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Introduction

In this document we will first give a general overview of the school and a current snapshot of our cohort. Sections 2 and 3 respectively outline progress since our last Juno submission, and priorities going forward. We then discuss our work for each of Juno’s 6 principles in sections 4-9. Throughout this document, we will reference plots and actions in the accompanying data supplement and action plan.

The School of Physics and Astronomy (SPA) employs 54 academics and 33 research staff, split across four research areas: Astronomy Unit (AU), Centre for Condensed Matter and Materials Physics (CCMMP), Centre for Research in String Theory (CRST) and the Particle Physics Research Centre (PPRC). Our undergraduate (UG) intake is between 100 and 150 students per year and we recruit between 15 and 20 graduate research (PGR) students each year. The percentage of women decreases with career stage (see figure 1). With only 6 female academics (1 at professor level) our academic female ratio (12%) is below the national average, our PhD ratio (18%) is close to the national average (20% in 2016/17) and our UG female ratio is consistently above average: 29% across the cohort and has reached a new high of 34% for our current first year. As part of the South East Physics network (SEPnet) we share best practice and findings in diversity with other physics departments in the South East. We are trying to understand why we have the highest female ratio in our UG cohort, but one of the lowest in our staff (Figure 2, action 1.3.a).

Based in East London, QMUL has a unique student demographic with an UG BAME ratio significantly above the national average (in SPA the ratio was 47% in 2015/16 cf. HESA national average of 14% for physics). The BAME ratio has been steadily increasing (figures 4,5) and is now over 50% in our UG cohort, which is not reflected in our staff: only a handful of academics identify as BAME.

Progress since Juno Champion Award

The ratio of female researchers and academics has been increasing throughout our Juno journey: when we submitted our first champion application in 2015, we employed 16% female post-docs (now 18%) and 6% female academics (now 11%). We have doubled the number of female academics through dedicated recruitment actions.

Our action plan (attached) has continued to evolve since our first Champion submission, but we have focussed on making our actions more evidence-led and accountable. Many actions are well embedded and no longer included in the plan but feed into running agenda items at Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) committee meetings.
We have held many useful internal discussions, including very fruitful engagement with the undergraduate BAME community, which has led us to understand that race is at least as important as gender within our school and has motivated us to extend the remit of our work to include other characteristics.

The EDI committee has been extended to include a professional-services (PS) representative and two UG representatives, one specifically for BAME issues. In addition, we have appointed four Champions in Gender, Race, LGBT+ and Disability, sending a strong message on our commitments to inclusivity within the School. The remit of these roles is to act as a point of contact for SPA members and to promote events and information related to each characteristic.

We have seen significant improvements in data collection, with student recruitment, enrolment, attainment, staff recruitment and staff progression data now provided annually from the strategic planning unit (SPO) in the form of dash-boards. We have, and continue to liaise with the SPO to optimise these data sets for our purposes.

We have undertaken an important project to embed and formalise EDI roles and actions within the SPA. The first stage, now complete, was to review and improve all committee remits to include relevant EDI responsibilities, and to add standard EDI agenda items to committee meetings (and standardise reporting through the school Indico server). The second stage is to ensure a written and approved remit exists for each formal role within the school (i.e. all roles which are recognised within the workload allocation (WLA) system) to future-proof our EDI programme against changes in management.

**Priorities going forward**

One of our main priorities is to formalise and embed our EDI work across the school, and formalise responsibilities and remits, recognising that clarifying expectations leaves less scope for biases or inconsistencies with respect to any minorities (action 1.1.c). Following on from this, we aim to identify and share best practice consistently across the different research groups, especially with respect to PGR and recruitment (actions 1.5, 2.2, 2.3). Actions to promote and enhance an inclusive environment within the SPA are also a high priority, such as work to promote and develop the role of our EDI champions (action 6.2.c).

Greater support from QMUL could significantly help our EDI efforts in some areas. We recognise that our EDI work in SPA is often in advance of other QMUL schools and departments (currently only a few schools, including SPA, hold Athena-SWAN Silver awards), so we will aim to influence university policy and improve central EDI provisions (e.g. actions 2.1, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 5.1 and 6.1).

Our work on other diversity characteristics has been gaining pace, and we recognise BAME-related issues to be especially pertinent to our cohort. We will focus on developing the successful elements (long-table discussions, BAME teaching resources) into Beacon activities that can be made available to other Physics departments. Our collaboration within SEPnet provides an ideal environment to test and develop such resources.
Principle 1: A robust organisational framework to deliver equality of opportunity and reward

The EDI committee consists of 16 members, including representatives from academics in each of the four research groups, the Head of School (HoS), School Manager, a PS representative, a post-doc representative, 2 PGR members and 2 UG members. The four appointed champions are also members of the committee, with some members currently having more than one role. There is an allocated EDI secretary and representatives from the QMUL Diversity team are also invited to attend our meetings. Upon the suggestion of our new UG representative, we are working to formalise the student roles in the committee such that they are recognised within the students' Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) (action 1.1.d).

In the school WLA model, the EDI Chair is awarded 125 hours, the Deputy Chair is allocated 50 hours and Champions 15 hours annually. Membership and allocations are reviewed quarterly (action 1.1.a). Agendas, minutes and reports are organised through the school Indico server and meetings are arranged at mutually-convenient times during core hours through Doodle poll. Documents and data are shared securely between committee members through the School's ownCloud file-sharing server. When actions arise within the remit of other School committees, the EDI secretary is responsible for adding these to the relevant agenda and coordinating with other committee secretaries to feed outcomes back to EDI (action 1.1.b).

The EDI Chair and HoS meet monthly to ensure that any EDI-related issues can be fed in a timely manner directly to the School Executive Group (SEG). These meetings are also minuted on Indico. There is a dedicated EDI budget, allocated £1,000 annually, which is used to pay speaker expenses, catering for organised events, and travel expenses to attend EDI-related events.

The EDI committee maintains both public and internal webpages, which have recently been overhauled. Committee members and their roles are now clearly displayed, along with links to events, meetings, relevant documentation and policies. These pages have attracted praise from other areas of QMUL with Schools and Departments asking to copy the format. (https://www.qmul.ac.uk/spa/equality-diversity-and-inclusion/)

In addition to the formal datasets now provided annually by central QMUL teams, we maintain our own school database to record training information, mentor allocations etc., and our own PhD database. We monitor UG attendance and performance and observe that female students out-perform males in both areas. This data is shared with students (action 1.3.b). Figure 10 shows that the fraction of female students achieving firsts has been increasing over time. We are collecting more data to understand the high drop-out rate for our first-year cohort (actions 1.4.a/b). We performed our last staff survey in 2017 and have used both qualitative responses and quantitative analysis to inform our current action plan (data appendix section 12). We have restructured the survey (through Bristol Online Surveys) based on staff feedback, and plan to run the next iteration in 2020 (to avoid clashing with the QMUL-wide staff survey in 2019). We have also asked the School colloquium and group-seminar organisers to collect statistics on the gender of invited speakers, and have previously set targets to increase female-speaker ratios.
The successful PGR and post-doc forums continue to meet termly and provide a useful source of qualitative feedback. This is provided to the SEG and distributed to the relevant committees. We maintain 'You said, we did' feedback on our EDI webpages and report outcomes at subsequent forums (action 1.2.a). Women's lunches are held 2-3 times per year for all staff (academic and PS) and PGR students within the school. We recently extended the invite to the UG cohort (action 4.3.c) and received very positive feedback on the last women's lunch (8/3/2019 to coincide with International Women's Day): one PGR student wrote to say "It was really insightful listening to everyone’s views and experiences in a relaxed and informal setting. It was also a great opportunity to meet other women from different departments. I thought it was great!"

We have identified large differences in gender ratios across our different research areas, by studying conference attendance, speaker ratios and job applications in the different fields, with CRST seeing the lowest female fraction at ~10%. This appears to be reflected in our UG cohort with less women choosing theoretical-physics modules. Hence, we are seeking to address the root cause that deters women from theory and plan to collate and analyse more quantitative and qualitative data on this (action 1.3.c) aiming to identify and address factors deterring module selections (action 1.3.d).

Figure 1 Photograph from March 8th 2019 Women's Lunch

There are year-on-year fluctuations in our PGR gender ratio due to low numbers, but they appear to be in line with (or slightly higher than) the national average (figure 14). We did identify some differences in recruitment practices across the four research groups, driven in part by differing numbers of applications per available position. However, the Graduate Degrees Committee (GDC) is embarking upon actions to share best practice in PhD recruitment (including advertising of posts, responding to informal enquiries, shortlisting and interviewing), supervision (including supervisor allocation) and monitoring across the school (actions 1.5.a/b). We plan a deeper analysis of PhD attainment by characteristic as well as interventions to prevent students from dropping out (action 1.5.c). We also plan a more detailed analysis of the race break-down of our PGR cohort by funding stream as the residency requirements of different funding schemes have a large impact on the PGR demographics (e.g. we have a number of Chinese Scholarship Council or Mexican CONACyT students) and could mask potential biases in our selections for other funded positions (action 1.5.d and figure 15).
**Principle 2: Appointment and selection processes and procedures that encourage men and women to apply for academic posts at all levels**

We require that all interview-panel members receive “Fair-selection and Interview-Skills Training” and strongly encourage all members of SPA to attend “Unconscious-Bias Training” (UB) every three years. Our in-house data shows that about 60% of staff have attended UB training in the last 3 years. We aim to increase this figure by lobbying QMUL for shorter accessible “refresher” UB workshops (action 2.1.b), and pushing for implementation of an automated-notification system to alert staff when this refresher is due1 (action 2.1.a). Looking into the future, as a result of sustained lobbying, QMUL is in the process of rolling out a centralised repository keeping track of all staff training. We will be switching our UB monitoring to this system once it is established and proven to be reliable.

