Athena SWAN Bronze and Silver Department award application

Name of institution: London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

Date of application: 30\textsuperscript{th} November, 2012

Department: Faculty of Public Health and Policy

Contact for application: Dr Lucy Platt

Email: lucy.platt@lshtm.ac.uk Telephone: 0207 958 8156

School Athena SWAN Co-ordinator: Hilary Lowe

Email: Hilary.Lowe@lshtm.ac.uk

Departmental website address: http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/php/

Date of university Bronze SWAN award: 30\textsuperscript{th} March, 2012

Level of award applied for: Silver

Athena SWAN Bronze and Silver Department awards recognise that in addition to university-wide policies the department is working to promote gender equality and to address challenges particular to the discipline.

Not all institutions use the term ‘department’ and there are many equivalent academic groupings with different names, sizes and compositions. The definition of a ‘department’ for SWAN purposes can be found on the Athena SWAN website. If in doubt, contact the Athena SWAN Charter Coordinator well in advance to check eligibility.

It is essential that the contact person for the application is based in the department.

At the end of each section state the number of words used.

Click here for additional guidance on completing this template.

1. Letter of endorsement from the Head of Department – maximum 500 words

A letter from dean of faculty is enclosed.
2. The self-assessment process – maximum 1000 words
Describe the Self-Assessment Process. This should include:

a) A description of the self assessment team: members’ roles (both within the department and as part of the team) and their experiences of work-life balance an account of the self assessment process: details of the self assessment team meetings, including any consultation with staff or individuals outside of the university, and how these have fed into the submission;

The team met 4 times during the course of 2012. The first meeting was held on 20th March. Team members who had participated in the Bronze application (HL and LP) described the background to the award and their experience in preparing the Bronze application. We discussed whether the composition of the team represented the faculty in terms of gender, grade and experience of maternity/paternity leave and flexible working. We agreed to invite AM, CW and PW to increase representation of senior staff and mid level male staff. Tasks were allocated across the team members in terms of analysing the data, producing graphs and reviewing faculty policies. We agreed a timetable and schedule for meetings.

The second meeting was held on July 25th. During this meeting, we reviewed a first draft of completed sections and some preliminary data analysis in order to interpret the data and to assess what further analysis or information was needed to gain a full picture of the relevant policies and how they work and are experienced on the ground. Some problems were identified with data, including how to define staff turnover rates and how to allocate MScs, some of which operate across faculties. The importance of using standardised definitions of turnover rates and student data used in the report was discussed in order to facilitate comparison across the three faculties. We also discussed the best way of comparing PHP’s practices and standards against national benchmarks. It was agreed to discuss these issues further at the school-level Athena SWAN group.

The third meeting took place on September 24th. A completed draft of the report was circulated prior to the meeting and the time was spent interpreting the data, reviewing the findings, agreeing an action plan and discussing the presentation. Remaining tasks were allocated across the group. It was decided to speak to a selection of staff to gain some further insight into how policies affect staff in their day to day working life.

The final meeting took place on October 30th and the report and action plan was agreed. Both were presented and discussed at the Faculty Management Group on November 7th ensuring that all Heads of Departments could contribute to the report and sign up to the action plan.

In addition there were two meetings, on 17 April and 30 July of the Athena SWAN Leaders in all faculties to consider progress, issues and data. The Faculty coordinators remained in constant email contact, exchanging drafts to ensure that findings could be compared across faculties.
Table 1 summarises a brief description of the assessment team, their position and role in the completion of the application. Biographies of self-assessment team members are provided in Appendix 1.
b) Plans for the future of the self assessment team, such as how often the team will continue to meet, any reporting mechanisms and in particular how the self assessment team intends to monitor implementation of the action plan.

The team will meet at least three times a year, to examine the relevant annual statistics in order to monitor the action points implementation, to discuss perceptions of satisfaction, issues that may raise from this, and strategies for the future, and once to prepare the annual report. They will meet at other occasions if necessary, to deal with unexpected relevant developments. Representatives from the team will present their report to the Faculty Management Group following each of these meetings. Reports will be placed on the Faculty’s intranet.

[945 words]

3. A picture of the department – maximum 2000 words

a) Provide a pen-picture of the department to set the context for the application, outlining in particular any significant and relevant features.

The London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine is a world-leading centre for research and postgraduate education in public and global health, with 4000 students and more than 1300 staff working in over 100 countries. The School is one of the highest-rated research institutions in the UK, did extremely well in the RAE, and was recently cited as one of the world’s top universities for collaborative research. The research intense culture in the school also means that most staff are funded on short-term research grants rather than on core funded posts. Our mission is to improve health and health equity in the UK and worldwide; working in partnership to achieve excellence in public and global health research, education and translation of knowledge into policy and practice. The School is part of the University of London, and has research funding of over £60 million per annum from national and international sources including RCUK, the UK government, the European Commission, the Wellcome Trust and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The School’s multidisciplinary expertise includes, among others, clinicians, epidemiologists, social scientists, statisticians, molecular biologists and immunologists. We work with our partners worldwide to support the development of teaching and research capacity, and our alumni work in more than 180 countries. The school was awarded Athena Bronze status in 2012.

The Faculty of Public Health and Policy is one of the three Faculties of the School. Its mission is “to contribute to the improvement of health and health systems globally through research, teaching and policy and public engagement in the areas of health policy, health systems and services, and the individual, social and environmental influences on health.”

The Faculty is the largest multi-disciplinary public health group in Europe, with a total of over 250 staff including epidemiologists, public health physicians, economists, policy analysts, anthropologists, sociologists, historians,
psychologists, statisticians and mathematicians, of whom some 70% overall are female, and comprising more than 50 nationalities. The Faculty currently (as of November 2012) has a staff of 22 professors, 3 readers, 30 senior lecturers, 64 lecturers, 103 research fellows and assistants, about 35 computing, administrative and secretarial staff, and a number of honorary staff, with gender breakdown in the sections below (Figure 3b-vii).

The Faculty's research programmes, with an annual spend of over £8m, focus on public health problems of importance both globally and in the UK, and build on an extensive network of collaborations across more than 100 countries, most of which are with institutions in low- and middle-income countries. The research programmes exploit multidisciplinary and multi-method approaches, generate new knowledge for specific contexts and test transferability to different settings, and engage with policymakers and providers of health care to ensure research is relevant and translated into practice. In the last RAE in 2008, staff from the Faculty were included in two units of assessment, Health Services Research and Epidemiology and Public, with feedback commenting that: the Faculty had attracted and retained a very productive body of staff; that there was a strong and vibrant research culture; and noted the breadth of the research, its multi-disciplinary and global reach, and its contributions to policy and practice.

The Faculty comprises three departments:
- Global Health and Development (Head, Dr Kara Hanson)
- Health Services Research and Policy (Head, Prof Jan VanderMuellen)
- Social and Environmental Health Research (Head, Prof Kaye Wellings)

Each department is multidisciplinary and is responsible for its own research. There are strong programmes of research that relate to gender issues, such as the Centre on Gender Violence and Health, based in GHD, and the pioneering work on sexual health within SEHR.

The management of a department is under the Head of Department, appointed for a period of three years in the first instance; at present two of the three departments have female Heads. The Faculty Dean, currently male, but with two previous female incumbents, is appointed for an initial period of up to five years. Faculty management is complemented with a Director of Taught Course programmes, who is presently female, and a Research Degree Director, who is currently male but will hand over in 2013 to a female member of staff. The Faculty and Department Administrators are all female.

