three of the main functions of the university have taken place over the last year. These changes, and their impact on and opportunities for Juno, are described below... The restructuring has presented us with opportunities for:

- rethinking and improving our procedures in the school;
- influencing the practice of the university as a whole.

On the negative side, the additional time demands made by restructuring on senior staff meant that some parts of our Juno Champion plan did not proceed as far as we had hoped.

Progress against Juno Practitioner Action Plan

Our Juno Practitioner submission included a 13-point action plan aimed at improving our procedures, broadening the awareness and involvement of the school in Project Juno, and investigating in more detail the views of more junior members of our school. We have made significant progress against most of these action-plan items. Some activities were delayed by lack of time available to school senior management, who have been dealing with the fall-out from university restructuring. However, other activities have had a more significant outcome than anticipated, and have led to a better understanding of the factors influencing the careers and career choices of our PhD students and junior staff. This has also produced changes in the running of the school.
The objective of your Champion Action Plan is to put in place any further issues that you have identified and to work towards your Champion renewal in three years’ time, or Athena SWAN Gold. As with the Practitioner Action Plan, it should be ambitious, but achievable with a mix of short-, medium- and long-term actions.

The key to becoming a Champion is demonstrating that the whole department is involved and engaged in this work, and to demonstrate real embeddedness across the department. It is important that a range of people are identified and that all of the work for delivering does not simply fall on the Juno Committee or on the Juno lead within your department.

There are two essential elements for an effective action plan – people who are enthusiastic and committed and a realistic action plan. The best action plans contain S.M.A.R.T. goals:

- **Specific**
- **Measurable**
- **Attainable**
- **Realistic**
- **Timely**

### Specific
There is a much greater chance of delivering a specific goal than a general one. When setting specific goals, bear in mind:

- **Who**: Who is involved?
  It is better to assign the responsibility for overseeing and driving action forward to a single named individual, rather than a group or a broad function, such as the Juno Committee. The named individual doesn’t have to do all the work and the responsibilities should be spread around. No one individual, or small group of individuals, should be overwhelmed.

- **What**: What is to be achieved?
  Be specific. A broad aim might be “increased awareness of promotion criteria”. A more specific target would be, “an increase to 80% of male and female staff reporting that they understand or understand well the promotion criteria”. Note, the assumption here is that data already exist on staff’s current understanding of the promotion criteria.

  Actions might be broken down into separate steps with specific targets. In the example above, if baseline data were not available, then a first step would be to survey staff and then to use the results to set or revise the target. A second step would be a work programme to raise staff awareness of the promotion criteria (perhaps running workshops, improving the materials available on the website). The third step would be to survey staff again.

- **Measurable**
  The use of numbers, percentages, dates and time to be taken are ways to clarify objectives. The above target is based on achieving a set percentage. In some circumstances setting a target date is useful, for example, “investigate the career destinations of PhD students (focusing on the difference between men and women), produce a report on the findings and recommend actions by July 2014.”

- **Attainable**
  If targets are not attained, there is a risk that momentum will be lost. The achievement of a target (by its planned date) will depend on the resources that are available. Time is often the
most important factor, therefore the staff who are responsible for the action should be given time to do it.

**Realistic**
A way to establish if a goal is realistic, is to find out if something similar has been achieved elsewhere; alternatively to think through the “conditions” that are necessary to achieve the goal. A realistic goal is one that people are both “willing” and “able” to work towards. A goal can be both high and realistic. In the example above, a target of 100% of staff reporting that they “understand or understand well the promotion criteria”, although desirable, is probably not realistic, whereas 80% is ambitious but achievable under the right conditions. It may be sensible to amend targets as time passes, especially if targets are date related. It is usually better to do this than to carry on with an unrealistic target. Priorities will change and actions may have to be rescheduled to fit a new focus.

**Timely**
Goals should have a time frame because without this there is no sense of urgency. The time frame for individual goals needs to take account of what else will be going on. Actions may need to be prioritised. Some actions may be dependent on others being completed before they can begin. The need to manage the workload may mean that some goals have to be rescheduled.

You need to ensure that you have a mix of short-medium- and long-term actions. Set yourself some easy “quick wins” to keep momentum going, as well as some more visionary longer-term goals.

Review the plan regularly – say once a year. The purpose of the review is to assess progress on individual actions. Then, if necessary, revise timescales and targets. The review should re-confirm that the original priorities still hold. If not, timescales may need to be amended to reflect new priorities. New actions may have to be added where new issues have emerged to maintain momentum in other areas and to take forward recommendations from reports.

There are many formats/templates in use for action plans. At the minimum, a template should contain column headings for the description: of the actions; responsibilities; timescales; and success measures. A “progress column” will also be useful as time goes on.

---
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The Champion visit

The aim of the Juno Champion visit is to have a positive and constructive dialogue with you to enable you to carry out the critical reflection that is crucial as you progress towards Juno Champion status.

The visit is not part of the assessment process; it is designed to provide opportunity for a two-way dialogue, for you to receive feedback on your Juno journey to date and to enable you to identify where the priorities are for your department’s action plan and future work.

The visit is not a compulsory part of the process of applying for Champion, but we strongly advise all departments to schedule one in. We have found over the years that those departments who do not have a visit tend not to be successful in their submissions first time round. This is because they have not taken advantage of the advice, guidance and reflection on progress that the visit enables. We therefore recommend a Champion visit to provide you with a valuable opportunity for crucial feedback.

The visiting team will be drawn from the Juno Assessment Panel and will normally comprise two or three panel members who have substantial experience in dealing with the issues raised through the Juno framework. All of our panel members, with the exception of our member representing industry, are drawn from Practitioner or Champion departments because it is important that they understand the issues of implementing Juno in the environment of university physics.

Prior to the visit you will be asked to provide the most up-to-date copy of your draft Champion submission as this will enable the visiting team to tailor its questions appropriately. The visiting team will ask challenging questions; these are not designed to assess your department, or to criticise your practice or application, but they are designed to enable you to reflect on your current practices and reflect on how embedded processes have actually become. They can also discuss any issues that you have particular concerns about in your application.

As a minimum, the visiting team will meet with the head of department, the Juno Champion or lead for the department and the Juno Committee. If there are no postdocs on the Juno Committee, then the visiting team will also request to meet with some postdocs or postdoc representatives, to gain insights into this group of staff specifically.