Our recruitment practice includes embedded positive-action statements in job adverts, while job descriptions are checked for gender-specific language. Our academic/PS shortlists are currently checked for gender imbalances (against field-specific expectations) by the respective EDI group representatives/School Recruitment officer. We are working towards a uniform hiring practice among all groups through the development of a recruitment checklist and will lobby QMUL for that to form the basis for all recruitments across the Faculty (action 2.1.e). Once successful applicants arrive at the School, they attend a presentation introducing the work of the EDI committee (PGR/postdocs) or meet with the EDI chair (PS/academic staff) as part of the school-induction process.

At post-doc level, our female ratio drops below the national average (18% c.f. 20% from IoP benchmarking in 2016/17 - figure 1). Recruitment data shows that we interview and appoint a higher percentage of women compared to the percentage of female applications (figures 19, 20), indicating we need to focus on attracting more female applicants to post-doc positions (actions 2.2.a-d). The female ratio further decreases to 12% at academic level with only 6 women academics (1 at professor level). Again, we see, if anything, a positive bias to women in the recruitment process post application (figure 20), although our in-house monitoring actions have required short-listers to make assumptions about candidate genders; we are working with QMUL for a longer-term solution (action 2.4.a/b). We have doubled our female staff in the past 4 years with 2 women lecturers in the AU, following successful positive-recruitment action, and all remaining female academics in the PPRC. We plan consultation and further review of our staff-recruitment processes to attract more female applicants, with greater focus on the CRST and CCMMP groups (actions 2.3.a-d). This can include advertising the positions through all-female mailing lists, such as the "UK Women in Mathematics" (UKWIM)² in addition to the usual channels.

---

1 Such a system is already successfully running in the QMUL School of Mathematical Sciences.

2 Theoretical-physics groups in the UK fall under both Physics and Maths departments.
**Principle 3:** Departmental structures and systems which support and encourage the career progression and promotion of all staff and enable men and women to progress and continue in their careers

The HoS has continued to hold one-to-one meetings with all staff every autumn, while for postdocs these are conducted by the Heads of Group (HoGs). This practice has been carried out by two different HoS to date and, as the School has just appointed a new head, we are making sure that this activity is future-proofed by including it in the HoS job description (action 3.1.e).

The university conducts an annual appraisal scheme, in which the School is fully engaged (~100% appraisals initiated). However, completion rates vary widely (about 65% for men and 55% for women albeit with a very small sample for the latter) and only ~60% of staff find this exercise useful (2014, 2017 SPA surveys), either due to lack of personal chemistry with the appraiser (line manager) or issues with the purpose of the process as a whole. Some of the non-engagement may arise as a result of QMUL’s attempts to not over-specify the process, so as to avoid it being interpreted as performance management. We aim to increase appraisal engagement through a collection of initiatives prior to each round. First, we will further advertise the option of requesting an alternative appraiser (non-line manager) (action 3.1.a), as well as the availability of 1hr drop-in sessions titled “Making the most of your appraisal” offered by the QMUL Centre for Professional Development (CPD) (action 3.1.b). Second, we will use appraisal feedback to construct a best-practice checklist on how to use the process as a useful tool for career progression (action 3.1.b). Third, we will lobby the faculty to establish a firm connection between the appraisals scheme, career progression and the “Staff Bonus Scheme” (action 3.1.c).

The 2017 School survey indicated that staff satisfaction with the promotions framework is increasing. Academic staff can put themselves up for promotion on a yearly basis, through a process that involves a first round requiring the approval of a school committee and a second round involving a Faculty committee. The promotions guidance is available on the QMUL website and faculty-led workshops are available before the opening of each round. We are aiming for the HoS and HoGs to actively identify and encourage candidates to apply for promotion. Although feedback relating to the first round is informally, but successfully, given within the School, we will be lobbying for the Faculty to improve and formalise the feedback given to unsuccessful applicants (action 3.2.a). Our data does show a lower success rate for female and BAME applicants, although the samples are very small. We will keep monitoring these statistics in the future, as our female and BAME academic-staff numbers grow.

Despite many attempts, the School has been largely unsuccessful in establishing a formal in-house mentoring scheme, with poor take-up while the uptake of QMUL-wide mentoring schemes (e.g. B-Mentor, Aurora) has been erratic. We have therefore decided to change direction and, while keeping the formal-mentoring options open to interested staff, more actively promote the informal peer-to-peer mentoring that already takes place within the groups which, while unstructured, is usually successful. This broadening of mentoring activity is being achieved by collating best practice from all research areas into a mentoring checklist (action 3.3.a) and advertising this option through the staff-induction process, the one-to-one meetings with the HoS and the appraisals scheme (action 3.3.b).
The SPA continues to actively engage with SEPnet and GRADnet, as well as university careers services. We strongly encourage our PhD students and post-docs to attend courses targeting soft and computing/statistics skills that can be useful for employment outside academia. Fig 18 shows our PhD students have a high success rate with no evidence for a gender bias in the fraction completing within 4 years. We are working towards building an alumni network, which will allow us to monitor the destinations of our postgraduate and post-doc cohorts and review this data by gender and other protected characteristics (action 3.4.a).

**Principle 4:** Departmental organisation, structure, management arrangements and culture that are open, inclusive and transparent and encourage the participation of all staff

In our 2017 SPA staff survey the majority of respondents agreed with the positive culture statements, although gender and ethnicity were perceived to be the biggest issues in whether staff were treated on merit. Open discussions with students indicate race is more of a concern to our UG cohort although evidence shows we do not have a BAME attainment gap (figures 12, 13).

We continue to discuss EDI matters through staff forums, in all-staff meetings, emails (e.g. the HoS has recently sent a strong message on inclusivity and tolerance to the whole-school mailing list). One EDI member (currently the Deputy Chair) is appointed, on a yearly rotation to maintain and update the EDI webpages. Another member (currently the post-doc representative) is responsible for writing EDI updates, including advertising upcoming and recent events, to the School’s monthly newsletter, while our PGR representatives are responsible for including relevant EDI updates in the School twitter feed.

We adhere to a family-friendly “core hours” policy; all seminars, colloquia and School meetings should be held between 10am-4pm. Where meetings have been organised outside of core hours, members of the SEG have spoken to the Chair and Secretary to reiterate the policy and ensure that it is adhered to in the future. The School colloquium was moved from 4-5pm to 3-4pm, however this has had a negative impact on attendance. We will now be trialling the colloquium at a 1-2pm lunchtime slot and re-thinking how it is promoted within the School, with the aim to improve attendance.

We continue to run our Outreach activities in conjunction with SEPnet and the Ogden Trust, working with Schools to promote Physics as a viable subject for all students regardless of gender or ethnicity. Our Outreach Officer recently won a Public Engagement Involve Award for his MUSICS project as part of our Physics Research in School Environment programme.

We now have EDI protected-characteristics Champions who are points of contacts for staff and students, and help promote relevant support, resources or events (action 4.1.a). The School supports appropriate training for these new Champions. We plan to have at least two SPA staff attend the “Train the Trainer” CPD course, specifically on UB training (action 4.2.a). This should improve the number of staff and PhD Demonstrators receiving unconscious-bias training, overcoming issues due to the limited number of centrally-offered CPD courses.
In 2017 a group of BAME physics students, who were members of the De-Colonise-QMUL student society requested a discussion on issues relating to race. A long-table discussion was organised, open to all members of the School, with clear rules for open engagement, where people could take a turn sat at the table to have their say. Following this, members of the EDI committee and SEG met with the students and a number of actions were identified including adding relevant reference to BAME physicists in lectures. We also supported a student-organised exhibition on BAME scientists in the foyer of our building.

We recognise these long-table discussions as a ongoing positive action (action 4.1.b) and aim to share our practices beyond the School (action 4.1.c). We are working to embed inclusivity into our teaching (action 4.1.e) by including relevant diversity examples in our modules (where possible) and through extra-curricular activities (action 4.1.d). Our BAME student rep is creating a self-led QMPlus (the University’s virtual learning environment) module on BAME Physicists and their influences. We will gather examples of this work to ensure we can share best practice with other Schools within QMUL, SEPnet partners and eventually other universities (action 4.1.f/g).

We continue to run inclusive social activities, on which we will be gathering feedback (action 4.3.a-c). Following discussions with our BAME students we organised alcohol-free social events and worked with our student society, PsiStar, to do the same. This year the LGBT+ Champion organised a series of talks for LGBT history month, an the Gender Champion organised a lunch to celebrate International Women’s Day. We also hosted a second BAME long-table discussion. All of these activities were extensively advertised to staff and students, well attended and subsequently reported in the School newsletter. We plan to promote this work as positive action and share details with other Schools and student societies (action 4.3.d).

In our 2017 SPA staff survey, 86% of staff agreed that inappropriate images that stereotype people on the basis of their gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation and disability, are not acceptable in the School. We reviewed our website and publications to ensure the images represent the diversity (gender and ethnicity) of our department and are now reviewing the images on our QMPlus pages (action 4.4). We have also removed gender pronouns from titles on our website’s "People" page for PhD students, PS and technical staff. Professional titles (e.g. Dr, Prof.) remain.

Hosting female seminar speakers has been successful in the AU and PPRC groups (figures 28, 29) but more challenging for the CRST and CCMMP groups. We found some evidence of 'over-invitation' for UK female speakers, who were unable to accept our requests, and as a result we made a proportion of the EDI budget available to supplement the group-seminar budget allowing occasional invites for speakers across Europe. Going forward, we will prioritise the CRST and CCMMP for this facility and concentrate on sharing best practice across the research areas (action 4.5.a) to reach an average female speaker ratio of 25% across the School. One suggestion to highlight speaker diversity, that worked well for an LGBT+ event, was to invite all speakers to start their talks by introducing themselves and their career journey (action 4.5.b).