The Faculty's teaching programmes encompass both London-based and distance learning MSc programmes. Around 130 students every year take the London-based MSc in Public Health. A further 100 or so students follow MSc programmes which are cross-faculty - the MScs in Public Health in Developing Countries and Control of Infectious Diseases. A joint programme with the London School of Economics, the MSc in Health Policy, Planning and Financing, offers the opportunity for around 40 students each year to focus on the disciplines relevant to health policy. Around 1300 students worldwide
follow the Faculty’s MScs in Public Health and Global Health Policy by distance learning, combining their normal work with part-time study.

The Faculty has a thriving research degree programme, of around 140 students. The PhD programme is designed for those who plan a career in research, while a DrPH provides doctoral level training for those who will be health decision-makers. Students commonly divide their time between study in London with their supervisor, and undertaking a research project, often in another country.

In keeping with its focus on the interface between scientific research, policy and practice, faculty staff are engaged in a very wide range of policy-influencing roles, including membership of key government advisory groups, leadership of professional bodies, membership of research funding bodies, and provision of expert advice to global health institutions.

The Faculty has a clear value framework within which it operates, which specifies that “working relationships and practices inside and outside of the Faculty are guided by the need for equality, respect, integrity and scientific rigour. Incorporation of these values into working practice is effected by:

• scrupulous application of ethical principles to staff relations, the management and supervision of students, and the conduct of scientific research;
• monitoring and assessment of our research, teaching and human relations, using quantifiable measures;
• collaboration undertaken from a basis of equal partnership.

b) Provide data for the past three years (where possible with clearly labelled graphical illustrations) on the following with commentary on their significance and how they have affected action planning.

Student data

(i) **Numbers of males and females on access or foundation courses** – comment on the data and describe any initiatives taken to attract women to the courses.

There are no access or foundation courses in the Faculty.

(ii) **Undergraduate male and female numbers** – full and part-time – comment on the female:male ratio compared with the national picture for the discipline. Describe any initiatives taken to address any imbalance and the impact to date. Comment upon any plans for the future.

There are no undergraduate students at LSHTM.

(iii) **Postgraduate male and female numbers completing taught courses** – full and part-time – comment on the female:male ratio
compared with the national picture for the discipline. Describe any initiatives taken to address any imbalance and the effect to date. Comment upon any plans for the future.

There are post-graduate students on both London-based and distance-learning taught courses. Over the past 3 years, there have been consistently more female than male students, with at least two female students for every male completing post-graduate taught courses, (Table and Figure 3b-iii). The ratios compare favourably with national data for both social studies and medicine and dentistry; the female:male ratio of postgraduate taught students in the UK in 2010/11 completing social studies 1.68, and completing medicine and dentistry was 1.37 (Equity Challenge Unit 2012)\(^1\)

![Figure 3b-iii: Ratio of female to male post-graduate students completing taught courses](image)

## Postgraduate male and female numbers on research degrees

Comment on the female:male ratio compared with the national picture for the discipline. Describe any initiatives taken to address any imbalance and the effect to date. Comment upon any plans for the future.

There have been substantially more female than male students on research degrees over the last 4 academic years registered in PHP (Figure 3b.iv and Table 3b.iv). This compares favourably with the national picture for both social studies and for medicine and dentistry; the female:male ratio of postgraduate research students in the UK in 2010/11 completing social studies was 1.05 and completing medicine and dentistry was 1.24.  

### Table 3b-iii: Ratio of female to male post-graduate students completing taught courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance-learning (all part-time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3b-iv: Ratio of female to male post-graduate students on research degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 MSc in Public Health by distance learning. Data are not available on post-graduate diplomas and certificates

Figure 3b.iv: Ratio of female to male post-graduate students on research degrees

(v) Ratio of course applications to offers and acceptances by gender for undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research degrees – comment on the differences between male and female application and success rates and describe any initiatives taken to address any imbalance and their effect to date. Comment upon any plans for the future.

Over the past four years there have been more female than male students applying for, offered places and accepted on post-graduate courses across London-based taught courses, and research degrees (Table 3b-v). For distance learning taught course data from 2010/11 showed that the ratio of offers to applications was 0.78 for females and 0.59 for males.\(^4\) For other academic years data on distance learning students were incomplete\(^5\), though improvements in administrative systems should enable data to be available for coming years.

---

4 These data aggregate MSc, PG Diploma and PG Certificate in Public Health and Global Health Policy.

5 This was due to changes in database used by the University of London, which manages the application and registration for the distance learning courses. LSHTM will liaise with the University of London to ensure there is a system in place to obtain accurate statistics on distance learning students by gender in the future.
Table 3b-v: Ratio of course applications to offers and acceptances by gender for post-graduate taught courses

(vi) **Degree classification by gender** – comment on any differences in degree attainment between males and females and describe what actions are being taken to address any imbalance.

Over the past years there are consistently more female than male students completing the range of post-graduate courses in the Faculty of Public Health & Policy (Figure and Table 3b.vi).

![Figure 3b-vi: Ratio of female to male post-graduate students completing taught courses](image)
In summary, there are more female and male students applying, offered places and completing post-graduate studies in the faculty. This trend has been consistent across the past three years, and applies to both taught and research courses and to full-time and part-time students. Data will continue to be collected on distant learning students to facilitate monitoring (action plan).

### Staff data

**(vii) Female:male ratio of academic staff and research staff** – researcher, lecturer, senior lecturer, reader, professor (or equivalent). Comment on any differences in numbers between males and females and say what action is being taken to address any underrepresentation at particular grades/levels.

The Faculty has the highest proportion of female staff across all three faculties in LSHTM at 68% and this has remained constant for the last 3 years. Within the faculty, GHD has the highest proportion of female staff overall over the last 3 years (75%) compared to SEHR (62%) and HSRP (59%).

The administrative unit is predominantly female (80%) as are distant learning tutors (70%). There are a far higher proportion of female staff at the level of Lecturer or below and proportionally fewer at Reader and Professor level (Figure 3b-vii.b). Although it’s important to note that there is a far smaller number of staff in the posts of Reader (currently 4) and Professor (currently 18\(^6\)) which means that any differences in the numbers of men and women employed will create a large proportional difference. Data from the Higher Education Statistics Agency shows that only 15% of Professors in SET departments were female in 2009/2010. \(^7\) Although more than 25% of PHP Professors are female in 2012, we accept that this needs to be addressed. A barrier to greater equity is the low turnover of senior staff and strategies to

---

\(^6\) Data taken from June 2012

address key career transition points have been in place since 2006 and are discussed below in Section 4.

As of June 2012, the majority of staff work full time (72%). Among the 56 members of academic staff working part-time the majority (80%) are female. This is higher than the national average that suggests that among academics working part time 54% are women.

Figure 3b-vii.a: Percentage of female staff in PHP by department and year

---

Figure 3b-vii.b: Percentage of female staff by grade and year
The faculty has a greater proportion of female academic staff than the UK generally: 44% of UK academic staff in 2010-11 were female compared to 69% in PHP in 2012. Imperial College Faculty of Medicine was selected as the best available benchmark. Table 3.4 shows that gender balance in PHP compares favourably to that at Imperial College at all grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 data</th>
<th>PHP Total</th>
<th>%Female</th>
<th>Imperial Total</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC STAFF TOTAL</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH STAFF TOTAL</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: Benchmarking comparison for staff by grade and gender between the Faculty of Public Health and Policy, LSHTM, and the Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College.