On the day of the visit, you will be given informal feedback. Following the visit, a formal, confidential written report addressing your progress against the principles will be provided. The aim of the feedback is to provide positive indications of the work and actions needed to move towards a successful Champion application. This report will remain confidential to your department and will not be seen by the wider Juno Assessment Panel.

How you take on board the feedback from the visit is entirely up to you. We suggest that your Juno Committee works through the feedback to incorporate it into your submission and to carry out sufficient further actions to take you to Champion status. This, with the report, will also enable you to decide when you should submit for Champion.

When you request the Champion visit is entirely up to you to decide. Some departments wish to have a visit as early as possible in the process to provide them with a clear guide as to the work that needs to be done before a Champion submission. Other departments wish to delay the visit until they have a comprehensive draft submission so that they can receive very detailed feedback on anything further that needs doing.

It is very hard, given panel member diaries, to organise a visit at less than around two months’ notice, particularly at busy times in the academic
calendar (such as start of term or exam time). You should discuss your intention to submit for Champion with the Diversity Team as early as possible in the process, so that they can maximise the possible dates for a visit and ensure that you have sufficient time to take on board feedback before the next deadline.

Contact information:
Institute of Physics Diversity Team
76 Portland Place
London W1B 1NT
Tel +44 (0)20 7470 4842
E-mail juno@iop.org
www.iop.org/diversity
The Institute recognises that there are particular issues that face smaller departments or groups who wish to participate in Project Juno (and similar award schemes) in the UK and Ireland. This information sheet has been produced to provide ideas and guidance for smaller departments who wish to achieve Juno Champion status.

We know that departmental size can affect issues such as gathering robust quantitative data, preserving anonymity in gender-disaggregated data, having fewer staff to actually undertake the work and potentially having fewer resources to implement any outcomes. In addition, recruitment and promotion opportunities will be less frequent, and policy, procedures and communication may be more informal. We also know that many of the smallest physics departments and groups only have one or two female staff, and some have none at all.

In terms of Athena SWAN, it may be easier for smaller departments to join together to submit a school or faculty level application. However, we hope that, as a physics department, you understand that there is a place for you within the Juno Award scheme and that you can be recognised for the work you are doing within physics. We want to ensure that, as a small department, you do not feel unduly penalised as a result of participation. Even if you have no female staff, we want to encourage you to consider the Juno Award scheme. By working through the principles, you will be future-proofing equality and diversity in your department, and ensuring that the department is fair, open and transparent for everyone, including potential female applicants and employees.

Working towards Juno Practitioner
To achieve Juno Practitioner, departments must demonstrate that they have met Principle 1: A robust organisational framework to deliver equality of opportunity and reward.

Establishing organisational framework
This means putting in place the necessary framework to improve equality and transparency for all staff, regardless of the current number of females or staff in the department. If you cannot establish a new committee for Juno or Athena SWAN work, allocate the responsibility to an existing committee, and ensure that there is a reporting mechanism directly into the senior leadership of the department. Equality and diversity should be standing items on other committees, and responsibility for collecting gender-disaggregated data could be taken on by a number of different committees (e.g. teaching, research, senior-management team, HR committee, etc) rather than just in one place or being collected by one person. This will allow the load to be spread and allow equality to become embedded.

Monitoring and evidence base
Gathering quantitative data
Departments are encouraged to gather and submit as much quantitative data as they can, and there is a list of the minimum data expected from departments. However, smaller departments may wish to concentrate on providing more detail where their numbers are larger (e.g. undergraduate students) and less detail where numbers are smaller. It may be that you have to rely on more data from your central HR or planning department. Many universities are now gathering central data much more robustly for Athena SWAN – you can use the same physics data for Juno as for Athena SWAN.
Analysing quantitative data with small numbers is tricky because percentages can fluctuate dramatically with the addition or removal of 1 or 2 people. You may have to aggregate data across several years (say 3–5 years), where you have the datasets to do this. This provides an outline picture of the department.

Gathering qualitative data
You may wish to spend more time and detail at the Practitioner level focusing on qualitative data. With small numbers of female staff or students, it can often be difficult to preserve anonymity, and in some cases it may not be possible to present data disaggregated by gender (e.g. where there is only one female in the department or group). In these cases, you may wish to initiate, for example, a generic questionnaire or focus group of all females in the department (staff, undergraduate students, PhD students, PDRAs, etc) to obtain some data around opinions of the overall culture within the department. This may not elicit as much detailed information as specific questionnaires aimed at particular groups, such as research staff, but it may help the department to portray a general picture.

There are a range of Culture Analysis Tools (QuickCAT) available from the National HE STEM programme website [http://www.hestem.ac.uk/resources/guides-and-publications/culture-analysis-tool](http://www.hestem.ac.uk/resources/guides-and-publications/culture-analysis-tool). You can download the staff-and student-culture surveys and use the most appropriate questions for your department. Alternatively, you can use the Juno Good Practice Checklist as a questionnaire, available at [www.iop.org/juno](http://www.iop.org/juno), and ask all staff to fill it in, rate the department and describe their experiences, where relevant and appropriate. This will provide a wealth of data for your application. You may wish to use a case-study approach with one or two particularly successful members of your department – for example, males or females who work flexibly, showing how you have implemented a successful home-working policy, etc.

Other qualitative data could also include:

- Reflections on interview procedures for new staff
- Female representation in departmental seminars
- Perceptions of departmental induction process
- Perceptions of appraisal process
- Perceived transparency of promotion procedure
- Perceptions of career development, including careers guidance
- Perceptions of workload allocation
- Female representation on committees
- Perception of support of flexible working
- Work–life balance
- Departmental support of gender activities.

Action plan
One of the major issues with the action plan is the time and resources to carry out sufficient actions to take a department to Practitioner and Champion. A good action plan focuses attention on the crucial tasks to be tackled, enables equality to be tackled like any other management task, and becomes part of the objectives and responsibilities of named individuals within management.

Spreading the load across the department and embedding it into the functions and work of the departmental committees may be an easier way to ensure that action is taken in smaller departments. It is important that these committees can be held to account and report on their equality objectives. Ensuring that there is a clear link between the data that you have and the work that you are going to undertake will enable you to set realistic and achievable deadlines and spread the load.