In our WLA model nominal hours are assigned to teaching, research and admin duties, which are recorded in the IT system SWARM and can be viewed by all academics to ensure
transparency. Policies for reduced workload such as the “returning from absence” policy and reduced workload for new starters are implemented through this framework. However, in our 2017 staff survey only 60% of respondents agreed the WLA was fair and correctly reflected their full workload, with women were more likely to actively disagree. As a result, a workload-allocation task force was created (action 4.6.a), consisting of volunteer SPA academics supported by the School Manager. The task force is surveying academics and will report their recommendations to the SEG in late summer 2019. Any revisions to the WLA will be gender tested (action 4.7.a) and the SEG will ensure that all staff are aware of the criteria used in the revised WLA (action 4.7.b).

Each research group has slightly different approaches to allocating PhD students to supervisors, but priority is generally given to new starters to ensure all academics have PhD students. The GDC is working on sharing guidance and best practice across the school (action 1.5.a).

**Principle 5: Flexible approaches and provisions that enable individuals, at all career and life stages, to optimise their contribution to their department, institution and to SET**

QMUL has clear and progressive policies related to flexible working and leave for caring responsibilities (maternity, paternity, adoption, shared parental leave, unpaid parental leave, and other compassionate leave). The university maintains extensive documentation detailing these policies on its HR website, and as a School we have ensured these are clearly linked both from the “Strategies, Policies & Guidance” section of our staff intranet pages, and the “Policy and Procedure Documentation” of our new headline “Equality” pages. QMUL policy is also currently being reviewed with a new “Ways of Working” (WOW) policy expected imminently at the time of writing. SPA EDI representatives have been actively involved in the consultation process for this document.

The School and HoS are supportive of flexible working, as evidenced by the 2017 staff survey with 73% of staff agreeing that managers were supportive of requests. Given the nature of academic work, informal flexible working is routinely accommodated, provided the school has mobile-phone contact with staff (inside core hours). To date, all academic requests for formal flexible working have been accepted, with two academics currently working part time. Figure 23 shows no evidence that part-time working affects promotion. Two members of the PS staff also work part time, with a number of others working non-standard hours (which must include core hours), for example a compressed lunch break or shifted day. The EDI committee have encouraged academics working part time to indicate their working hours in their email signatures (in line with PS staff), aiding normalisation and visibility of flexible working (action 5.1.c). It is standard practice to conduct an email consultation with teaching staff before timetables are finalised in an effort to accommodate any restrictions and flexible working.

In addition to the university policies on leave, the School runs and underwrites a “Maternity Plus” scheme, which will provide an academic on maternity or (extended) paternity leave with a PDRA to continue their research. This is also clearly advertised on our “Strategies, Policies & Guidance” and “Equality” pages. Further, when staff return from extended leave, it is the
School’s policy to reduce their teaching and administrative workload for a fixed period ("Returning from Long-term Absence" Policy).

Feedback from staff who have formal flexible working arrangements, which was reported to the WOW consultation (action 5.1.d), indicates the deadlines they are set are often unaccommodating. Moreover, the 2017 staff survey recorded disappointing levels of awareness of enabling policies, with only 37.5% aware of flexible working, 44% of career breaks and 42% of maternity plus. Hence, our actions focus on communication of our policies and associated expectations on staff: we are preparing comprehensive guidance for new starters, which will include information on all our enabling policies, and on our expectations, including scheduling meetings within core hours and accommodating colleagues with formal arrangements (action 5.1.a). Moreover, we are acting to ensure these are discussed as a matter of course at the annual one-to-one meetings and appraisals (action 5.1.b). We also continue to promote policies, activities and innovations, and to celebrate related events (such as births), in the monthly school newsletter (action 5.2), and continue to monitor staff awareness through the School survey.

**Principle 6: An environment where professional conduct is embedded into departmental culture and behaviour**

The QMUL “Dignity at Work” policy details the kind of work environment that the university is striving for, and the expectations it has on all staff and students to create it. This is an environment for work and study where bullying and harassment are not tolerated and where all members of the community are free from all forms of prejudice and discrimination. This overarching policy is supported by a number of initiatives and campaigns, including the recent “Zero Tolerance” campaign against bullying and harassment and the “Affinity at Work” report.

As a department we fully embrace QMUL policies and initiatives, and are working both to help shape them and their implementation at university level, and to embed them within our local culture. For example, EDI-committee representatives and members of our management team made contributions to the recent “Affinity at work” report, which is being further developed into the “Ways of Working” policy (actions 6.1.a/b). We have also ensured that the various QMUL campaigns and policy guidance are clearly referenced on our website Equalituy pages and have promoted them through emails from the HoS and at EDI events such as the forums and recent LGBT+ talks. When the “Zero Tolerance” campaign was launched, we dedicated a section of our School newsletter to detailing it and linking to related QMUL policy.

Unfortunately, responses from 2017 staff survey indicated that only 63% of staff feel that unsupportive language and behaviour are not accepted in SPA, and there are rare reported cases of unacceptable behaviour within the School. The HoS responds to such reports immediately, e.g. with emails repeating our obligations, reminding staff and students where they can report incidents and seek help (including our anonymous feedback system). We have also ensured these are clearly referenced on our web pages. The AU recently initiated a new visible code of conduct (displayed on the group’s notice board) which has since been modified for adoption by the whole School. This single-page code will be promoted and displayed prominently across the school and presented to faculty (action 6.1.c/d).
Glossary
For brevity a number of common abbreviations are used throughout this document, which are defined again here:

- AU - Astronomy Unit
- BAME - Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic
- CCMMP - Centre for Condensed Matter and Materials Physics
- CRST - Centre for Research in String Theory
- CPD - Centre for Professional Development
- EDI - Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
- GDC - Graduate Degrees Committee
- FPE - Full Person Equivalent
- HoG - Head of (research) Group
- HoS - Head of School
- HR - Human Resources
- LGBT+ - Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, +
- MO - Module Organiser
- PGR - Post Graduate Research
- PPRC - Particle Physics Research Centre
- PS - Professional Services
- QMUL - Queen Mary, University of London
- QMPlus - The QMUL virtual learning environment
- SEG - Senior executive Group
- SEPnet - South East Physics network
- SSLC - Staff Student Liaison Committee
- SPA - School of Physics and Astronomy
- SPO - Strategic Planning Office
- SWARM - Simple Workload Allocation and Resource Management
- TLC - Teaching and Learning Committee
- UB – Unconscious Bias
- UG – Undergraduate
- WLA - Workload Allocation
Data Appendix

Please note that data is now collated centrally through HR and the QMUL Strategic Planning Office (SPO) and distributed to the schools. This has been supplemented with data collected in-School. HESA benchmarking data collected up to 2016/17 was also supplied through QMUL central sources.

1) School Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Group</th>
<th>Per RG Total Male</th>
<th>Female Other</th>
<th>Total Male</th>
<th>Female Other</th>
<th>Total Male</th>
<th>Female Other</th>
<th>Total Male</th>
<th>Female Other</th>
<th>Total Male</th>
<th>Female Other</th>
<th>Total Male</th>
<th>Female Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCMPP</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRST</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPRC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade (all nationalities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>academics</th>
<th>researchers</th>
<th>PG students</th>
<th>professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPA % Female at grade</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IoP Benchmarking 2016-17 % female at grade</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: School Composition by gender and grade taken from the SPA school database as of 1/3/2019. Note that student numbers refer to all graduate students (including those who are writing up and waiting confirmation of their degrees). The second table compares QMUL female percentages at each grade to UK benchmarking data compiled by the IoP [email from Angela Townsend, 11/3/19] and show that our female ratio is below average for the UK at all grades above PhD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEPnet Partners</th>
<th>Female staff ratio (lecturers and readers)</th>
<th>Female staff percentage (lecturers and readers)</th>
<th>Female professors</th>
<th>Female UG ratio (2018-19 intake)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>15/70</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>5/22</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>26/58</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>2/20</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMUL</td>
<td>5/40</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHUL</td>
<td>4/30</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1/14</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>3/18</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2/19</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>8/21</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0/14</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>6/23</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4/23</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 Staff gender ratios for SEPnet partners at both lecture-reader level and at professor level. Also included in the final column are the female percentage in the 2018-19 first year undergraduate cohort. QMUL has the highest UG female ratio but one of the lowest academic female ratios. Due to the informal nature in which this data was collated (through the SEPnet Diversity mailing list) there is a variation in definition of who is included as staff (Physics, Physics and Maths, teaching fellows etc.) and also in how part-timers are accounted for. At QMUL there are a number of staff on part-time contracts, including 4 close to retirement on between 0.1-0.5 FTE who are counted as integers here.
2) Undergraduate Cohort Data

Figure 3 Undergraduate enrolment numbers to all cohort years by gender. The QMUL SPA female undergraduate percentage consistently exceeds the national average (obtained from HESA: 21% in 2013/14 to 23% in 2016/17). Absolute numbers of students have been increasing over time. FPE = full person equivalent.
The number of undergraduate students over all cohort years by ethnicity. The increase in student numbers is dominated by an increase in BAME students, with the most significant increase seen for Asian ethnicity. We have also examined intersectionality and see that the same trend is reflected in female-only data. The BAME percentage at QMUL is significantly larger than the national average for physics and astronomy obtained from HESA data (12% in 2012/13 to 14% in 2015/16).

Figure 4: The percentage of undergraduate students over all cohort years by ethnicity. Since 2014 there has been a clear trend in the increase in the BAME percentage, with the largest increase in the Asian percentage.