In summary, women are well represented at most levels in the Faculty staff; underrepresentation at senior level is noted, but compares favourably with other institutions. More women than men work part-time and the Team will monitor the affect of part-time working on career progression (see action plan).

(viii) Turnover by grade and gender – comment on any differences between men and women in turnover and say what is being done to address this. Where the number of staff leaving is small, comment on the reasons why particular individuals left.

The turnover rate was calculated by taking a mid-year estimate of people in employment as the denominator and those not there at the end of the year as the numerator (see Figure 3b-viii). Turnover is higher at lower grades where most staff are employed on short-term research contracts. Until 2006 permanent contracts were only given to readers and professors who for historical reasons were still predominantly male. After 2006 all employees with 4 or more years of service were given permanent contracts, in accordance with the Fixed Term (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2002. In addition staff are entitled to 6 months underwriting and referred to an internal redeployment registry, which may have improved retention at this level. Underwriting is a School initiative and not a legal requirement. (http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/personnel/policies/note_on_underwriting_of_staff_contracts.pdf)

---

10 Only data for 2011 were available and PHP staff at Research Fellow and Research Assistant grade were combined for comparison to ‘Research Staff’ at Imperial College.
The proportion of male to female staff at Senior Lecturer level was equal in 2010 but proportionally more men than women left in 2011 and 2012. There has been no turnover at Reader level, but the proportion of women leaving the post of Professor has been consistently higher in 2011 and 2012.

Staff are invited to report on reasons for leaving during a voluntary exit interview, 18 interviews were completed in the last 3 years. Among these interviews, only 1 person reported leaving because of difficulties in managing work/life balance, 4 people left because of lack of funding or dissatisfaction with short term contracts, 4 people reported an unsatisfactory relationship with their manager, 2 people left having been promoted and 6 people to advance their careers elsewhere, move abroad or to seek out new challenges.

| In summary, there is little difference in turnover rate across grades by men and women. Turnover is higher among more junior staff who are more likely to be funded by research grants. The team will set up a system to monitor how turnover is affected by funding status and part-time working (see action plan). |
Figure 3b-viii Turnover of female to male staff by grade 2010-2012 in PHP

[2010 words]
Supporting and advancing women’s careers – maximum 5000 words

4. Key career transition points

a) Provide data for the past three years (where possible with clearly labelled graphical illustrations) on the following with commentary on their significance and how they have affected action planning.

(i) **Job application and success rates by gender and grade** – comment on any differences in recruitment between men and women at any level and say what action is being taken to address this.

Figure 4a-i summarises the percentage of women applying, being shortlisted and appointed to jobs at LSHTM between 1 September 2010 and 31 May 2011 and 1 June 2011 and 31 May 2012. This is an improvement in data capture as planned in the School Athena SWAN Bronze application. Data broken down by Faculty are not available prior to these dates. However, the analysis here demonstrates the commitment given in the School’s successful Bronze application to collect application data in this way. In both years proportionally more applicants for the position of Research Assistant (64%, 75%) and Research Fellow (66%, 61%) were women than men. There were proportionally fewer female applicants to the post of Lecturer in 2011 (30%) but this had increased in 2012 (46%). In both years there were proportionally fewer female than male applicants to the post of Senior Lecturer (46%, 43%). In 2011 40% of applicants for the post of Professor were women, but there were no female applicants in 2012. In terms of applicants shortlisted, higher proportions of female applicants were shortlisted to all grades from Senior Lecturer to Research Assistant in both years. In 2012 the proportion of applicants shortlisted remained high among women, particularly for the positions of Lecturer and Research Fellow and declined to 50% among Senior Lecturers and Research Assistants. In both years only 1 male applicant was shortlisted for the position of Professor. In terms of appointments, an equal or above equal proportion of women were appointed to all posts from Senior Lecturer to Research Assistant in 2011. In 2012, 100% of applicants appointed to Senior Lecturer were women and 89% of Research Fellows. No-one was appointed as Research Assistant in 2012 and only 2 appointments to Lecturer were made and both were men. There were no appointments to Professor made in either year.
Figure 4a-i: Number of applicants, shortlists and recruitment by grade and proportion female
Applications for promotion and success rates by gender and grade – comment on whether these differ for men and women and if they do explain what action may be taken. Where the number of women is small applicants may comment on specific examples of where women have been through the promotion process. Explain how potential candidates are identified.

Women applying for promotion are well represented among staff within the faculty (Table 4a-ii). In 2010 and 2011, more than 50% or more applicants were women. Similarly in terms of successful promotions, the proportions of women who are successful compared to the proportions of men do not differ considerably. In 2009 and 2011 a lower proportion of women compared to men were successfully promoted to Lecturer, but there was no difference in 2010. Some of the potential barriers that may affect women’s promotion, particularly after returning from maternity leave are explored in more detail in Case Study 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Promotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4a-ii: Number of applicants and successful promotions by grade and gender

b) For each of the areas below, explain what the key issues are in the department, what steps have been taken to address any imbalances, what success/impact has been achieved so far and what additional steps may be needed.
(i) **Recruitment of staff** – comment on how the department’s recruitment processes ensure that female candidates are attracted to apply, and how the department ensures its short listing, selection processes and criteria comply with the university’s equal opportunities policies

The School has strictly regulated and transparent procedures for short listing and appointment boards, requiring explicit job requirements that are graded for each candidate by the short listing and the appointment boards. All promotion and appointment boards must include at least one female and one male academic staff member.

(ii) **Support for staff at key career transition points** – having identified key areas of attrition of female staff in the department, comment on any interventions, programmes and activities that support women at the crucial stages, such as personal development training, opportunities for networking, mentoring programmes and leadership training. Identify which have been found to work best at the different career stages.

The School has transparent promotion procedures. There is a career map for academic staff that allocates minimum required points for teaching, research, research degree supervision and citizenship. This can be found at the following link: [http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/personnel/careermap/index.html](http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/personnel/careermap/index.html)

This provides a framework where all staff have to undertake responsibilities in the 4 areas, and ensures that those promotion criteria are clear and transparent. Since the submission of the School Bronze award the Career map has been revised to further improve transparency and to help address the pipeline issues identified in that application.

Staff are allowed to put themselves up for consideration for promotion. In addition, heads of department review every member of staff to establish whether in their view they are ready for consideration for promotion or not, and contacts those who they consider are ready to consider applying for promotion. This is to avoid any gender imbalance and to avoid unwillingness by any one individual (especially females) to put themselves up for promotion. Applications for promotion are reviewed by Heads of Department and the Dean of Faculty (who comment on their overall performance) and also by the Taught Course Director (who comments on their teaching), taking into account whether the member of staff is full or part-time. Applications are then reviewed by the Staff Review Committee. Women are well represented on this committee there are currently 3 women, 5 men and one post to be filled, the committee is chaired by Professor Anne Mills in her role as Vice Director.