School or faculty Athena SWAN Bronze
If your department already has an Athena SWAN Bronze award, as part of a school or a faculty application, we can provide advice on how you can convert this to Juno Practitioner, providing it is a recent award (i.e. in the last year), so that you can use the same datasets.

Mentoring, advice and help
Smaller departments can and do achieve Juno Practitioner and Juno Champion.

The IOP Diversity Team is here to support you. We can put you in touch with departments in a similar position or of a similar size, who have already achieved an award, and they can talk through some of the issues you might be facing. We can come to visit your committees or teams to provide advice on action planning or other areas, such as gathering data. We can also provide access to generic training – for example by organising a regional workshop with local partner physics departments on a particular issue (e.g. unconscious bias). We can also provide advice and feedback on draft applications for Juno Practitioner or conversion applications from Athena SWAN Bronze.

If you have any suggestions about what might help you, then please contact us and we can discuss the options.
Good Practice Guide:

Principle 1

Robust organisational framework

“A robust organisational framework to deliver equality of opportunity and reward.

Establish organisational framework

Senior management are clearly committed to the process, there is evidence of the impact of the communication and reporting mechanisms, and there is clear accountability for the allocated resources (both time and money).

● The Juno Equality Action Plan has been incorporated into the school’s strategic plan for the next three years and the requirement to monitor equality and diversity has been written into the role description of the head of school.

● All heads of groups are asked to report on their own group’s Juno activities annually to the all-staff meeting.

● Department communications are cascaded down and up through heads of groups at group meetings. Groups meet monthly in term time and Juno is a standing item on their agenda.

● Initially, the Juno process was driven by the head of department and Juno Champion. This work then resulted in the formation of: a wider Juno Committee, consisting of staff with a range of different experience and duties within the department; a Research Staff Forum; and a Postgraduate Forum. This structure, supplementing the established committee structure of the department, provides effective mechanisms of consultation and communication with the respective groups (academic staff, research staff, postgraduates, administrative and technical staff). There is now an embedded calendar of meetings and events for these groups, as well as holding additional meetings when required.

● Research assistants felt that they were not properly represented in the department, which has now been addressed with the formation of the Research Assistant Committee, which will meet regularly and report at head of group meetings.

● Practices are now embedded within different administrative hubs providing an in-depth appreciation of the undergraduate gender statistics, undergraduate final-year motivation survey, PhD five-year review and generic reasons for drop out, research assistant destination statistics, and recruitment of academic and research assistant staff. National, university and departmental surveys have helped us to form a clearer understanding of outstanding gender issues.

● The department supports the Juno project by funding:
  - weekly Friday (Juno) coffee mornings, providing money for cakes, biscuits and administrators’ time for organisation;
  - Women in Physics group events targeted at undergraduates;
  - travel costs for female speakers invited to talk at Women in Physics events;
  - Juno events, e.g. to support academic staff, research staff, and postgraduate survey events and forum meetings (chocolates and tea/coffee);
  - a yearly “Celebrate Success Event” held in June (food and drinks);
  - travel costs for Juno Champion to attend Juno workshops, and administrative staff time to collate the statistics data for Juno and to help prepare Juno application documentation;
  - new posters for department foyer and corridors – showing diversity;
  - alumni careers events to which undergraduates, postgraduates, research staff and academics are invited.

“Heads of departments can be encouraged to engage formally, which benefits everyone, not just female staff.”

Prof. Brian Fulton
University of York
Monitoring and evidence base

Continue to monitor gender-disaggregated quantitative data and provide evidence of qualitative data from staff over time. Identify any discrepancies in gender representation, the factors that may be causing them and the impact of any actions so far.

- Updates on the baseline and the SET academic staff profile: there are currently 58 scientific staff in the department of physics including academics and research staff. In July 2010, nine out of 46 scientists (19.6%) were female; in May 2011, female scientists were 10 out of 61 (16%).
- The department’s gender statistics compare favourably with national figures except that we have a slightly lower proportion of female postgraduates. The percentage of women academics has remained around 10% over recent years as the department has grown, which implies a growth in the absolute number of female staff. 25% of the female staff are part-time. There has been considerable growth of women at lecturer and senior lecturer grades in percentage terms over the monitoring period. Given women’s percentage representation in the UK pipeline we have focused on retention and support of the existing staff in the department. The action plan addresses improvements in the male/female balance at postgraduate, postdoc and lecturer grades.
- Our bespoke front-end database was modified to include gender-disaggregated analysis tools. In addition, when the university implemented a simple reporting system, showing long-term trends in applications, conversion and admitances for all university admissions tutors, gender disaggregation was implemented in direct response to a request by the physics department.
- Staff survey: the university commissioned a survey of staff opinion on many aspects of working at the university. The results of this survey showed the university to be in the top 10 of the 300 employers surveyed, which included a large number of universities. Even more encouraging were the results for the department of physics, which had better scores on almost all questions than the university average, having an average ranking second in the university. Particularly relevant for this submission, the statement that the department respects gender equality had a positive response from 98% of staff (compared with 91% for the university). In addition, 93% of staff said that they were generally able to work flexible hours and/or had flexible-working arrangements (compared with a university average of 77%). Also of interest is the response that 83% of staff considered themselves to be supported by their line manager in accessing the identified staff development activities (university average, 74%) and 81% were satisfied with their current level of staff development (university average, 66%).
- In the focus group recently held with postgraduate research assistants in the department, they were questioned about the department’s flexible-working policies. The feedback was that they all felt that they can work flexibly and this flexibility is seen as embedded within the culture.
- Examples of actions taken this year include: ensuring that when women postgraduate candidates were interviewed, they met at least one female academic and a current female postgraduate or researcher; holding a meeting of the Women in Physics Committee with final-year MSci female undergraduate students in order to give them as much general information as possible about doing a PhD; ensuring that a female academic presented at postgraduate open day; including images to illustrate diversity of the postgraduate admissions web page; populating the department, particularly the foyer, with posters to illustrate diversity.
Good Practice Guide: Principle 2
Appointment and selection

Appointment and selection processes and procedures that encourage men and women to apply for academic posts at all levels.

Ensure that recruitment and selection processes are open and transparent, and that everyone is treated fairly.
Identify how career breaks are taken into consideration, that all staff who interview have undertaken equality and diversity training for recruitment, and that all new staff, including postdoctoral research assistants, have an induction. Demonstrate the impact of these measures to date and identify further measures to build on this.