Figure 5: The number of undergraduate students over all cohort years by ethnicity. The increase in student numbers is dominated by an increase in BAME students, with the most significant increase seen for Asian ethnicity. We have also examined intersectionality and see that the same trend is reflected in female-only data. The BAME percentage at QMUL is significantly larger than the national average for physics and astronomy obtained from HESA data (12% in 2012/13 to 14% in 2015/16).
3) Foundation Year Cohort Data

Figure 6 Number and percentage of foundation students by gender. With the exception of 2013/14 the ratio of female students is generally equivalent or higher than that of the regular undergraduate cohort. The size of this cohort has been increasing over time although the statistics are fairly low. FPE = full person equivalent.
Figure 7 Percentage of Foundation year students by ethnicity. Since 2013, the fraction of BAME students has been increasing over time, and now dominates this cohort showing a similar trend to the undergraduate cohort. Note that there are very low statistics so fluctuations of individual minority ethnicity group numbers are not significant.
4) Undergraduate Recruitment Data

Figure 8 The percentage of applications, offers and acceptances to undergraduate courses (BSc and MSci) by year and gender with numbers of students overlaid. There is no evidence for a change in the male to female ratio across the recruitment cycle with similar ratios of women applying, receiving offers and accepting offers each year.
Figure 9 The percentage of applications, offers and acceptances to undergraduate courses (BSc and MSci) by year and ethnicity with numbers of students overlaid. Due to the way data is recorded during the recruitment process, the ethnicity of many students, who do not accept offers, is never known. This data has been omitted from the second plot but this makes it difficult to monitor for ethnicity bias in the process.
5) Undergraduate Attainment Data

Since 2013 there does not appear to be any clear bias in degree classification with gender with year-to-year fluctuations out-stripping any differences between male and female distribution of the 4 grades. In general, we see an increase in first class degrees awarded over time but it should be noted that the cohort was significantly smaller in 2012/13.

![Figure 10 Undergraduate degree attainment by gender. Since 2013 there does not appear to be any clear bias in degree classification with gender with year-to-year fluctuations out-stripping any differences between male and female distribution of the 4 grades. In general, we see an increase in first class degrees awarded over time but it should be noted that the cohort was significantly smaller in 2012/13.](image-url)
Figure 11 Undergraduate degree attainment by ethnicity. It appears that in 2013/14 there was a bias to white students obtaining higher grades, whilst other ethnicities, especially Asian were awarded more thirds, but this trend does not appear in subsequent years. It should be noted that enrolment data show that the ethnicity balance of the school was changing over this period (although that data relates to students incoming each year and this data relates to the students finishing each year) with the fraction of non-BAME students decreasing.
Figure 12 Cohort analysis showing student final outcome after 4 years for BAME and non-BAME students from three complete cohorts. This analysis was performed by Dr Diego Bunge, Research and Data Manager, QMUL, who found that SPA was the only school without a BAME attainment gap in the Faculty of Science and Engineering at QMUL and the only physics department in the UK without a BAME attainment gap.

Figure 13 Cohort analysis showing student final outcome after 4 years for different ethnicity groups from three complete cohorts. The differences between ethnicities do not seem to be statistically significant. This analysis was performed by Dr Diego Bunge, Research and Data Manager, QMUL.
6) Post-graduate Cohort Data

Figure 14 The PGR cohort composition by gender per year. The numbers include all active PGR students. We have seen a slight decrease in numbers for PhDs due to reduction in available funding, but the percentage of female students has stayed fairly constant and consistent with HESA benchmarking data, which gives the PGR female ratio in physics at 25% across the years 2014-2017. FPE = full person equivalent.
Figure 15 The PGR cohort composition by ethnicity per year. The numbers include all active PGR students. We have seen a slight decrease in numbers for PhDs due to reduction in available funding, but a consistent increase in BAME students over time. This is, in part, due to increased success in overseas funding opportunities, especially the Chinese Scholarship Council PhD scheme.
7) Post-graduate Recruitment Data

Figure 16 PGR Recruitment by gender per year. Since 2014 the percentage of offers to female students is greater than the percentage of applications from female students indicating that the minority gender is not unfairly biased during the recruitment cycle. Although there is fluctuation in the percentage of women accepting offers, it is not possible to draw firm conclusions from this due to the small numbers involved.
The percentage of applications, offers and acceptances to post-graduate research (PGR) courses by year and ethnicity with numbers of students in the table below. Note that the number of applications has been steadily increasing over time, although the number of positions available (acceptances) has remained fairly constant. The data is difficult to interpret due to residency and nationality requirements on the various funding sources for PhD placements. QMUL have an established agreement with the Chinese Scholarship Council (CSC) resulting in the successful recruitment of a number of Chinese PhD students each year and the UK research councils, which fund the bulk of our PhD cohort require UK residency.

8) Post-graduate Attainment Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female submitted</th>
<th>Female 4y</th>
<th>Male submitted</th>
<th>Male 4y</th>
<th>female %</th>
<th>male %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18 PGR students who submitted their theses within 4 years out of the total number who reached the 4-year deadline by start year. Note that for the 2015/16 cohort only a handful of students have reached the end of their funding or submitted so there is limited data. It appears that female students are slightly more successful than male students in completing on time but the statistics are not significant.
9) Staff Recruitment Data

Figure 19 Staff recruitment by gender across all career grades. There are large fluctuations in the percentages due to the small number of hires per year. The main observation is that in all years the percentage of women shortlisted exceeds the percentage of women applying, indicating that our positive actions to prevent biases in the shortlisting step have been successful. This has resulted in the percentage of women hired exceeding the percentage of female applications each year.

Figure 20 Cumulated recruitment data for the period 2013-18 by rank and gender. At the post-doc level we can see that the female percentage increases during the recruitment process from applications, through interviews (shortlist) to hires. The same increase from applications to shortlists is seen at the lecturer and senior lecturer/reader level although the female percentage of academic hires is lower.
Figure 21 Recruitment data by rank and ethnicity. This data has only been available since 2017 and suffers from low statistics but indicates there may be a trend in decreasing BAME ratio through the recruitment process from Applications to Interviews (shortlist) to Hires.
10) Staff Promotions and Appraisals Data

Figure 22 Staff Promotion data for the period 2012-2018 by gender and rank. The number of female applications is very small but in line with the ratio of female staff in the school (11% in 2019). There is an indication that female applications are less successful than male applications but this is not statistically significant and should be monitored going forward. It should be noted that applications could be from the same member of staff in different years.

Figure 23 Staff Promotion data for the period 2012-2018 for full and part time employees by gender. There is no evidence that being part-time affects the success rate of promotions applications, although the data is very statistically limited.
Figure 24 Promotions data for the period 2012-2018 by rank and ethnicity. The data indicate that there is a lower success rate for BAME applications than non-BAME applications, although again the statistics are very low.

Figure 25 Promotions data by ethnicity, now shown per year. It should be noted that applications in subsequent years could be from the same member of staff. These data indicate that it is important to review the promotions process for biases in race and to carefully monitor this data going forward.
Figure 26 Anonymised academic promotions data showing the time spent at Lecturer (blue - L), Senior Lecturer (orange - SL), Reader (grey - R) and Professor (yellow - P) since their start at QMUL in years. Data exist for a maximum of 25 years. Each current member of staff is indicated by a different number on the vertical axis. Of those successfully progressing to the next grade only, the average time spent as lecturer is 4.9 years, at senior lecturer is 1.2 years and at Reader grade is 6.6 years. Although gender is not explicitly shown here for confidentiality reasons, we can conclude that all women who have been employed at QMUL for more than 5 years have been promoted at least once and one of the two staff to progress from lecturer to professor within 10 years is a woman. Based on a data set of 2, the average time of women at lecturer level before successful promotion is above average at 6 years. Reflection on this data by the HoS provides a tool to identify those candidates who have been at their current grade above the average length of time and to consider if any biases have occurred and if further support would be beneficial. This data has not yet been assessed for biases in race but we plan to do so.
Figure 27 Fraction of people SPA staff members completing appraisals per year since 2015 with 90% confidence intervals. There is no significant difference between the male and female completion rate and the fraction completing is consistent over time.
11) Seminar Data

Figure 28 Seminar Speaker data (left - total invited speaker numbers per academic year, right - percentages) by gender for each of the four research groups. There is a large variation across the research areas but the AU shows a clear trend for increasing female percentage over time.
Figure 29 Comparison of female ratio of seminar speakers over time by research group. The school total is also shown in blue. The increase in the AU female speaker ratio is most significant and the largest contribution to the increase seen across the SPA as a whole. The PPRC speaker ratio also shows an increasing trend whilst the CRST and CCMMP ratios appear fairly constant with time and the lowest in the school.

12) School Survey

School surveys are run roughly every two years with the last conducted in 2017. The full analysis is available on request but the overviews of each section are included here:

Protected Characteristics

- In total 37 staff responded to the survey. This is comparable to the survey carried out in 2015 which had 33 respondents.
- Respondents were less likely than in 2015 to disclose all protected characteristics, with the lowest disclosure rate for religious beliefs (48%).
- Of those who identified, respondents were more likely to be younger and less likely to have caring responsibilities than in 2015.
- There was an increase in the response rate from BAME staff, and a small increase from female respondents.

Employment Characteristics

- The majority of staff (69%) where happy to disclose information about the nature of their employment with SPA (e.g. FTE, part-time, fixed term).
- Respondents were less comfortable identifying their current role within the school than in 2015, with 19% opting not to disclose as oppose to 7% in the last survey.
- In general, staff who disclosed where on permanent contracts working full time.
• Only 8% of respondents reported having flexible working arrangements or working from home options.
• The majority of respondents (2/3) have worked in SPA for 6 years or more.