In addition to the formal process the Dean of Faculty will provide informal advice to staff at key transition points of their career. This is illustrated by the actions of former Dean (Anne Mills, 2006-2011) and is continued by current Dean of Faculty, Richard Smith:

> In general I saw it as my role to discuss with staff at key points - usually applying for promotions, maternity leaves, and points where staff needed to go on underwriting when grant funding
ended. Often this was at my initiative - for example I knew that someone wished to apply for promotion and asked them to discuss with me. I was always careful to talk not just about progress in work, but also how the staff member was managing the pressures of work (which often include frequent travel) and work life balance issues especially where they had children or elderly parents. I frequently drew on my own experience of working while having children to advise on career development, encompassing things like how staff might shift the balance of their work so they travelled less when their children were young. I also frequently informed staff of their right to request flexible working to enable them to manage the demands of a young family or aging parents. Finally I always take care when meeting staff informally to ask not just about how their work is going but how they are managing the demands of family life - and I do this for not only female staff but male staff as well since many of our male staff take on important caring roles. During the period I was head of faculty I probably formally saw around 10 people a year and informally had many more conversations in the cafe.

Professor Anne Mills (Dean of Faculty, 2006-2011)

In the last three years the Faculty has funded three post doctoral fellowship and two Senior fellowships. The post-doctoral fellowships were designed for staff in early part of their independent research career to provide core-funding for two years to enable them to develop a programme of funded research. Senior fellowships had the same aim but were funded for up to one year. All five of these fellowships were awarded to women and have been useful both professionally as well as enabling women to more easily balance family and working life as the following quotes illustrate.

Working in GHD always entails intensive travel. Coming off my first maternity leave, I was setting up a 3-country study and had international work travel every month from the time my baby was 7 months until she was 28 months. This was very intense for the whole family, but had to be done for the project to go smoothly. Working part time would have been in name only. Winning the faculty fellowship has made returning from my second maternity leave completely different and has dramatically improved my work-life balance. I was able to take the full year off, rather than rushing back to support project deadlines and junior staff. The flexibility of spreading the two year funding over longer for part-time working, also makes reduced working hours feasible. I can do some school pick-ups, school trips and be there when one is ill. It also makes travel much easier to decline as projects are not my primary job. I really appreciate how the faculty has been supportive, not only to me, but more generally given its more than proportionate share of women staff.

Post-Doctoral Fellow
I was awarded a Faculty Senior Fellowship the year after my maternity leave (0.8 FTE for 12 months) which allowed me to prepare applications for Fellowships that would support my long term career objectives. In addition, I have been able to adopt flexible working that has allowed me to meet family commitments (I have 2 children, one is 15 and one is 2 years old, as well as my partners children that stay on a regular basis). Because of the Fellowship I was successfully awarded a Knowledge Transfer Placement by NERC.

Senior Fellowship award winner

Summary: Women are well represented among those promoted. One off fellowships have supported women in key transition points as well as support from senior staff. A clear career map ensures transparency, though greater clarity on how the map caters for staff working part time would further improve this process (see action plan).

5. Career development

a) For each of the areas below, explain what the key issues are in the department, what steps have been taken to address any imbalances, what success/impact has been achieved so far and what additional steps may be needed.

   (i) Promotion and career development – comment on the appraisal and career development process, and promotion criteria and whether these take into consideration responsibilities for teaching, research, administration, pastoral work and outreach work; is quality of work emphasised over quantity of work?

LSHTM has an outstanding staff development programme, which includes many training courses on skills necessary for career progression, e.g. writing papers and preparing grant applications. Regardless of gender, all Faculty staff are encouraged to participate in a comprehensive programme of management training. The staff development programme offers specific courses for female staff such as 'Communicating Positively for Women'. A separate equivalent course is offered to male staff. Data on the overall numbers of female and male members of staff attending training courses are monitored on an annual basis and presented to the Equal Opportunities Committee. These data are for all staff and not broken down between academic and professional staff.

All academic staff take part in an annual appraisal scheme with the objective to support their career planning and management. The scheme is based on a meeting between the appraisee and the appraiser. At the appraisal meeting, objectives are agreed for the forthcoming academic year, and training and development needs identified. The appraisal system is currently being reviewed at School level, with the current version aimed at career planning and management and not at performance management. At the time of appointment of a new Lecturer, or when a Research Fellow is promoted to
Lecturer, the Dean of Faculty appoints a mentor for the successful candidate. Emphasis on career progression is given to publications and research grants, with strong support offered at the Faculty level to draft proposals and research papers.

There are two yearly rounds of staff review when promotions are considered and before that time staff are encouraged to discuss their suitability with their line manager and/or Head of Department and/or Dean of Faculty. They are also allowed to put themselves for promotion without their support. As described previously, the School has a career map scheme to guide promotions described above. All staff being considered for promotion are encouraged to complete this career map first as for all applications individual career maps are graded by two members of the Staff Review Committee (SRC). Although the SRC uses these data as guidance only, it has the positive impact on clearly recognizing contributions to teaching, research and management, with a minimum level required in each of these areas.

(ii) **Induction and training** – describe the support provided to new staff at all levels, as well as details of any gender equality training. To what extent are good employment practices in the institution, such as opportunities for networking, the flexible working policy, and professional and personal development opportunities promoted to staff from the outset?

The School benefits from a talented and diverse workforce whose skills and contributions are highly valued. LSHTM has developed an Equality and Diversity Strategy with the aim of providing a working, learning and social environment which is supportive and inclusive. This strategy is promoted to new staff and there are opportunities for on-going training. The staff development programme offers numerous seminars, online workshops (for Distance Learning Staff), and teaching and training courses (in house and externally) for staff at all levels. These include: Computing courses; Leadership & Management courses; Career planning; Research skills and career development; Workplace skills and Personal Effectiveness.

Upon appointment, all new staff undergo a one-to-one induction meeting with a member of HR staff which includes information on maternity/paternity leave, Staff and Educational Department training courses, and Equality and Diversity policies. Each term, a Staff Induction Day is provided which includes a presentation by the LSHTM Equality and Diversity Manager. During this presentation several LSHTM policies are reviewed including Family Friendly Policies; Recruitment Procedures; Dignity at Work and Study; Supporting Disabled Staff at Work. In addition, new staff are required to undertake an e-learning course which covers the ‘essentials’ of equality and diversity, including UK Legal Framework, workplace application, dignity and work principles, case studies and a quiz. The completion rate is very high.

New staff at all levels are provided guidance and support upon their arrival to the Faculty. They receive a welcome letter from their departmental administrator. A PHP Welcome booklet for new staff is currently under
development. As part of induction staff across all faculties are required to complete the course on Equality and Diversity Awareness training provided through the Staff and Educational Development Programme. Moreover PHP adheres to the School’s equal pay policy.

There are opportunities for professional development such as open invitations to present research at seminar series, including the Faculty-level and departmental seminar series. Also there are internal research events such as the “Annual PHP Research Afternoon”, as well as ad hoc meetings such as commemoration research afternoons.

There are a range of opportunities for networking as well as professional and personal development opportunities. For example a Dean of Faculty Open Meeting with Staff and Students is held once a term and is an opportunity to liaise with staff across departments. Research Proposal Review Workshops are opportunities for research proposals to be peer-reviewed by an expert panel. Explicit effort is made to achieve gender balance on the expert panel. Departmental meetings are held once a month. There are also informal meetings and gatherings such as “PHP coffee and cake mornings” (held once a term and rotateD between departments) and annual departmental away days, which are excellent occasions for networking.

(iii) **Support for female students** – describe the support (formal and informal) provided for female students to enable them to make the transition to a sustainable academic career, particularly from postgraduate to researcher, such as mentoring, seminars and pastoral support and the right to request a female personal tutor. Comment on whether these activities are run by female staff and how this work is formally recognised by the department.