- Recruitment procedures include:
  - appointing committees and procedures are designed to treat applications from men and women equally;
  - all appointing committees are constructed to meet diversity criteria;
  - all members of an appointing committee participate in scoring applications against objective criteria to generate the shortlist;
  - members of appointing committees are required to have undergone the human resources training programme “Recruiting the Best”, which includes specific emphasis on equality and diversity, legal, and best practice requirements in recruitment.

- All university employees are required to take part in training on diversity and equal opportunities, for which human resources provides an online module “Diversity in the Workplace”. The department requests data from human resources to ensure that the Juno Committee monitors uptake annually.

- An extensive induction programme is in place for new staff, which is fully documented on the department intranet. This starts with introductions to key support staff, health and safety briefing, and a department orientation tour on the first days. This is followed by an induction meeting with the head of department and deputy head shortly afterwards (ideally a week), which the new staff member’s mentor also attends. In subsequent weeks, staff work through the orientation material on the website and may also attend a centrally organised half-day session on orientation to the university. For teaching fellows and postdoctoral research assistants there are follow-up meetings at two – three – six – and nine – month intervals after appointment teaching fellows with the head of department and postdoctoral research assistants with their respective PIs. For academic staff, the initial induction meeting is followed by a subsequent meeting with the mentor, after which it is up to the mentor and mentee to develop the basis on which they maintain contact. Human resources collect feedback on the induction process, to ensure that it is working as it should and this feedback is disseminated to the department.

- We are particularly pleased at the positive response by new staff to our extensive induction process, involving departmental and central activities. This is supported by an extensive dedicated area on the department’s intranet with information to help orientate new staff to the workings and culture of the department. This same programme runs for research staff as well as academic staff. The induction process is embedded in department practice by having it initiated automatically by the department administration and by having the process set out publicly on the departmental web pages.

“Project Juno is about taking diversity to a different plane – you think about what you are doing and do it differently.”

Prof. Robin Ball
University of Warwick
The percentage of women research staff in all physics cost centres in the UK is 19%, whereas here it is x%. Clearly, we need to address this at every stage of the recruitment process. Since there is no evidence of bias in the recruitment process once an application is received, we need to increase the percentage of women applicants for these positions. In order to address the generic issue of encouraging women to apply, we had strengthened our “welcoming” statement on our job advertisements recently as part of our Juno Practitioner Action Plan; however, this is being revisited. The physics department now has a new Juno action to include a specific statement regarding women.

The figures show that the women in the department are distributed across the academic grades somewhat differently to their counterparts in other UK universities, with proportionally more of the women at the professor grade and fewer at the research grade. These percentages again are swayed by very small numbers; the total number of women at present is x. In an effort to address the under-representation of women throughout the university, the human resources equality and diversity team has produced a report on the feasibility of removing the names from applications and CVs in an effort to mask the gender of applicants. The feasibility study is ongoing. Also, human resources has increased its focus on training for members of recruitment panels, including diversity training.

Recruitment data have been collected in recent years, so information on the gender balance of applicants, which might help us analyse whether there is a problem at the recruitment stage, is limited. Four years ago, out of a total of 94 applicants to academic and research posts, 16% were female. 28 applicants were interviewed (14% female), from which 11 men and two women (i.e. 15% of the total) were appointed. Three years ago, there were a total of 70 applicants, 14% were female. 32 applicants were interviewed (21.9% female) and three appointments were made (no female). These sets of data would appear to demonstrate that there is no problem with women being shortlisted or appointed, although the latter statistics are heavily affected by the small numbers considered. A gender bottleneck is present at the application level so that strategies for increasing the number of women applicants should be searched for. The department is now publicising its commitment to gender equality in every job announcement as well as in its publicity material, highlighting the Juno Practitioner and university Athena SWAN Bronze awards. The department will be considering how it can take forward an action to proactively seek out more female applicants.

The department has put in place the following actions:

- identification and encouragement of high-quality female applicants internal to the department through the mentoring and staff review and development schemes;
- identification and encouragement of eligible females external to the department to apply for posts;
- an explicit statement about equal opportunities on all job adverts, and provision of Athena SWAN material and a family/carers information sheet as part of the further particulars;
- the presence of at least one female academic on all search and interview committees;
- coverage of childcare costs for female interview candidates and the requirement that all academic staff have completed the university’s specific equality and diversity online training course.

Take positive action to encourage under-represented groups to apply for jobs

Monitor the number of applications, shortlists and appointments of female staff, and take action to remedy any discrepancies. Identify the impact of these actions.

Contact information:
Institute of Physics Diversity Team
76 Portland Place
London W1B 1NT
Tel +44 (0)20 7470 4842
E-mail juno@iop.org
www.iop.org/diversity
Departmental structures and systems that support and encourage the career progression and promotion of all staff and enable men and women to progress and continue in their careers.

Transparent appraisal and development
Ensure that all staff, including postdoctoral research assistants, are appraised regularly, that there is a mentoring scheme in place, or under development, and that all staff have access to impartial career guidance. Demonstrate the impact of these measures.

- The appraisal process considers all aspects of the individual’s working life (research, teaching and administration) and anything that would affect it, including personal circumstances, career breaks, life-changing events and flexible-working opportunities. The system has been running for several years and is now embedded across the whole university. The completion rate for last year was 91% for the university as a whole and 100% for the faculty of science and technology, which includes physics. Staff are usually appraised by their line manager. For more senior staff this might be the head of division or the head of department. All staff have the option to choose a different appraiser, who may not be their line manager, but must be an appropriate person agreed by the head of department. All appraisers receive mandatory training. Postgraduate students have their own appraisal system, run by the central postgraduate service office and conducted every term with their supervisor, deputy supervisor and their independent advisor.

- This system ensures that postgraduate students have an opportunity to give feedback regarding their programme that is independent of their meetings with their supervisor. In addition, all postgraduate students are encouraged to fill out an online development needs analysis in which they assess their own capabilities on a regular basis. They may, if they wish, invite their supervisor to see and comment on this assessment.