Promotion

• Respondents were less likely to agree that they understood the promotions criteria than in 2015, and PS were less likely to agree than academics.
• Men were less likely than women to understand the promotions criteria, (50% and 40% respectively), and those who did not disclose gender were least likely to agree overall that they understood promotion criteria (70%).
• Respondents were less aware of where documentation relating to promotions criteria could be found than 2015.

Opportunities to Develop

• Over half of staff felt they were encouraged to collaborate both internally and externally.
• Respondents in 2017 felt more encouraged to take up career development opportunities than in 2015.
• 78% agreed that they had opportunities to meet with their line manager.
• Respondents felt that they had less networking and mentoring opportunities than in 2015.
• Clearer careers guidance was a continued theme from 2015 raised in free text responses.

Probation/Appraisal

• 30% of respondents did not find their annual appraisal ‘helpful’ and 22% felt that their probation/appraisal did not provide useful goals.
• Over half of respondents had not undertaken appraisal training.
• There was a 13% increase in the number of respondents who weren’t aware of where to find documentation supporting appraisals.
• Clearer guidance on promotion pathways was a continued theme from 2015 raised in free text responses.

Inclusivity

• The majority of those surveyed responded positively towards survey questions about SPA’s culture and actively agreed with positive culture statements, though there was reduction in positive response from 2015 survey.
• Men, and those who did not disclose their gender, were more likely than women to respond negatively to survey questions about SPA’s culture, with the exception of the response to the statement ‘SPA is a great place to work for staff who identify as women’, where female respondents were more likely to actively disagree.
• The majority of respondents agreed that staff in SPA were treated on their merits, irrespective of protected characteristics (between 68-70% for all characteristics).
• Gender and ethnicity were felt to be the biggest issue in whether staff were treated on their merits.
• Respondents who identified as white males were the most likely group to comment on the culture of the school via free text.
Workload Allocation

- The majority of respondents (~60%) agreed that workload was allocated on a fair basis, irrespective of protected characteristics.
- Women were more likely to actively disagree that workload was fairly allocated with respect to gender and ethnicity than men and those who did not disclose their gender.
- Knowledge of documentation supporting workload allocation decreased from 2015.

Equal Pay

- The majority of respondents (~55%) did not agree that staff in SPA are paid equal amounts for equal work with respect to protected characteristics.
- Gender and ethnicity were felt to be the most negative factors in receiving equal pay.
- Women and men were similarly likely to actively disagree that staff were paid equally for equal work with respect to gender, though men were more likely to feel neutrally.

Flexible Working

- The number of respondents who actively disagreed that staff who had flexible working arrangements have the same career development opportunities significantly increased from the 2015 survey, however the negative response was solely from staff who worked full time.
- 73% of respondents agreed that their line manager was supportive of requests for flexible working arrangements.
- Staff awareness of documentation relating to flexible working decreased by 26% from 2015.

EDI Training

- The number of staff who have completed Equality and Diversity and Unconscious Bias training remained roughly consistent from the 2015 survey.
- Appraisal training was the least completed training at 22%.

Communication of EDI Activities, Structures and Policies

- The majority of staff responded positively to questions regarding the communication of EDI activities and understood SPA’s reasons for taking positive action.
- There was a slight reduction (4%) in staff awareness of EDI Committee contacts and commitments from 2015, though the majority of staff knew who their committee members were and what SPA’s EDI commitments were.
- The majority of staff (between 64-73%) were aware that SPA has polices to support EDI activities and outlining the school’s organisational structure, though not necessarily where to find these policies.
QMUL SPA Action Plan for Juno Champion Renewal  (last updated 30/4/2019)
Actions related to Juno Principle 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective or Principle</th>
<th>Action already taken and outcome</th>
<th>Further Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Progress (P)/Success (S) Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Make EDI activities fully embedded and resilient to changes in management by ensuring reporting from the Equality Committee embedded in committee structures.</td>
<td>EDI chair meets monthly with HoS. EDI champions appointed and attend EDI committee meetings PS representative appointed to EDI committee UG representatives appointed to EDI committee 2017 staff survey showed 60% agreed that workload allocation was fair and 70% aware of EDI agenda.</td>
<td>1.1.a Review/Update/Provide all Committee Terms of Reference and incorporate EDI actions as appropriate. 1.1.b Provide EDI agenda items for each School committee and means of reporting between committees. 1.1.c Provide Descriptions / Terms of Reference for all Staff Roles in WLA model incorporating EDI actions as appropriate 1.1.d Formalise UG EDI representative positions with formal title and application process to cement importance of role</td>
<td>SEG</td>
<td>complete March 2019 (P) review March 2020 (S) complete July 2019 (P) review December 2020 (S) 2020 (P)</td>
<td>P1.1.a: Terms updated on website S1.1.a/b: EDI actions discussed and minuted for &gt;80% of committee meetings (Indico records) P1.1.c: Terms updated on website S1.1a-c: 2020 Staff survey shows &gt;80% of staff aware of EDI and understand workload model P1.1.d: Students engage with process and &gt;2 applicants per year for available positions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 To address the reducing female proportion of staff through post-doc and academic career stages. This 'Leaky Pipeline' is visible in the School data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2.a</th>
<th>Improve external and internal promotion of our supportive policies, support provided and actions taken to date.</th>
<th>PhD and Graduate EDI representatives, Web-page lead</th>
<th>review Dec 2020 (P)</th>
<th>P1.2.a: Increase in positive responses for support, development opportunities and feeling included from RAs in 2020 staff survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.2 Post-doc and graduate-student forums established to engage these cohorts and collect qualitative feedback. Meet termly. Anonymous feedback reported to SEG.

1.3 Maintain and improve our undergraduate female ratio, which is consistently above the national average (34% in 2018 intake).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3.a</th>
<th>Work with SEPNet partners to understand increase in female ratio across network - analyse cohort by other characteristics collated across SEPnet cohort to overcome issues with sparse data and review outreach activities.</th>
<th>Faculty EDI officer, EDI chair</th>
<th>QMUL report Septembe r 2019 (P) SEPNet review 2021 (P)</th>
<th>P1.3.a: Identified correlated factors across partners to inform best practise.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3.b</th>
<th>Share attendance/achievement data with students. Closer monitoring and feedback on attendance data.</th>
<th>Student EDI reps and student support officer</th>
<th>Mar 2021 (S)</th>
<th>S1.3.b: Male students match female students in attendance and achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.3 Ensure presence of female ambassadors and group female candidates at UCAS open days and interviews.

1.3.1 Work with SEPNet partners to understand increase in female ratio across network - analyse cohort by other characteristics collated across SEPnet cohort to overcome issues with sparse data and review outreach activities.

1.3.2 Share attendance/achievement data with students. Closer monitoring and feedback on attendance data.

1.3.3 Ensure presence of female ambassadors and group female candidates at UCAS open days and interviews.

1.3.4 Work with SEPNet partners to understand increase in female ratio across network - analyse cohort by other characteristics collated across SEPnet cohort to overcome issues with sparse data and review outreach activities.

1.3.5 Share attendance/achievement data with students. Closer monitoring and feedback on attendance data.

1.3.6 Ensure presence of female ambassadors and group female candidates at UCAS open days and interviews.
| 1.3.c | Collect and analyse more data on module and degree selection by gender and qualitative info from module feedback forms and SSLC. |
| 1.3.d | Discuss best practice and teaching modifications to make modules more attractive to women with MOs delivering theory options. |
| T&L Committee | Sep 2020 (P) |
| T&L Committee | Mar 2022 (S) |

**1.3.c** Report on factors affecting module selection circulated.

**1.3.d** Fraction of females selecting theoretical module options >20%

| 1.4 Address the high drop-out rates of undergraduates identified in 2017/18. |
| Implement improved performance monitoring, timely interventions by Student Support Officer. |
| 1.4.a Review drop-out by gender / diversity characteristic. Collect qualitative feedback from students. |
| 1.4.b Monitor take up of resources and Q-Review to see how we can make courses more accessible. |
| Student Support Officer | Sep 2019 (P) |
| Student Support Officer | Sep 2021 (S) |
| Student Support Officer | Sep 2022 (S) |

**1.4.a:** Qualitative data show we have positive effect on individual cases. **S1.4.a:** Drop out rate reduces.

**1.4.b:** Monitoring data show increase in engagement with online resources.

| 1.5 Understand and address fluctuations in postgraduate female ratios year-on-year and between different research groups | Academics involved in recruitment required to take fair selection interview training and unconscious bias training. |
| 1.5.a Standardise recruitment practice across research groups - prepare best practise document, standard responses to enquiries, interview forms, supervisor allocation etc. |
| GDC | Sep 2019 (P) |
| GDC | Sep 2020 (P) |
| GDC | Sep 2023 (S) |