Many of the tutors and supervisors are women, reflecting the composition of the academic staff; should a student request a female tutor this would be considered, as all requests for tutor change are considered, and accommodated when reasonable, but no such request was ever made to our knowledge. Each Faculty has a Research Degree Committee (RDC) which is chaired by the Faculty Research Degree Director (FRCC) and includes one Departmental Research Degree Coordinator (DRDC) from each Department, plus a student representative. In PHP, one of the two FRCC is female, and three of the five RDCs are female. In addition, six of eight student representatives are female, and the current student representative to the research degree committee is female.

LSHTM has a Careers Service (http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/careers/) which provides central reference point for careers literature, employer information and job vacancies and provide careers events, seminars and workshops throughout the year. In addition, students are offered one-to-one meetings with consultants to discuss career planning, CV writing, interviewing (includes mock interview practice) and job hunting advice. Students can use these services for up to two years after graduation. There is also an active alumni network (http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/alumni/index.html) which includes links to
Careers Service. We also have an Alumni Tracing project funded by the Rockefeller Foundation in which all alumni were asked to complete a career questionnaire, with 53% of the 1067 respondents female. There are active Alumni Chapters and networks in 14 countries.

Students transitioning into staff positions are assigned an academic mentor (as are all junior staff) and encouraged to participate in research seminars (both attending and presenting their work) and opportunities for professional networking (as described above). PHP has a mentoring programme for junior staff, including female students making the transition to an academic career.

Student Advice and Counselling Services are available centrally at the School. PHP adhere to the School Code on dignity at work and study, which provides guidelines to students (and staff) on how to manage and seek help in cases of bullying and harassment. The School Student Advice and Counselling Service is run by at least one female staff member.

**Summary:** Women benefit from excellent staff training and development courses available at the school. Further support could be provided by formalising a system where issues of part time/flexible working and strategies for combining work and family life could be discussed (action plan).

### 6. Organisation and culture

a) Provide data for the past three years (where possible with clearly labelled graphical illustrations) on the following with commentary on their significance and how they have affected action planning.

(i) **Male and female representation on committees** – provide a breakdown by committee and explain any differences between male and female representation. Explain how potential members are identified.

There are 5 faculty-level committees in the faculty of PHP.

- The Faculty Teaching Committee consists of directors of the MSc courses and Distance Learning courses, Dean of Studies and Deputy, Dean of Faculty and Taught Course Director.
- The Faculty Teaching sub-committee consists of Dean of Faculty, some directors of MSc courses and volunteers.
- The Faculty course representative committee is attended by the Dean of Faculty, the taught course Director, the course administrator, the taught course manager and administrators from the MScs as well as between 2-4 students from each of the 4 MSc courses.
- The Faculty Management Group is made up of the Dean of Faculty, the three heads of departments, the Faculty Administrator, the Research Degrees Director, the Taught Course Director and the Faculty Secretary.
- The Research Degrees Committee is made up of the Faculty Research Degrees Director and Deputy Departmental Research Degrees
Coordinators, Research Degrees Administrator and assistant and student representatives from each department.

For most of the committees, membership is obligatory to the posts described above (Table 6a-i). The high proportion of women on the committees therefore reflects the high numbers of women within the Faculty. The Faculty sub-teaching committee is comprised of ex officio members but chaired by a volunteer and a selection of volunteers from the MSc course directors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>2010 (%)</th>
<th>2011 (%)</th>
<th>2012 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHP Teaching committee</td>
<td>17 (82%)</td>
<td>18 (72%)</td>
<td>19 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (% female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHP Teaching sub committee</td>
<td>7 (86%)</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (% female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHP course reps</td>
<td>25 (72%)</td>
<td>25 (84%)</td>
<td>21 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (% female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Management Group</td>
<td>9 (67%)</td>
<td>9 (67%)</td>
<td>8 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (% female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Degrees Committee</td>
<td>8 (63%)</td>
<td>8 (63%)</td>
<td>8 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (% female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6a-i: Faculty committees and proportion of female members

(ii) Female: male ratio of academic and research staff on fixed-term contracts and open-ended (permanent) contracts – comment on any differences between male and female staff representation on fixed-term contracts and say what is being done to address them.

There has been little difference in the proportion of male and female staff on permanent contracts and this gap has reduced over the last 3 years. In 2010 there was a 10% difference between men and women on permanent contracts, this declined to 3% in 2011 and is now 7% in 2012 (figure 6a-ii.a). This gap is due to the larger number of male professors in post. There is much variation in the numbers with permanent contracts by grade (Figure 6a-ii.b). All Professors and Readers now have permanent contracts as do the majority of Senior Lecturers and just under half of Lecturers. Numbers of staff on permanent contacts across the remaining grades has increased as a result of EU legislation, but particularly for Senior Lecturers, Lecturers and Distance Learning Tutors.

There is little difference in the proportion of men and women with permanent contracts across the grades between 2010 and 2012. In 2010 there were proportionally more women with permanent contracts than among men in the post of Senior Lecturer, this was reversed in 2011 and is roughly equal in 2012, but slightly favouring women. The same can be seen among Lecturers and Distance Learning Tutors where slightly more women are on permanent contracts than men. Among Research Fellows there are roughly equal proportions on permanent contracts. The proportion of both sexes on permanent contracts is considerably lower among Lecturers and Research
Fellows compared to other grades, irrespective of sex. No Research Assistants are on permanent contracts. This is a result of the high proportion of salaries originating from research project grants rather than core HEFCE funding.

A large proportion of staff at Senior Lecturer, Lecturer and Research Fellow may have permanent contracts but are not funded through core Faculty or HEFCE funding but supported through research contracts. Data were not analysed to see the differences in ratio of male to female staff across the grades by funding status. We recognise that this is a crucial issue as there may be difficulties for staff funded on short-term project grants particularly in relation to taking maternity or family leave or applying for flexible working. These issues are explored in more depth in the case studies and will be monitored as an action point (see action plan). Strategies to address these issues include the offer of 6 months underwriting (from School’s funds) for all

Figure 6a-ii.a: Percentage of staff on permanent contracts
staff with 5 years of service, and the redeployment registry, where all staff with less than 6 months funding remaining can register. All new jobs are advertised in the redeployment register before being advertised openly, and all staff in redeployment who meet the required person specification are guaranteed an interview.

The faculty has a similar proportion of females on permanent contracts that the UK generally: 63% of UK female academic staff on permanent contracts in 2009-10; compared to 66% of PHP academic staff on permanent contracts in 2012 are female.

**Summary:** There is gender equality in staff with permanent contracts. However, a key difficulty faced by staff funded from project grants is making sufficient time to submit proposals for future work. This may disproportionately affect women as they are more likely to work part time, reducing the amount of time available to submit proposals. Successful strategies to address this have included underwriting, the redeployment register as well as one-off strategies such as award of junior and senior research fellowships. Differences by sex in staff project/core funded will be monitored (see action plan).
b) For each of the areas below, explain what the key issues are in the department, what steps have been taken to address any imbalances, what success/impact has been achieved so far and what additional steps may be needed.
(i) **Representation on decision-making committees** – comment on evidence of gender equality in the mechanism for selecting representatives. What evidence is there that women are encouraged to sit on a range of influential committees inside and outside the department? How is the issue of ‘committee overload’ addressed where there are small numbers of female staff?

The staff development programme ensures that all staff, including the Dean of Faculty, making selection decisions attend an equality and diversity workshop. Membership of Faculty committees are mostly defined by positions occupied and is reasonably balanced.