- The department aims to provide an environment in which all staff are valued and able to flourish. A key part of this provision is the Staff Review and Development scheme, which provides an opportunity for individuals to discuss and plan career development with a senior colleague, and to review achievements and issues arising in the course of their work. The department’s scheme is in line with university policy and is administered by the head of department’s office. The departmental administrators are very much engaged with the developments of the university Staff Review and Development scheme and will influence changes to improve the quality of reviews for all university research staff, in particular using the department’s experience of the Athena SWAN programme. The department’s Staff Review and Development scheme was modified to provide an annual review for research staff in their first five years, starting six months from start of contract and ending six months before end of contract, such that appropriate career advice and encouragement to apply for personal fellowships, in particular those targeted at women, could be given. The department uses a group of skilled senior reviewers, whose contributions are recognised in the Workload Model. All record forms are scrutinised by the head of department to monitor, identify and prioritise training and career advice, and to identify underlying issues; feedback is reported at advisory board and staff meetings.

“For the next generation of women physicists, making small changes will make a huge difference.”

Prof. Val Gibson
University of Cambridge
A perennial issue in the department has been the implementation of a mentoring scheme that works effectively. Although we run a voluntary mentoring scheme in which all new staff are assigned a mentor, the uptake of mentoring among postdocs has been poor. The department has introduced a revised mentoring scheme for all staff that requires research groups to actively assign mentors to new staff members and report on the uptake (providing the name of a mentor within a one-month probationary period). The online mentoring support has also been improved with a list of specialist mentors who advise staff on various aspects of working in the department; career development in general is published on the website.

In addition to the department’s activities, the university provides many forums for career advice and support at key career transition points. Excellent advice is available from the University Careers Service; the science careers advisor runs three surgeries per month, with one-to-one appointments at the department to discuss opportunities in academia and industry. We plan to undertake a review of the careers service provision within the department. The university runs a widely acclaimed Professional Development Programme for PIs at all career levels; activities include a grant submission support scheme, skills development, leadership and management training, and the “New Perspectives for Women” workshops. There are also career development seminars for early-career women researchers, topics include confidence building in the workplace, “speaking up and saying no” and “working smarter not harder”; these are widely publicised and encouraged within the department. The department also hosts many of these activities, such as the “Cake and Careers” event.

All academic staff are considered for promotion annually through the academic staff review. There is no sense in which staff are required to “put themselves forward for promotion”. There are clearly defined criteria of achievements that must be demonstrated for promotion available on the website and recently updated at the request of the Athena SWAN Committee. All academic staff are required by the department to put forward their CV for consideration by the departmental academic staff review committee, which comprises the professors in the department and the dean of the science faculty. University policy requires that this committee includes at least one female professor. At present, there are no women professors of physics and so a female professor from another science department attends. The committee is aware of those staff who have had a career break and this is explicitly taken into consideration. The departmental academic staff review committee decides who, in their opinion, meets the promotion criteria. These staff are put forward and there is no “cap” on numbers.

One of the first issues that the Juno Committee tackled was drawing up a document to explain the early stages of the promotion process to make it more transparent. It was one of the points raised when the women academics in the department were interviewed by the member of the Juno Committee who comes from staff development. The document was finalised with agreement from all of the head of groups and is on the departmental website.

The head of department invites all academic staff to submit an annual “summary of achievement” record. A review by the Juno Committee suggested that women were less likely to respond to the invitation. Action will be taken in advance of the next promotion round to encourage more women to submit.

Transparent promotion processes and procedures
Ensure that all staff are aware of the promotions process and the criteria for promotion. Support staff through the promotions process and take steps to encourage potential candidates for promotion.
Good Practice Guide: Principle 4
Open and inclusive culture

“Through Project Juno we have people in the department talking about important matters of how the department runs.”

Dr Lyndsay Fletcher
University of Glasgow

Departmental organisation, structure, management arrangements and culture that are open, inclusive and transparent, and encourage the participation of all staff.

Promote an inclusive culture

Ensure that all processes in the department are open, transparent and fully inclusive, all staff receive general equality and diversity training, that there are inclusive social activities for all staff, positive images are used in all communications, and female seminar speakers are encouraged and supported. Monitor the number of female seminar speakers and take action where appropriate.

- In the last few years, the department has initiated staff training workshops and events that include undergraduates, postgraduates and staff to increase connectivity. Minutes of meetings and news highlights are now updated regularly on the main departmental websites. New prizes have been created for staff and students, celebrated annually.
- To verify that all staff perceive that the departmental processes, procedures and practices are fully inclusive, we have implemented three feedback methods:
  - Annual Equal Opportunity events, in which staff have the opportunity to address and discuss equal opportunity issues and to express any concerns that they may have.
  - We have the “Clickers” events in which the academic and research staff are asked questions from the Good Practice checklist (and additional questions). Members of the Research Staff Forum are asked to complete an appropriately edited version of this checklist to gauge their opinions on departmental processes and procedures. There is also the opportunity at the end of each event for staff to provide comments and suggestions to the Juno Champion.
  - The Research Staff Forum and Postgraduate Forum have been established to ascertain if departmental practices are inclusive and to give feedback.
- The department has now run in two successive academic years a series of informal lunchtime science seminars entitled “SIESTA” (Student Informatives on Experimental Science, Techniques and Applications), which mostly comprise talks given by postgraduate students about their research. The SIESTA talks take place weekly during term time and continue outside of term time when participants are available. The sessions are held at lunchtime, with food and drink available, and provide an inclusive social and learning activity for undergraduates, postgraduates, academic and research staff. They have proved extremely popular with students and staff at all levels.
- We regularly review the departmental undergraduate admissions publicity material (leaflets, web pages, etc) to ensure female representation in images and student profiles, and this has contributed towards the portrayal of a gender-balanced image to prospective applicants. There is a healthy female proportion of UCAS student guides on UCAS days, and part of the “mini lectures” on UCAS days have been given by female members of staff.
- Junior staff, women and other under-represented groups, and postdoctoral research assistants, are encouraged to raise their profile internally, e.g. by contributing to departmental research seminars and presenting to research sponsors. The department aims to ensure that speakers...
The distribution of departmental teaching, administration and research duties among academic staff is guided by a Work Allocation Model, in which a nominal number of hours are assigned for each task. The total number of hours is computed for each academic staff member. The entire spreadsheet is e-mailed to all academic staff and presented annually at the Physics Committee. The spreadsheet is managed by our director of teaching and by the head of department (for research). Any staff member who has concerns about their share of the workload can discuss the situation with the DoT and/or the head of department. This system has been in place for many years (but with the addition of research allocation in the last couple of years) and has seemed to work well, with modifications being made to accommodate requests wherever possible. It is an excellent example of transparency and fairness, yet it can and will be improved by changing the procedures to systematically include longer-term (as opposed to just one academic year) information about each staff member’s workload. This will ensure that where a staff member has a disproportionately heavy load for a few years, they can be given a lighter load in subsequent years in the interests of fairness.