**1.5.a:** Best practise guide produced. **P1.5.a:** Adoption of best practise across all groups. **S:** Gender ratio of PhD applications >35%
the national PGR average (25% in 2016-17, IoP benchmarking)] and ensure that existing students are fully supported to complete their theses on time [>80% of students complete within 4 years].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor training renewed every 3 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-monthly progress monitoring of all enrolled PhD students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development opportunities advertised to students, PhD forums.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD database established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study race break-down of PGR cohort and understand if there are biases apart from those dictated by available funding streams and residency requirements.</td>
<td>1.5.b GDC Sep 2020 (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P1.5.c: Decrease in PhD students dropping out or failing to complete on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase feedback/intervention rate to both students and supervisors (using online tools)</td>
<td>1.5.c GDC Sep 2020 (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P1.5.d: Data on conversions to PhD positions show no bias by gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed analysis of attainment by gender and other diversity characteristics.</td>
<td>1.5.d GDC Sep 2024 (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>S1.5: Increase in successful on-time PhD completion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S: BAME ratio UK-funded PhD places in line with UK average.
## Actions related to Juno Principle 2

| Objective or Principle | Action already taken and outcome | Further Action | Responsibility | Timescale | Progress (P:)/Success (S:)
|------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| 2.1 Address inconsistencies in hiring practices and expectations across positions and groups. | All staff who interview required to undertake Fair Selection and UB training (60% of staff have undertaken UB training in the last 3 years.) | 2.1.a. Maintain SPA database for staff and PhD student UB training and automate refresher notifications.  
2.1.b Lobby for creations of UB “refresher course” (shorter in duration). Lobby QMUL to store training details centrally. | School manager | 2021 (P) | P2.1.a/b: 70% staff and student demonstrators trained. |
<p>|                        | Positive-action statements in Job adverts and Job Descriptions is checked for gender-specific language. | 2.1.c Monitor all shortlists for gender imbalance before interviews. | EDI chair and deputy | 2024 (S) | S2.1.a/b: 85% staff trained. |
|                        | External panellists observed interview procedures for professional staff (1/10 interviews). | 2.1.d Work with new Faculty recruitment manager to extend this action to academic-staff. | Recruitment Officer | 2021 (S) | S2.1.c: Shortlists are gender-balanced according to subject area. |
|                        |                                      |                | Recruitment Officer | 2022 (P) | P2.1.d: Updated recruitment best-practice checklist. |
|                        |                                      |                |                | 2024 (S) | S2.1.d: Increase in number of female academic staff hired. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.e Engaged with external review of recruitment practices in April 2017 by external consultant WHEN Equality Ltd. Implemented school level recommendations.</td>
<td>2.1.e Feed back to Faculty to act on QMUL-level recommendations (e.g. providing faculty-wide resources on benefits, job templates).</td>
<td>EDI Chair and Deputy/School manager/Recruitment officer.</td>
<td>2022 (P)</td>
<td>P2.1.e: Faculty resources form basis for all recruitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Reduce the drop in female percentage from PhD to Post-doc level. [Our female post-doc percentage is 18%, below UK average (20% in 2016-17, IoP benchmarking data)].</td>
<td>We monitor recruitment short-lists and EDI training requirements in recruitment process. We found we interview and appoint a higher percentage of female postdocs than the percentage of female applications which indicates an improving trajectory.</td>
<td>2.2.a Review data on PhD graduate destinations by gender. 2.2.b Research leads to identify potential post-doc applicants from PhD pool. 2.2.c Keep in contact with unsuccessful applicants - fellowship opportunities etc. 2.2.d Share data on PDRA diversity with post-doc forum for discussion. What aspects of QMUL post-doc life should we promote / improve?</td>
<td>GDC  Group heads  Group heads and Recruitment officer  post-doc EDI rep</td>
<td>Mar 2022 (P)  Mar 2024 (S)  Sep 2021 (P)  Sep 2019 (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3 Increase our female academic ratio, which is currently 12%, below the national average (18% in 2016-17, IoP benchmarking data) with most women clustered in one research group (PPRC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.a</td>
<td>Consult SEPNet, IoP, other QMUL faculties and review advertisement and promotion of jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.b</td>
<td>Maintain contacts for unsuccessful applicants, review for future recruitment rounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.c</td>
<td>Identify and approach potential female fellowship applicants. Offer and provide assistance with applications (review and feedback).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.d</td>
<td>Investigate positive actions that could be applied to recruitment, especially in CRST and CCMMP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment officer</td>
<td>Mar 2024 (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment officer</td>
<td>2023 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Leads</td>
<td>2022 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG</td>
<td>2021(P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4 Improve the implementation of a formal policy to check the diversity of interview shortlists for all jobs, by addressing difficulties in establishing gender and ethnicity of candidates in a timely and anonymous fashion (i.e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.a</td>
<td>Work with Faculty to understand how this is approached in other schools. Then update best practice checklist.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty EDI Officer/School Manager</td>
<td>Sep 2019 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without requiring interviewers assuming the candidates' protected characteristics).</td>
<td>2.4.b Investigate if HR staff can carry out a gender/ethnicity check of shortlist prior to sending out interview invites. This will involve reporting development in our recruitment system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Actions related to Juno Principle 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective or Principle</th>
<th>Action already taken and outcome</th>
<th>Further Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Progress (P:/) /Success (S:) Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Improve the appraisals process</strong></td>
<td>Only 61% of staff indicate the appraisal process is useful to them (2014, 2017 staff surveys)</td>
<td>3.1.a Advertise option to request alternative appraiser (non-line-manager) prior to appraisal round</td>
<td>HoS</td>
<td>2020 (P)</td>
<td>P3.1.a: Monitor take-up of this option and positive feedback on appraisal from those that choose it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.b Prepare checklist of discussion points and guidance, to be circulated before appraisals. Message to focus on performance towards career progression</td>
<td>HoS</td>
<td>2021 (P)</td>
<td>P3.1.b: Use feedback to create checklist of discussion points and guidance. Monitor qualitative feedback and staff survey response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrange 15-minute session on the process in staff meetings prior to appraisal round and provide drop-in sessions to follow up with appraisal trainer</td>
<td>HoS</td>
<td>2024 (S)</td>
<td>S3.1.a/b: Achieve 90% of staff finding appraisals useful in staff survey. Keep track of related gender/BAME data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.c Initiate discussions with faculty about stronger links between appraisal and staff bonus scheme</td>
<td>HoS</td>
<td>2024 (S)</td>
<td>S3.1.c: Qualitative / quantitative evidence of success in staff bonuses and promotion in line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HoS to send email to academics encouraging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.1 Address issues in academic promotions and ensure fairness with respect to protected characteristics | Promotions committee identify candidates who should be encouraged to apply for upcoming promotions round | Review of appraisal objectives half-way between appraisal and promotion round.  
3.1.d HOS to send email to postdocs encouraging review of appraisal objectives half-way between appraisals  
3.1.e Write into HoS job description to embed and future-proof this practice | HoS, School Manager | 2024 (S)  
S3.1.d: Qualitative / quantitative evidence of successful care progression  
P3.1.e: All academics are engaged in process annually |
| 3.2 Address issues in academic promotions and ensure fairness with respect to protected characteristics | Promotions committee identify candidates who should be encouraged to apply for upcoming promotions round | An analysis of length of time at grade by gender indicates that women are being promoted at or above the average rate (based on low numbers)  
3.2.a Lobby faculty to improve and formalise feedback to unsuccessful promotion candidates. Lobby faculty to clearly define the “collegiality” area of contribution.  
3.2.b Promotions panel members to be named ahead of promotions submission  
3.2.c All candidates to be given feedback on applications before final submission | HoS, School Manager | 2022 (P)  
P3.2.a/b/c: Staff survey shows increase in satisfaction with promotions process  
S3.2.a/b/c: Success in staff bonuses and promotion in line with school demographics. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3 Improve uptake of mentoring schemes</th>
<th>We already promote and engage with specific QMUL mentoring schemes (e.g. Aurora, BMEntor; 2-3 people involved per round)</th>
<th>3.3.a Promote informal mentoring and collate evidence of successful examples (e.g. on EDI website)</th>
<th>EDI Chair/Deputy</th>
<th>2022 (P)</th>
<th>P3.3.a/b: Raise awareness to 80% in staff survey (including options for both formal/informal avenues) and monitor uptake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.b Promote examples of best practice and work to establish culture of informal peer-mentoring. Tie into HoS 1-2-1 meetings, appraisals (via checklist) and induction process</td>
<td>HoS</td>
<td>2024 (S)</td>
<td>S3.3.a/b: Quantitative evidence of success in staff bonuses and promotion in line with school demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Offer better careers guidance</td>
<td>We engage with SEPnet and University careers services for PhDs and postdocs Alumni who work outside academia invited to give talks and colloquia (e.g. recent data-science talks)</td>
<td>3.4.a Prepare data-base to keep track of destinations of PhDs and postdocs. Maintain contacts and review this data by gender 3.4.b Educate line managers to improve uptake of Exit Interviews. Analyse data by gender 3.4.c Statistics and examples of onward careers promoted on SPA websites</td>
<td>PGR Programmes Officer/School Manager Recruitment Officer HoGs</td>
<td>2022 (P) 2024 (S)</td>
<td>P3.4.a: Resource is used to promote career opportunities and to source speakers S3.4.b/c: Monitor data for evidence of gender bias in onward career progression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Actions related to Juno Principle 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective or Principle</th>
<th>Action already taken and outcome</th>
<th>Further Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Progress(P:)/Success(S:) Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1. Ensure our processes and procedures are fully inclusive</td>
<td>Discussing EDI through Forums, staff meetings, Emails, webpage. School colloquia moved to core hours. Committee Chairs and secretaries reminded to keep meetings in core hours. EDI related questions included in our staff surveys to gain feedback on diversity and inclusivity in the School. Initial long-table discussions on race issues led to a number of inclusive actions (e.g. additions to curriculum, non-alcohol social events, exhibitions and talks on BAME role models). Strong message on inclusivity and tolerance sent to whole-school mailing list. Message underlined by delivering a session on LGBT science</td>
<td>4.1.1a Role models: EDI champions - promote and expand presence on webpages. Organise events to celebrate different characteristics hosted by champions. 4.1.1b Establish termly long-table discussions on EDI issues 4.1.1c Share best practise on EDI long-table across QMUL and SEPNet 4.1.1d Embed more inclusive examples in curriculum and extra-curriculum activities. TLC Education Development sub group discuss and ensure best practice is shared across all module organisers (MO).</td>
<td>Deputy EDI Chair/ EDI Champions</td>
<td>2019 (P)</td>
<td>P4.1.1a: EDI champions feed back to EDI committee on issues raised with them. 2021 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks during LGBT History month as one of many cross-campus activities, including wearing of rainbow lanyards by many staff as a visible demonstration of support for LGBT awareness.</td>
<td>4.1.1e</td>
<td>Incorporate inclusivity into the annual review process. Inclusivity in modules to be discussed in academic annual review meetings with Director of Education and Head of School.</td>
<td>DoE, HoS, MOs</td>
<td>2022 (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1f</td>
<td>TSSM to gather examples of inclusive curriculum following academic review days and June TLC meetings. Work with the SPA Director of Education, S&amp;E Dean for Education and S&amp;E Faculty Education Manager on how to best share this across Faculty and wider university.</td>
<td>Teaching and Student Support Manager (TSSM), DoE</td>
<td>2024 (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1g</td>
<td>Develop resources from our inclusive curriculum so that it can be shared outside SPA. (lecture recordings, materials - investigate funding sources)</td>
<td>Teaching and Student Support Manager (TSSM), DoE</td>
<td>2026 (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.4.1.1e: The annual review report will be submitted to TLC and Faculty Dean for Education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S1.1.1a-e: 80% of staff and students respond that they feel SPA is an open and inclusive place to work/study in school surveys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P4.1.1f: Report submitted to the TLC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S4.1.1f-g: Resources used by &gt;3 external institutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.1.2 Embed unconscious bias training within the School | See action 2.1. | 4.1.2a
Staff members in SPA to attend Train the Trainer course, and then provide unconscious bias training to SPA staff and PhD Demonstrators. | School manager | 2019 (P) | P4.1.2a: At least 2 SPA staff trained to provide UB training
2024 (S) | S4.1.2a: 90% of staff and PhD Demonstrators trained |
| 4.1.3 Ensure social events are inclusive | Effort to include non-alcohol events on social calendar.
Psi-star on board and series of well attended events in progress
Women's lunches established for staff to provide network, support and feedback mechanisms. | 4.1.3.a Collect feedback on changes to social events from student and staff cohorts. For students this can be via PSiStar facebook survey, SSLC etc | School manager | 2021 (P) | P4.1.3a: 60% staff and students report in surveys that they feel SPA events are inclusive
2024 (S) | P4.1.3.b: Increasing attendance at themed events |
<p>|  | 4.1.3.b Arrange diversity / characteristic themed events | EDI committee /PSiStar President | 2021 (P) | P4.1.3.b: Increasing attendance at themed events |
|  | 4.1.3c Extend lunches to include undergraduates. Arrange topics / discussion points for each meeting. | Gender champion, EDI secretary | 2024 (S) | S4.1.3c-d: SPA positive action examples adopted in other schools/organisations |
|  | 4.1.3.d Promote this as a positive action. Share details of successful events with other societies in student union. | Student Support Officer/PSiStar President | 2024 (S) | S4.1.3: 80% staff and students report in surveys that they feel SPA events are inclusive |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1.4 Ensure inclusive images are used in internal and external communications</th>
<th>Reviewed website and publications to ensure images represent the diversity (gender and ethnicity) in our department.</th>
<th>4.1.4 Review images on QMPlus pages (QMUL’s virtual learning environment)</th>
<th>Learning Technologist and Web/Computing Support Officer</th>
<th>July 2019</th>
<th>P4.1.4 Images on QMPlus show diversity of SPA. 2021 (S)</th>
<th>S4.1.4 95% of staff survey respondents agree that inappropriate images that stereotype people are not acceptable in SPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.5 Encourage and support female seminar speakers</td>
<td>Targets set for Group Seminars and School Colloquia to ensure diversity of invited speakers as role models. Additional funding made available for diverse speaker support.</td>
<td>4.1.5a Prioritize CCMMP and CRST groups to improve their speaker ratios. Share best practise across research groups 4.1.5b Invite the speakers to start their talks with a slide introducing themselves and their career journey.</td>
<td>Gender champion, Seminar organisers</td>
<td>review June 2021 (P)</td>
<td>P4.1.5a-b: Positive feedback on diversity awareness from seminar audiences.</td>
<td>S4.1.5: &gt;25% female speaker ratio achieved (school total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Ensure our workload-allocation model is transparent</td>
<td>Work-load allocation task-force established to review our workload-allocation model to ensure it is fair and transparent. EDI committee member included on the task-force.</td>
<td>4.2 a Task-force to carry out a survey of all academic staff before end of academic year 18/19. They will review the results and make recommendations to Senior Executive Group (SEG).</td>
<td>SEG</td>
<td>July 2019 (P)</td>
<td>P4.2 a: Task-force report submitted to SEG by end of academic year. Reasonable recommendations implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Workload allocation model system SWARM is used. Academics can be view their and their colleagues workload via the system. | 4.2.b  
Following the workload model review, the model (and any revisions) will be gender tested. | SEG/EDI Chair | 2019 (P) | P4.2.b/c: SEG report to the EDI committee on the outcome of the workload model review and gender test. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4.2.c  
The SEG to communicate the outcome of the workload model review, which recommendations will be implemented and that it has been gender tested. Explanation of the workload model to be included on the SPA staff intranet page. | SEG | 2021 (S) | S4.2: 80% of staff survey respondents state they feel the work-load allocation is fair. |
## Actions related to Juno Principle 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective or Principle</th>
<th>Action already taken and outcome</th>
<th>Further Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Progress (P:)/Success (S:) Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1 Increase staff awareness of flexible-working options and ensure that the School culture is supportive of flexible working. Specifically, to improve on the 2017 staff survey awareness level of 37.5% and to address feedback from formal flexible staff which indicates that some deadlines are unaccommodating, and expectations need to be reasonable.</strong></td>
<td>Links to enabling policies (including flexible working) added to SPA website and references in staff induction pack. Request for formal flexible working accepted by the school with a small number of academics working condensed hours. Many staff work informal flexible hours and from home on a regular basis. The majority of staff (73%) in 2017 agreed that line managers were supportive of flexible working requests (formal and informal).</td>
<td>5.1.a Prepare guidance for new starters on reasonable expectations, including scheduling meetings within core hours and accommodating colleagues with formal arrangements. 5.1.b Promote formal flexible working requests to staff to raise awareness (e.g. at appraisals and 1-2-1 meetings). 5.1.c Staff with formal arrangements to include dates in the office/out of office in email signature. 5.1.d Feedback into ‘Ways of Working’ (WOW) policy that &quot;last minute culture&quot; impacts flexible workers more, and sufficient working hours are required to respond to requests.</td>
<td>EDI Committee</td>
<td>Summer 2019 (P) Review after one year (P)</td>
<td>P5.1.a: Positive feedback from new starters on benefits and policies supporting work/life balance. P5.1.a/b: WOW policy communicated and implemented in school. P5.1: Qualitative data showing positive working culture from staff who work flexibly. S5.1: 2020 survey to show an increase positive attitudes to flexible working.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.2 Increase staff awareness of other enabling policies including career breaks and maternity plus (the 2017 staff survey indicated an awareness level of 44% for career breaks and 42% for maternity plus, with a decrease since 2015).