(ii) **Workload model** – describe the systems in place to ensure that workload allocations, including pastoral and administrative responsibilities (including the responsibility for work on women and science) are taken into account at appraisal and in promotion criteria. Comment on the rotation of responsibilities e.g. responsibilities with a heavy workload and those that are seen as good for an individual’s career.

Teaching allocation covers contributions to both face-to-face and Distance Learning MSc degrees. It may formally include short courses but does not include research degree supervision/advice. Teaching consists of marking exams, supervision of projects, pastoral care of students as well as lecturing, seminar facilitation and organisation of courses. At the school-level the expectation is that all staff from Research Fellows upwards will contribute to teaching, contributing up to 15% of their time as stated in their job descriptions (pro rata according to FTE). Research Assistants who are employed for 6 months or more and at 0.5 FTE or more, contribute up to a maximum of 10% of time. Any research assistant on a shorter or more part time contract is welcome to be involved with teaching if their line manager agrees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Grade</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals exclude staff on maternity leave and atypical staff*

**Table 6b-ii: Teaching load: average number of time spent teaching in seminar or lecture format 2011-2012.**

Within PHP teaching load is allocated centrally by the Teaching Coordinator following discussions with staff, on the basis of grade, expertise and according to FTE. Teaching load by grade is specified in the guidelines. Teaching is allocated at the start of the academic year, allocation can be disrupted by staff working on short-term contracts that may be extended or
terminated in the middle of the year at short notice. Data presented in Table 6b-ii shows the average number of contact hours with students for 2012. This includes hours spent lecturing or facilitating seminars, this only reflects a small part of teaching within the faculty as it excludes time spent on teaching preparation, marking, meetings with tutees and does not incorporate any of the distant learning masters.

(iii) **Timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings** – provide evidence of consideration for those with family responsibilities, for example what the department considers to be core hours and whether there is a more flexible system in place.

Faculty level meetings include the annual Research Afternoon where staff are selected to present work to ensure that colleagues are aware of research conducted across the Faculty. This is followed by the annual Faculty summer party, which is held immediately after the research meeting. More informal meetings such as the Faculty cake and coffee mornings rotated across the departments during working hours to encourage staff to socialise.

Departmental meetings are held quarterly on a Wednesday between 10 and 4. This is to allow staff who work part time or work some of their time from home to attend. Academic seminars are generally held during lunch breaks or early afternoon, and not usually on Mondays or Fridays, for the same reasons. Weekly departmental social events are held in working hours, usually early or mid afternoon. All meetings and social activities end within core working hours (before 4pm), and evening social activities play no significant role.

(iv) **Culture** – demonstrate how the department is female-friendly and inclusive. ‘Culture’ refers to the language, behaviours and other informal interactions that characterise the atmosphere of the department, and includes all staff and students.

As part of its commitment to Equal Opportunities, LSHTM has in place a Equality and Diversity Strategy which aims to promote an inclusive workplace culture that is not discriminatory to men or women. LSHTM’s Dignity at Work and Study policy also clearly defines inappropriate workplace behaviours including harassment and bullying. To support the policy, there is a named contact person in every faculty trained in supporting persons with problems of harassment and bullying. The contact persons are recruited from all levels of the School and advice is provided in confidence (to both staff and students). Their contact details are available to all via the School Internet.

Flexible working arrangements are available to assist both male and female in combining the demands of employment with those of family or other personal commitments and responsibilities. Examples of possible flexible arrangements such as working from home or flexible start times are provided on the School intranet and staff induction pack, so staff have a better understanding of
available options. Below is a quote from a Research Assistant on how the school’s policies supported her during a difficult time:

"The evening after my first day of work at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, my father was diagnosed with cancer. Because of the school’s personal, professional, and technical support, I was able to develop a flexible work-plan with my line manager. Despite being able to work, I was never pressured or bullied into working more than I was able to. After returning to work for a week, my father’s condition worsened dramatically, and I was once again told that family is more important than work and that I did not need to worry about leaving. After returning from his funeral, the department was welcoming, encouraging and continued with its ethos of ensuring that staff members are able to have flexible working and an appropriate life/work balance.

There is also a childcare voucher scheme in place to help towards the cost of amount on the cost of childcare. The numbers of staff using the childcare voucher scheme have increased from 8 in 2010 (3 female staff), 7 in 2011 (4 female staff) and 20 in 2012 (13 female staff).

(v) Outreach activities – comment on the level of participation by female and male staff in outreach activities with schools and colleges and other centres. Describe who the programmes are aimed at, and how this activity is formally recognised as part of the workload model and in appraisal and promotion processes.

For over a decade, LSHTM has run a young scientists’ programme for young people aged 14-18 from disadvantaged schools. This programme was first set up by Carolyn Stephens, Reader in PHP, and has since been adopted across LSHTM. The programme gives participating students a chance to see how public health and science work in the real world, by supporting them in devising a hypothesis, conducting their own (small scale) original research (e.g. a survey in their school). The programme has in recent years also given students the opportunity to contribute to research studies being carried out in the School, including the ‘On the buses’ project led by researchers in the Faculty. The programme has won multiple awards, including for its organisers, for participating students (see for example http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/pressoffice/press_releases/2010/youngstaraward.html, and for the programme itself. It has also featured in conference presentations and the National Institute for Health Research ‘Involve’ public engagement newsletter. It is recognised within the School as a very important activity of School staff that has helped improved the profile of public health research to those from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Examples of other public activities include those of the PHP-led Centre for History of Public Health, headed by Professor Virginia Berridge and Dr Martin Gorsky, which runs a regular programme of seminars (including the annual
public health lecture each autumn), conferences, workshops and walks. The ‘walks’, funded by the Wellcome Trust, are led by Dr Ros Stanwell-Smith, a Public Health Consultant who is also a Blue Badge Guide, and are aimed at anyone interested in public health (http://history.lshtm.ac.uk/history-walks.html). Prof Watts is engaged in Women in Science debates, and in that role was a speaker at the “Soapbox Science’ event on the Southbank in July 2011, that received substantial media attention.

7. Flexibility and managing career breaks

a) Provide data for the past three years (where possible with clearly labelled graphical illustrations) on the following with commentary on their significance and how they have affected action planning.

(i) Maternity return rate – comment on whether maternity return rate in the department has improved or deteriorated and any plans for further improvement. If the department is unable to provide a maternity return rate, please explain why.

A total of 18 women took maternity leave in 2010 and 2011 and all have returned to work. In 2012, 9 women took maternity leave, but currently there are no data on return rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Taking maternity</th>
<th>No. Returned</th>
<th>% Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Too early to know

Table 7a-i: Numbers taking maternity leave

(ii) Paternity, adoption and parental leave uptake – comment on the uptake of paternity leave by grade and parental and adoption leave by gender and grade. Has this improved or deteriorated and what plans are there to improve further.

The uptake of Paternity, Parental and Adoption leave is relatively low. Only two people in the last 3 years have requested paternity leave. Both were granted it and returned to work. The low uptake of paternity leave mostly reflects the culture of flexible working that characterises the working culture within the Faculty, new fathers are able to work from home more often in the early period after the baby is born.

A total of 7 staff (all Lecturers and 1 Senior Lecturer) have applied and been granted ‘Carer Leave’ since 2008. All these staff were female.

Staff are given information on the types of leaves options available to them when they join the Faculty as staff. In order to further improve awareness of paternity leave and paternal and adoption leave options the Faculty additionally plans to have a yearly agenda item on sub-departmental meetings.
to note the types of leave (including maternity leave and flexible working options) and where to find further information and advice.