We have made significant investment in our outreach activities, appointing a full-time Outreach Officer and working with a freelance journalist to produce a suite of YouTube videos. These videos have collectively attracted millions of hits worldwide. This medium has provided particularly high visibility for several of our female academics.

**Transparent work-allocation model**

Recognise the full range of contributions in the workload model and ensure that all staff are aware of the process and criteria used to develop the model.

- The distribution of departmental teaching, administration and research duties among academic staff is guided by a Work Allocation Model, in which a nominal number of hours are assigned for each task. The total number of hours is computed for each academic staff member. The entire spreadsheet is e-mailed to all academic staff and presented annually at the Physics Committee. The spreadsheet is managed by our director of teaching and by the head of department (for research). Any staff member who has concerns about their share of the workload can discuss the situation with the DoT and/or the head of department. This system has been in place for many years (but with the addition of research allocation in the last couple of years) and has seemed to work well, with modifications being made to accommodate requests wherever possible. It is an excellent example of transparency and fairness, yet it can and will be improved by changing the procedures to systematically include longer-term (as opposed to just one academic year) information about each staff member’s workload. This will ensure that where a staff member has a disproportionately heavy load for a few years, they can be given a lighter load in subsequent years in the interests of fairness.

- The Work Allocation Model was not transparent to all staff before the Juno process began. Teaching was assigned by the director of undergraduate studies in the department, and administrative tasks by the head of department. To increase transparency, the proposed duties, covering the whole spectrum, are tabled at the annual summer departmental board meeting as an A3 spreadsheet. This spreadsheet is then open to amendments. In response to negative staff-survey results about the model, the head of department recognised that a quantitative workload allocation model would be more transparent. We are therefore working towards a target of developing such a model for implementation. This will involve scrutiny of workload models used by other departments in the science faculty, the formulation of a proposal by the department’s senior management team and consultation with academic staff. The duties allocated to each academic are considered through discussion in the appraisals process. They are also considered at the Academic Staff Review, with a view to taking steps to support career progression.
Good Practice Guide: Principle 5

Flexible working

"Because we have more people talking to each other we have a better environment."
Prof. Jo Haigh
Imperial College London

Flexible approaches and provisions that enable individuals, at all career and life stages, to optimise their contribution to their department, their institution and to SET.

Support and promote flexible-working practices
Demonstrate how the head of department supports flexible and part-time working, that policies are consistently applied and the benefits are promoted. Provide explicit support for those returning from career breaks and encourage take-up of maternity and/or caring leave. Demonstrate how this has helped effect departmental culture change and how these processes will remain in place as senior management changes. Where there are university-wide policies, demonstrate and give examples of how they are used across the department or school.

- The university provides flexible-working guidelines that cover: unpaid leave, reduced hours working, seasonal hours (i.e. term-time-only working), staggered hours, flexitime, job share, compressed hours and homeworking. All requests for flexible working are dealt with on an individual basis (but adhering to a given framework) through the immediate line manager. Employees and managers work together to achieve the best outcome from any request for flexibility, and should both understand and consider the likely impact on the department/university. All staff have the right to request flexible working. The department of physics currently has a male member of academic staff working 50% of full-time, as a result of a request to work fewer hours to pursue other interests. One female postdoctoral research assistant also works part-time due to family commitments.

- Career breaks and flexible working: the progress in this domain has been very positive with an increase of male (zero to four) and female (four to six) staff taking up part-time work. Surveys indicate that all academic staff work flexible hours. The head of department encourages this as best practice. We have 100% take-up of paternity leave, of return-to-work fellowships and of an equivalent scheme set up for female research assistants returning after maternity leave. The latter has been adopted across the university as an area of best practice.

- Opportunities for flexible and part-time working are well embedded within the university regulations and procedures. In addition to these formal arrangements, academic staff members have considerable choice in their work schedules, except of course in cases where they are teaching. Even with teaching, the university has a policy of allowing academic staff to request certain teaching times and, as long as the member of staff has acceptable reasons, an effort will be made to accommodate the request. Acceptable reasons include caring responsibilities.

- All departmental meetings are held during the main part of the working day (10.00 a.m. to 4.00 p.m.); termly staff meetings are held at 3.00 p.m. to ensure that we can include those with childcare/carer commitments.

- The university has a widely advertised policy that flexible and part-time working will be accommodated when possible, and the department supports this fully. In recent years, we have had academic and research staff on part-time contracts, on job-share arrangements and on career breaks, which have been arranged to meet the personal circumstances or career development of individuals.
● Staff returning from career breaks have a meeting with the head of department to discuss arrangements for re-integrating into the department, which also gives an opportunity for the staff member to be updated on any significant developments that have occurred while they were absent (however, it is common practice to maintain staff on e-mail lists during absences so that they can keep up to date with things if they wish). In addition to these more structured ways of helping, the department practice is to manage carefully the teaching timetable to provide a better pattern of work. Formal university arrangements enable us to block out a teaching-free day for research and to accommodate issues such as childcare arrangements. Within the department we go further in accommodating periods for research activities and arranging terms relatively free of teaching.

● Particular examples of paternity leave in the department are: Dr -- (research fellow) has taken paternity leave and used flexible working hours to help care for his children. Mr -- (technical support staff) has taken one-week’s leave and paternity leave. Dr -- (new lecturer) took two weeks’ paternity leave (January 2010). Dr -- (senior lecturer) took two weeks’ paternity leave. Mr -- (technical support staff) took two weeks’ paternity leave and three months’ unpaid leave. Reduced teaching load was agreed with a member of staff with demanding weekend care responsibilities for an elderly relative.

● The school has developed and implemented a formal return to work policy for individuals returning-to-work after a career break and/or extended period of leave, including maternity or paternity leave. Academic staff members returning to work have a period of two years over which they build up again to a full teaching load. Administrative responsibilities are also minimised to enable the staff member to focus on their research.