| Links to enabling policies added to SPA website and references in staff induction pack. | 5.2 Promote policies through school newsletters, 1-2-1 meetings and committee EDI agenda items. | Line managers / SEG/ Committee chairs | 2019 | P5.2: Increase in click-through on website/policy downloads.  
P5.2: Increase in staff awareness of enabling policies (staff survey 2020).  
S5.2: Increase staff uptake on these policies, e.g. uptake in flexible working. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
## Actions related to Juno Principle 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective or Principle</th>
<th>Action already taken and outcome</th>
<th>Further Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Progress (P:)/Success (S:) Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.1 Ensure all staff are aware of their expected professional conduct, and create an environment free from harassment of any kind. To improve on the 63% of staff who agreed that unsupportive language and behaviour are not accepted in SPA in the 2017 staff survey. | SPA contributed to the research for the university-wide ‘Affinity at Work’ report. The report is being developed into the new ‘Ways of Working’ policy, outlining guidance on expected standards of behaviour. Promoted university policies on expected behaviours and reporting through school bulletin:  
  - Dignity at Work policy (bullying & harassment with respect to protected characteristics)  
  - Relationships policy (expectations if you start a relationship with other QMUL members)  
  - Zero Tolerance (student union policy)  
  - Student Code of Conduct  
  Code of conduct implemented in AU group. | 6.1.a  
Support the implementation of QMUL’s ‘Ways of Working’ policy by communicating the policy to staff and line managers and add to New Starter packs.  
6.1.b  
Promotion of these documents on SPA website and through emails/newsletter, and to specific groups, e.g. Student Code of Conduct to student-facing staff.  
6.1.c  
Code of Conduct developed for whole of SPA  
6.1.d  
Present code to Faculty with view to getting a standard code of conduct implemented across QMUL. | Line managers/HOS/  
School Manager  
EDI Committee  
School Manager  
Faculty EDI reps | Summer 2019 (P)  
Review annually (P)  
2019 (P)  
September 2019 (P)  
2020 (S) | P6.1.a/b: Increased click through/downloads from website.  
P6.1.c: Code of conduct implemented in all research groups.  
S6.1: Significant increase in percentage of positive survey responses in 2020, including qualitative responses from staff on workplace culture. |
6.2 Ensure all incidents of misconduct are identified and dealt with in an appropriate manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email sent to whole school to remind staff of obligations and detailing all points of contact for each cohort within the SPA. Complaints are raised on a number of diversity issues through anonymous feedback, our forums and long table discussions, and directly to student support officer indicating that students are comfortable to voice their concerns. When complaints have arisen (e.g. regarding homophobic comments by students) these have been addressed promptly from a senior level, and publicly if appropriate. (In the case mentioned a SPA-wide email was sent from HOS and an event was organised for LGBT history month to promote champion role and SPA support).</td>
<td>School Manager/DI Team</td>
<td>September 2020 for pilot (P)</td>
<td>Ongoing (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.a Work with central Diversity and Inclusion Team to pilot dignity disclosure reporting tool.</td>
<td>SEG/School Manager</td>
<td>From 2019 (P)</td>
<td>P6.2.a: Pilot scheme completed and review of process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.b Seek advice from other schools and faculty on best practice to address complaints</td>
<td>EDI Champions/ EDI chair/Heads of groups/Chairs of committees</td>
<td></td>
<td>P6.2.c: Reports from Champions/group leads about instances of misconduct within committees/groups and data from reporting tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.c EDI Champions and group leads to raise awareness of incidents of misconduct at school committees/research groups and outline zero tolerance approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S6.2: Decrease in number of reported incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S6.2: Statements from staff about improved working culture/reporting system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S6.2: Improvements in 2020 staff survey responses around workplace culture and increased staff awareness of how to report incidents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 July 2019