(iii) **Numbers of applications and success rates for flexible working by gender and grade** – comment on any disparities. Where the number of women in the department is small applicants may wish to comment on specific examples.

Applications for flexible working have been accepted for both men and women in the posts of Research Fellow, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Professor. Most applications come from Lecturer grade and more women request flexible working than men. Most requests for flexible working are made on return from maternity leave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research Fellow</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female numbers are in brackets

**Table 7a-iii: Numbers of applications and success rates for flexible working by gender and grade**

b) For each of the areas below, explain what the key issues are in the department, what steps have been taken to address any imbalances, what success/impact has been achieved so far and what additional steps may be needed.

(i) **Flexible working** – comment on the numbers of staff working flexibly and their grades and gender, whether there is a formal or informal system, the support and training provided for managers in promoting and managing flexible working arrangements, and how the department raises awareness of the options available.

PHP follows the school-wide flexible working arrangements which enable staff to combine the demands of employment with those of family or other personal commitments or responsibilities. The policy is open to all staff and goes further than the statutory right which is available to employees with children under 17 and caring responsibilities. ([http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/personnel/familyfriendly/flexible_working_arrangements:_policy_and_procedure_document.pdf](http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/personnel/familyfriendly/flexible_working_arrangements:_policy_and_procedure_document.pdf))

Written requests are sent to the head of department and Dean of Faculty. Within 28 days, the Head of Department is required to meet with the staff making the request and their line manager to discuss how the working arrangements can best be accommodated. The head of department is required to respond to the request within 14 days. If the request is refused the member of staff has the right to appeal and this appeal will be heard by
the Dean of Faculty or Director. The School introduced a Working from Home policy in 2011.  
(http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/personnel/familyfriendly/guidelines_for_staff_working_from_home_on_a_regular_basis2.pdf)

(ii) **Cover for maternity and adoption leave and support on return** – explain what the department does, beyond the university maternity policy package, to support female staff before they go on maternity leave, arrangements for covering work during absence, and to help them achieve a suitable work-life balance on their return.

PHP adheres to School-wide policies guiding flexible working arrangements and parental leave.  
(http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/personnel/familyfriendly/maternity_leave__adoption_leave_and_pay_procedure.pdf). PHP also follows school-wide policies supporting pregnant staff to ensure a safe work environment (for example through work station assessments) and the right balance in the working day. PHP has established dedicated breastfeeding facilities. Although there is no formalised policy on supporting staff on their return, the range of policies covering flexible working provide a flexible and supportive environment. There is no specific faculty funding for staff returning from parental leave or career breaks, however, the staff development programme provides many courses and opportunities for staff to update their skills.

[5026 words]

8. **Any other comments – maximum 500 words**

Please comment here on any other elements which are relevant to the application, e.g. other SET-specific initiatives of special interest that have not been covered in the previous sections. Include any other relevant data (e.g. results from staff surveys), provide a commentary on it and indicate how it is planned to address any gender disparities identified.

**Benchmarking**

The London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine is unique as a post graduate and research intensive institution with the majority of funding coming from research activities. Therefore identifying benchmarking information is and continues to be a challenge. Athena SWAN in their feedback on the bronze application suggested we looked to medical schools and we have been fortunate in getting some data from Imperial College and from UCL. However they are very different institutions both are larger and have undergraduates. In addition the research profile of LSHTM is broader than that of a traditional medical school. Therefore comparisons have to be treated with care.

**Research Excellence Framework**

PHP follows school wide guidelines outlined in the code of practice policy in the selection of staff to submit for the REF.
This code involves reducing the required output if an eligible member of staff has individual circumstances that may have adversely affected their volume of output including maternity leave or for family, health or other reasons. Members of staff are asked to make known – in confidence - any individual circumstances that may have affected their research output. In terms of support in the preparation process, staff are asked to select best publications which are then reviewed by two experienced academics. Feedback is given by the Head of Department or research group leader and support is provided to improving outputs where necessary. This may involve attending writing workshops and one to one advice. This system has proved successful but further efforts could be made to ensure staff are fully aware of the code of practice (see action plan).
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9. Action plan

Provide an action plan as an appendix. An action plan template is available on the Athena SWAN website.

The Action Plan should be a table or a spreadsheet comprising actions to address the priorities identified by the analysis of relevant data presented in this application, success/outcome measures, the post holder responsible for each action and a timeline for completion. The Plan should cover current initiatives and your aspirations for the next three years.

The action plan does not need to cover all areas at Bronze; however the expectation is that the department will have the organisational structure to move forward, including collecting the necessary data.

The action plan is attached in Appendix 2.

For Silver Department awards only

10. Case study: impacting on individuals – maximum 1000 words

Describe how the department’s SWAN activities have benefitted two individuals working in the department. One of these case studies should be a member of the self assessment team, the other someone else in the department. More information on case studies is available in the guidance.

Case Study 1: Charlotte Watts, Professor in Social and Mathematical Epidemiology

I joined LSHTM as a lecturer in 1994, going on to have a large succession of short term, soft funded positions, before becoming HEFCE funded. Over this period I had two children and had periods of time where I cared for elderly and disabled relatives. This did not hamper my academic progress, and I now
support a large research group of 30 staff focussing on HIV and violence against women. I have stayed at LSHTM not only because of its excellence in research and commitment to global health, but due to the institutional support it provides both to me as a female academic with a family and to my research on the sensitive issue of violence against women and health, a subject not studied in many health research institutions.

When I first joined LSHTM my line manager was a successful female academic and mother, who led by example, managing a large research programme and making it acceptable for staff to work from home, to use their hours flexibly and to attend parents meetings when needed. This was before some of the current family friendly legislation was in place, but helped institute a culture where women academics felt valued. Even though my children are now teenagers I still very much appreciate the flexibility that my Department and Faculty provide. An example of this may be setting up meetings involving a combination of face-to-face and skype participants, to incorporate the needs of staff working at home or based in other locations, due both to personal as well as work requirements.

Some challenges remain. Many staff are funded from short term soft funding, and as a manager it can be challenging to plan work around maternity leaves, especially when some staff member's skills are hard to replace, and there is a growing tendency for staff to want to take a year out from work, as well as ensuring there is new funding on their return. Typically our research does entail some overseas travel, which has to be balanced with their family and personal life. The situation has improved considerably since my maternity leave. Thirteen years ago LSHTM asked that I ask my funders whether they would cover my leave, which I found demeaning, and I felt pressure to return to work quickly. I returned after 4 months and found it hard to avoid the pressure of travel, so ended up taking my baby with me to three countries in Southern Africa. This was an adventure, but not what I wanted. There are now much clearer institutional and faculty policies regarding funding of maternity leave, far more explicit discussions about how work demands during leave can be minimised, and an openness for women to limit their travel for a while on their return. The introduction of new technology such as video conferencing and web-based communication has helped this. In the future I hope to see the increased use of Faculty funding to help support women returning from maternity leave, if they have no alternative sources of funding.

Case study 2: Dina Balabanova, Senior Lecturer in Health Systems/Policy

I have taken maternity leave twice in 2003 and 2007. After the first leave I returned to work part time for several years, increasing to 4 days as the job required and my circumstances changed. After I returned my line manager and staff at PHP were extremely supportive and I was able to share some of my travel with colleagues and focus on aspects of the work that could be completed in London.