● Over the past three years, there have been six members of staff (all research staff) who have taken paternity leave. The paternity forms and guidelines are accessible from the departmental website and all staff used the university-approved procedure. In a focus group with research staff in the department, the ease and openness of paternity leave was mentioned, as well as the flexibility around needing to take time off at short notice for children for a variety of reasons, including illness, dropping them off/picking them up from school.

● The university’s policy for flexible working is well advertised; a link to the university human resource site is posted on the website to remind staff that the department recognises the many forms of flexible working and to provide guidelines on how to obtain a suitable flexible-working arrangement. We plan to raise awareness of our flexible-working policy, in particular through the “Families at the Lab” website.

● The department has assigned a maternity mentor (female) who discusses pre- and post-maternity arrangements with individuals requesting maternity leave. The department accommodates requests, consistent with our child policy, such as provision of breast-feeding/expressing facilities and keeping-in-touch days. The maternity mentor provides further support prior to maternity leave and during the return-to-work period.

● As we are a large department, the policy is that the teaching load for female academic staff taking maternity leave is covered by other staff in their absence; arrangements for research responsibilities are covered by individual research groups. On return from maternity leave, female academics are relieved from lectures in the first term and no new lecture courses are assigned in the first 12 months. For those research associates/fellows employed on Research Council/Royal Society funding, the tenure of the appointment is extended accordingly; for non-Research Council Research associates, maternity leave is given according to the terms of the employment.

● All staff have good access to childcare through the university nurseries (one located adjacent to the department) and the university play scheme, which runs during the school holidays. The university also runs a returning carers scheme that provides teaching “buy-out” or covers the cost of a family member/nanny to accompany new mothers to conferences, and a salary sacrifice scheme, which, in effect, provides tax-free nursery provision. We will continue to monitor maternity and paternity leave rates, and account for leave in the workload model.

Contact information:
Institute of Physics Diversity Team
76 Portland Place
London W1B 1NT
Tel +44 (0)20 7470 4842
E-mail juno@iop.org
www.iop.org/diversity
What is unconscious bias?
The term *unconscious bias* refers to the way in which the brain routinely and rapidly sorts people into different groups, bypassing normal, rational and logical thinking. Regardless of how fair-minded we believe ourselves to be, all people have some degree of unconscious bias, and many people even hold unconscious bias towards the groups that they belong to. Although these thought processes are unconscious, they can have a significant influence on the conscious attitudes that we hold regarding different groups of people, and our behaviour towards them. These unconscious biases can lead us to favour people who look like us, sound like us and share our interests and overlook those that are different from us, but who may well be equally talented or qualified.

What is unconscious bias?
The term *unconscious bias* refers to the way in which the brain routinely and rapidly sorts people into different groups, bypassing normal, rational and logical thinking. Regardless of how fair-minded we believe ourselves to be, all people have some degree of unconscious bias, and many people even hold unconscious bias towards the groups that they belong to. Although these thought processes are unconscious, they can have a significant influence on the conscious attitudes that we hold regarding different groups of people, and our behaviour towards them. These unconscious biases can lead us to favour people who look like us, sound like us and share our interests and overlook those that are different from us, but who may well be equally talented or qualified.

Measuring unconscious bias and identifying its impact
Tools have been developed to assess an individual’s unconscious bias towards different groups – see Harvard’s “Project Implicit” [https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/](https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/).

Unconscious bias could potentially be affecting the recruitment, retention and progression of female staff and students within your department.

Outlined below are six areas where you may be able to identify if unconscious bias is having an impact, and suggestions to help mitigate this potential bias. These are designed to prompt discussion or action in your department.

Student admissions
Offer and acceptance rates are different for males and females. To address this your department could:

- Ensure images within the department and materials publicising the department are inclusive and representative.
- Female staff are visible on open days and the role they play in the department is made evident.
- Those responsible for admissions decisions receive equality and diversity training in which they are encouraged to consider their unconscious bias, particularly when they are reviewing contextual data or personal statements.

Student assessment
Differences in attainment between the genders in different modules, coursework, year-end assessments or final degree class. To address this your department could:

- Consider implementing anonymous and/or second marking.
- Look at group work and how students interact with each other in diverse groups.
- Consider how to overcome bias in assessments that are not anonymous, such as presentations.
- Look at the feedback given to different groups of students and whether they receive the same level of feedback.

“Good practice benefits all staff and students. Bad practice adversely affects women’s careers more than men’s.”

Prof. Paul Walton
lead on first successful Athena SWAN Gold departmental submission

Good Practice: Unconscious Bias
Six areas of good practice

Unconscious bias could potentially be affecting the recruitment, retention and progression of female staff and students within your department.
Recruitment of staff
Differences in the ratios between applications, shortlisting, interviewing and appointments. To address this your department could:
- Ensure that advertised jobs are visible to under-represented groups and that under-represented groups are encouraged to apply.
- Ensure that all those who are involved in Search Committees or interviews have received unconscious-bias training.
- Ensure that the criteria for a post are strictly defined before candidates are considered so that the person specification and required experience are based only on the essential requirements of the post.
- Consider using standardised application forms rather than CVs, so all candidates are submitting the same types of information and can be compared fairly.
- Consider anonymous shortlisting where all information that is irrelevant to the job is removed by the human resources department so it does not have any impact on the recruiter’s decision-making processes.
- Ask interview panel chairs to:
  - Make a verbal commitment to equality at the beginning of the process.
  - Explicitly mention unconscious bias and acknowledge that it may lead panel members to overlook candidates.
  - Encourage panel members to consider the similarities, rather than the differences, of people from minority and majority groups.
  - Ensure decisions are justified on objective rather than subjective grounds. Document decisions to ensure that they are consistent.

Promotion of staff
Gender differences in the proportion of male and female staff self-nominating/being nominated for promotion and success rates of applications. Differences by gender in the time spent at each grade for academic staff. To address this your department could:
- If staff are selected for promotion ensure that those doing the selection have received unconscious-bias training. If staff apply for promotion, encourage all staff to consider themselves eligible, particularly staff from under-represented groups.
- Clearly define the objective criteria for promotion to all staff so that they know what is required of them.
- Ensure that the Chair of the Promotions Panel specifically considers equality and diversity issues at the outset.