Professor David Arrowsmith
Head of School of Physics and Astronomy
Queen Mary University of London
London
E1 4NS

Dear David

**Juno Champion Renewal**

Thank you for submitting your paperwork to the Juno Assessment Panel for your Juno Champion renewal.

We are delighted to inform you that the Panel has agreed to renew your Juno Champion status for a further four years as they were satisfied that the school has consolidated your commitment to E&D in a number of areas, expanding the remit of the E&D work beyond gender and addressing the issues of race and ethnicity. There was a detailed action plan with timescale spread over several years and devolved responsibilities. Where actions have not worked, you have been sufficiently agile to change tack and you have demonstrated that work is future-proof, given the long handover period with clear documentation to the new head.

The panel particularly commended the following activities:

- The detailed analysis of data to understand any discrepancies in degree attainment, dropout rates, etc. not just by gender but also other characteristics.
- The new web pages illustrating the committee members and their roles along with links to events, meetings, relevant documentation and policies.
- The school database on training information, mentor allocations, etc. that are not normally kept centrally.
- Inclusivity is being embedded into teaching by including relevant diversity examples in modules (where possible) and through extra-curricular activities.
- The “Maternity Plus” scheme, providing an academic on maternity or (extended) paternity leave with a PDRA to continue their research.

However, the panel had a number of ongoing concerns, based on feedback already given to you during your journey to Champion and Champion renewal. While progress has been made since the initial Champion award, it was not clear what issues identified during the Champion renewal visit have been specifically addressed:

- There continues to be poor appraisal take up and satisfaction with the process and we would expect you to be proactively addressing this issue.
- There does not seem to be actions in place to address consistency of practice across the different groups in the school.
- While there are bullying and harassment policies in place, communication and awareness of reporting options was not clear.
We have set out below our feedback against each principle, highlighting where we commend your progress and the issues that you must address as you work towards your next Champion renewal. We will expect to see progress towards these issues in your Champion renewal visit in three years’ time and in your subsequent Champion renewal application.

Principle 1: A robust organisational framework to deliver equality of opportunity and reward.

**Issues to be commended:**
- The organisational framework appears excellent with a comprehensive committee structure, two-way reporting and representation for EDI activities. Juno has morphed into wider EDI, is included in all committee terms of reference and is a standing agenda item. There is a project to embed EDI in future job roles, which is excellent practice.
- The appointment of four EDI champions for Gender, Race, LGBT+ and Disability will allow each to focus on one aspect of equality. There is work allocation for EDI activities and EDI roles are embedded into SPA committees.
- There was detailed analysis of data to understand any discrepancies in degree attainment, drop-out rates, etc. not just by gender but also including other characteristics. The analysis of gender ratios broken down amongst the four fields has helped identify the strong deficit of women in theory (and in condensed matter). This is a good first step to improving the gender balance, particularly for PDRAs and PGR students and is potentially working towards a beacon activity.

**Issues to be addressed:**
- Running a SPA survey and a QMUL staff survey across different characteristics may lead to survey fatigue. You could focus on the key, most impactful areas and build a stronger annual focus on one or two of the identified characteristics.
- More work is needed to understand the high dropout rates of undergraduates.
- There is a discrepancy with PhD, post doc and academic ratios (in general and across groups) which needs to be addressed as a priority going forward.

Principle 2: Appointment, promotion and selection processes and procedures that encourage men and women to apply for academic posts at all levels.

**Issues to be commended:**
- External panellists observed the interview procedures for professional staff (1/10 interviews) and this is being extended to academic panels.
- There is embedded monitoring of take-up of EDI training in place and this will be rolled out centrally across QMUL. There will be an automated system to alert staff when they need a refresher course.
- EDI is now embedded in induction.
- A number of actions have been taken to improve recruitment processes including language in adverts, targeted advertising, shortlists checked for gender imbalances and these are having an impact. In particular, the number of women academics in astronomy has doubled.
Issues to be addressed:

- There is work to be done to set up a uniform recruitment process across the school.
- While all interview-panel members receive “Fair-selection and Interview-Skills Training”, they are only strongly encouraged to attend “Unconscious-Bias Training” every three years, and uptake is only at 60%. You should work towards making this mandatory at least for interview chairs and ultimately rolled out to all panellists.
- You have identified that you need to attract more women to apply for postdoc positions and you should look to develop more ambitious actions to improve the environment for postdocs across the whole school.

Principle 3: Departmental structures and systems which support and encourage the career progression of all staff and enable men and women to progress and continue in their careers.

Issues to be commended:

- Starting to destination track PGR and PDRAs after they have left is to be commended as your alumni are your best ambassadors.
- The head of school has one-to-one meetings with all academic staff, which demonstrates a tangible commitment to equality. This is being embedded into the HoS job description.
- Lobbying the university to get better feedback for unsuccessful promotion candidates is good practice but this should become an embedded part of institutional Athena SWAN activities.

Issues to be addressed:

- The appraisal scheme continues to have poor take-up, even with one-to-one meetings with the HoS / HoGs. Only 60% of staff report finding the appraisal process useful and this needs addressing as a priority. Making the one-to-one meetings an opt-out rather than opt-in may help combat imposter syndrome as might linking the scheme to the bonus scheme and to career development.
- The lower success rate of promotion for BAME and women applicants is a serious concern. The staff survey suggests a lack of understanding of the promotion criteria and there should be clear actions on how to address this.
- Improving the promotions process so that it does not rely on staff nominating themselves would increase fairness and transparency.

Principle 4: Departmental organisation, structure, management arrangements and culture that are open, inclusive and transparent and encourage the participation of all staff.

Issues to be commended:

- There is evidence from the staff survey that EDI is embedded across the whole school culture with EDI Champions, gender pronouns being removed from the website, train the trainer courses, engagement with de-colonisation discussions and alcohol-free social events. This is all commendable practice.
- The budget to invite female speakers from abroad to encourage speakers is excellent practice. Have you consider inviting female speakers from industry?
Informal peer-to-peer mentoring schemes are in place after low take-up of formal mentoring.

The workload model has been perceived as unfair and a taskforce has been set up to review this.

**Principle 5: Flexible approaches and provisions that enable individuals, at all career and life stages, to maximise their contribution to their department, institution and SET**

**Issues to be commended:**
- Flexible working is embedded and there are excellent polices in place, with work on-going to communicate these.
- Staff are consulted about flexible working arrangements before teaching timetable is formalised.
- The Maternity-Plus scheme for an academic to have a PDRA to continue their research during leave is excellent practice. There is a year of reduced teaching and admin load after returning to work from a career break.

**Issues to be addressed:**
- Despite having generous and well-thought through schemes, a substantial number of staff do not know about them. This could be the focus of a campaign (e.g. Did You Know posters, postcards etc; case studies on website).

**Principle 6: An environment where professional conduct is embedded into departmental culture and behaviour.**

**Issues to be commended:**
- There are university policies in place with evidence of clear top-down support and implementation, following the introduction of a zero tolerance policy and Dignity at Work policy across QMUL.
- The AU group’s code of conduct is now used across School.

**Issues to be addressed:**
- You should be tracking the number of cases of bullying and harassment, both informal and formal, and staff perceptions of the incidence fraction.
- Robust processes need to be in place, and well advertised as to what they are, at least when formal complaints are made.
- Although the management and committee have embraced the university policy, there is evidence that this has not been communicated to obtain buy-in across all staff and students. This should be via discussion forums, induction seminars, training, emphasis during one-to-ones etc. This could be a focus area going forward.
- You should identify training for school staff, either anti-bullying & harassment, or responsible bystander training particularly as only 63% of staff thought (2017 survey) that unsupportive language was unacceptable – this needs further exploration and actions in place to address this.
Action plan

The objective of the Champion action plan is to demonstrate progress and put in place further actions to enable you to work towards a further Champion renewal in four years’ time, Juno Excellence and/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. You should consider developing some longer-term actions to ensure ambition and stretch to address the feedback given for your next Champion renewal and further Athena SWAN awards.

You should also be considering possible Juno Excellence activities such as your data work on women in theoretical physics and the work to extend your EDI activities to BAME students and staff.

We will contact you with details of your next renewal visit (due 2022) in due course. We wish you every success as you work to further implement activities in your department.

With very best wishes,
Yours sincerely

Professor Nicola Wilkin
Chair, Juno Assessment Panel
n.k.wilkin@bham.ac.uk