Staff appraisals
Gender differences in the perception of the appraisal process among staff monitored via qualitative surveys. Gender differences in the outcomes of appraisals. To address this your department could:
- Ensure that all staff who are appraisers have had training in equality and diversity and/or unconscious bias.
- Ensure that the appraisal process recognises the variety of work carried out within the department, including research, teaching, outreach activities and administrative responsibilities.
- Consider how outcomes from appraisals could be moderated across the department and whether targets are equally ambitious for all staff members.

Workload allocation
Gender differences in time allocated to various work areas including research, teaching, administration and outreach. To address this your department could:
- Consider whether certain groups of staff are volunteering for, or being expected to, carry out more of the work that is positive for career progression or work that is not as highly valued.
- Ensure that research is assessed according to quality and not just quantity.
- Examine the process by which staff are allocated teaching responsibilities.
- Ensure that administrative work is not disproportionately allocated to certain groups of staff.
- Ensure that work on Juno and Athena SWAN submissions is considered as part of the model.
Good Practice: Paternity Leave
Removing barriers for male staff

“In practice three months off isn’t a long time, which is why it made sense to share the leave with my wife.”

Richard Alexander
University of Leicester

Supporting a departmental culture in which male and female staff feel able to take advantage of their entitlement to maternity and paternity leave can help to attract, retain and motivate a diverse and talented workforce.

This guide is designed to encourage departments to adopt best practice in paternity leave. Following a number of Juno visits to departments at various stages of their Juno journey, the Institute Diversity Team found that there was more confusion about paternity leave regulations and pay compared with maternity leave regulations and pay. While there was generally good knowledge about maternity entitlements, there was far less understanding about what the equivalent entitlements for new fathers were.

What UK law says

Maternity/adoption leave
New mothers (or new adoptive mothers) are eligible to take up to 52 weeks maternity/adoption leave, made up of “Ordinary Maternity Leave” (first 26 weeks) and “Additional Maternity Leave” (last 26 weeks). While on maternity/adoption leave, the mother is entitled to Statutory Maternity/Adoption Pay (SMP), which is paid for up to 39 weeks. As a minimum, it must be paid at 90% of an individual’s average weekly earnings for the first six weeks, and a set amount determined by the government or 90% of their average weekly earnings (whichever is lower) for the next 33 weeks.

Paternity/adoption leave
New fathers may be eligible for up to two weeks paid “Ordinary Paternity Leave” following the birth of their child and up to 26 weeks “Additional Paternity Leave” from 20 weeks after the birth of the child, but only if the mother has returned to work before she has used up her full entitlement to maternity leave. The statutory weekly rate of ordinary Paternity Pay and Additional Paternity Pay is a set amount determined by the government, or 90% of your average weekly earnings (whichever is lower). Fathers are only entitled to Additional Paternity Pay if the mother has not used her full entitlement to Statutory Maternity Pay.

Planned changes to the law on paternity leave and pay
From April 2015 the government plans to enable both parents to share the entire period of leave, providing families with more flexibility to decide which parent is in a better position to take the leave and care for the child during the first year.

Paternity leave in higher education physics departments
Despite the provisions that have been put in place by the government, many new fathers in higher education physics departments are choosing not to take time off following the birth of their child. In a short survey conducted by the Institute Diversity Team, only 9% of respondents were actually aware of any men who had taken Additional Paternity Leave. Our survey work identified three main reasons for the low uptake:

● A general lack of awareness of a partner’s right to share the leave and their entitlement to Additional Paternity Pay if Statutory Maternity pay entitlement has not been used up.
● A belief that it would be impossible to take an extended period of time off work and that if leave was taken it would have a negative impact on their career.
● Financial considerations that make it unfeasible to sacrifice their full salary during the leave period.

“Good Practice: Paternity Leave” is a guide by the Institute Diversity Team to encourage departments to adopt best practice in paternity leave.
Supporting a departmental culture in which staff feel able to take advantage of their entitlement to paternity leave

It is clear that departments need to do more to promote paternity leave. Therefore, departments could consider some or all of the following actions:

- Monitoring uptake of paternity leave and surveying male staff’s reasons for choosing not to take the leave. Developing actions as appropriate.
- Publicising the provision of both “Ordinary” and “Additional Paternity Leave” to ensure staff are aware of their rights, particularly targeting male academic staff.
- Collecting and promoting “human interest stories” of men that have taken the leave to reduce stigma.
- Setting up forums or mentoring schemes where men can seek advice and support from other men who are considering taking the leave, and from colleagues that have taken the leave in the past.
- Making an explicit commitment to supporting staff who choose to take the leave and outlining what they can expect from the department while they are on leave, and the support that they will receive on their return.
- Providing managers and PIs with training to ensure that they are able to adequately prepare for any periods of paternity leave that their staff choose to take.
- Offering enhancements to the statutory pay fathers receive while on paternity leave.

CASE STUDY: Rob Nyman, Imperial College London

Rob, an EPSRC Fellow, took Additional Paternity Leave when his partner returned to work after their baby turned nine months old.

It was a combination of financial and practical considerations that led Rob to take over caring for the baby when his partner returned to work.

Despite putting their child’s name on the waiting list for the university’s nursery 13 weeks into the pregnancy, their baby was 11 months old before a space was available. His wife had wanted to take the first nine months off and was offered a significant financial incentive to return to work at the end of this period. This meant that it made financial sense for Rob to take over as the primary carer before their son could start nursery.

For Rob a nine-week period of leave seemed manageable and he was able to maintain some contact with the department while he was away. His funding body, the EPSRC, has said that it is happy to grant him a no-cost extension at the end of his grant that will be put down to justifiable staff absence. The biggest challenge was working out how to ensure that his new PhD student was supported in his absence. Using his full allocation of “Keeping in Touch” days, Rob managed to continue supervising his student, the single other researcher working on the grant for which Rob is the PI. He didn’t think that this would have been such a big issue if he’d had a bigger team where someone else could have stepped into the role.

Rob is conscious that during the short period he was away there were some missed opportunities. For example, he missed his department’s postgraduate recruitment event, which may have affected his chances of attracting another PhD student. He also acknowledged that he would have struggled to meet deadlines for last-minute grant applications. His research slowed down during the period, but he believes that colleagues will give him the couple of months allowance he needs. He is happy that he decided to take the leave and is likely to do the same thing again if he has another child.