Shortly before my second maternity leave, I successfully applied for a permanent faculty position, despite being heavily pregnant and working part-time. Many areas of my work were covered, preventing disruption of work. On
my return I worked reduced hours for several years. My first leave was before the new UK legislation on flexible working for employees with young children was enacted, and the second time was afterwards. The institutional culture to support parents at LSHTM and PHP was already present and the legislation did not make any noticeable difference. While attending a course on diversity and equality at the School, I was made aware of additional steps that I could take to facilitate my daily life – e.g. requesting meetings, to coincide with my work days. I believe this has helped me to improve my work-life balance.

During my maternity leaves and in the subsequent years of part time work as a Lecturer, my publication record remained good and I was able to conduct my work and travel. However, I believe that reducing my working hours may have inevitably hampered my progress to Senior Lecturer to some extent, for example through having less time to apply for new grants, which is one of the core areas applicants are assessed by.

I work from the office on a daily basis during the academic year. However, due to family commitments I work abroad at some points in the year, up to a month during the summer. This is possible through increasingly positive attitudes to remote working and use of electronic project and research degrees management.

Working with colleagues who have successfully combined careers and family life has been an inspiration to me. Currently, there is no formal system where senior staff can share their experience on managing changing personal circumstances as their career develops; existing appraisals and mentoring focus on work issues. It would be useful to create opportunities for staff to discuss and learn from these experiences. For example, working in global health, it is very important for me to travel. In the past I have often had to travel in the weekend or non-working hours. In my case family support is not always available and I have had to allocate significant financial resources to cover child care costs. The situation has improved as I have become more senior and have gained more confidence and am better able to choose more convenient travel arrangements, even if they are slightly more expensive. I have learnt to deal with this through experience, but it is practical issues such as these, that less experienced staff with family commitments may benefit from hearing.
Appendix 1: Self Assessment Team Biographies

Dr Dina Balabanova is a Senior Lecturer in Health Systems/Policy at the Department of Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. She has background in social science and a Masters in Social Policy and Administration, followed by PhD in Health Policy/Systems at the LSHTM. She has worked in various capacities in the LSHTM; in 2001-06, she led work on health systems in the former Soviet Union within the Health Systems Development Programme. Previously she has worked as a Regional Policy Adviser for Oxfam advising on programme development and advocacy-oriented research. She has conducted research on access to care and its determinants, governance, public-private engagement, affordability of care in middle and low-resource settings (informal payments and community financing) using a variety of study designs. She led the Good Health at Low Cost project examining why some countries are able to achieve better health and access to services than others at a similar level of income. Currently she is conducting research on health system responses to diabetes and hypertension; chronic diseases requiring complex inputs. She is involved in a range of multi-country collaborations and policy dialogue. She organises and teaches on the Health Systems module at the LSHTM.

Dr Cecile Knai is a Lecturer in European Health Policy in the Department of Health Services Research and Policy. She has BA in European History from McGill University and an MPH from UC Berkeley. In 1999 she joined the World Health Organization's Regional Office for Europe (in Copenhagen) and worked on food and nutrition policy until 2003. She then got her PhD in Public Health Policy at LSHTM. She is currently working on various aspects of European public health and health policy, most of which centre on the prevention and management of chronic diseases and risk factors. This includes research on obesity and inequalities in Europe, the impact of voluntary and other policy options on public health, and chronic care policy and practice across Europe. She is an associate editor on the journal Public Health Nutrition.

Dr Wenzel Geissler MSc,PhD,MPhil, PhD, studied zoology, history and social anthropology and teaches social anthropology in the Global Health Department. His most recent books are the monograph The Land is Dying (2010, with Ruth Prince), and Evidence, Ethos and Experiment: the anthropology and history of medical research in Africa (2011, with Sassy Molyneux).

Hilary Lowe is currently the Equality and Diversity Manager. She has and MA in Human Resource Management and Employment Studies and has experience of working as a Visiting Tutor teaching on CIPD courses and supervising MA dissertations on equality and health related issues. Hilary has worked in equality in the sector for 10 years and started her career as one of the first teachers in the country to hold a paid post for equalities.

Lindsay Mangham-Jefferies is a research fellow in Health Economics in the Department of Global Health and Development. She has a first degree in
Economics and Econometrics, a Masters in Political Economy and a Masters in Business Administration. She is studying part-time for a PhD. Lindsay joined LSHTM in 2007 having previously worked at the UK Department of International Development (DFID) and Oxford University. Her research interests are in the economics of health systems in low and middle income countries, with a focus on the cost-effectiveness of complex interventions to improve health service delivery. Lindsay is currently involved in the economic evaluation of interventions to improve malaria diagnosis and treatment in Cameroon and Nigeria, and leading the economics component of large-scale evaluations of maternal and newborn health interventions in Ethiopia, Nigeria and India.

**Dr Alec Miners** is a lecturer in Health Economics in the Department of Health Services Research. He has a BA(Hons) in Economics from the University of Central Lancashire and a MSc in Health Economics from the University of York. He also has a PhD in Public Health Medicine from University College London (UCL). Before joining the London School of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene (LSHTM) in 2006, he worked as a Research Assistant / Fellow at UCL and a Technical Advisor at the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). His main research interests are in applied economic evaluation and decision modelling. He is an associate editor on the Journal Sexually Transmitted Infections and is a committee member on one NICEs Technology Assessment panels.

**Dr Lucy Platt** is a lecturer in Public Health Epidemiology. She has a BA in Russian Studies and an MSc in Public Health. She joined the Faculty of Public Health and Policy in 2006 as part of the Centre for Research on Drugs and Health Behaviour. She has collaborated on multiple epidemiological studies measuring risk of HIV and risk behaviours among people who inject drugs including in Serbia, Estonia and Pakistan and led a mixed-method study examining the nature and determinants of sexually transmitted infections among migrant sex workers in London. Her main research interests include: epidemiology of drug use, HIV and sexually transmitted infections; combining qualitative and quantitative methods to measure mechanisms through which structural factors increase individual risk behaviour and vulnerability to HIV among drug users and sex workers.

**Meghna Ranganathan** is currently a PhD candidate with the Department of Global Health and Development. Her doctoral research is a mixed methods study to explore the determinants of transactional sex among young adolescent women in rural South Africa. A native of Mumbai, India, Meghna has worked for over 7 years in program design and research focused on issues concerning quality, equity and access to health care. Specific areas of interest and expertise are demand-side financing, social protection, market based solutions to address health care issues and public-private partnerships in health care. Her experience has been in South Africa, Unites States, Malawi and the United Kingdom.

**Professor Richard Smith** has been a Health Economist for over 20 years, following undergraduate and postgraduate studies in economics at the
University of York. Upon leaving York in 1991, he has worked in Sydney, Cambridge, Bristol, Melbourne and Norwich, before joining the LSHTM in May 2007. He has worked in a number of areas of health economics, such as the monetary and non-monetary valuation of health, health care reform and genomics. More recently his work has focused especially upon developing the application of macro-economics to health, the economics of globalization and health, and aspects of trade in health goods, services, people and ideas.

**Professor Charlotte Watts** is Sigrid Rausing Professor in Gender, Violence and Health Head of the Social and Mathematical Epidemiology Group in the Department of Global Health and Development, and research director of the DFID funded STRIVE Structural HIV drivers Research Programme Consortium. She originally trained as a mathematician, with further training in epidemiology, economics and social science methods, she has more than fifteen years experience in international HIV and violence research, and brings a strong multi-disciplinary perspective to the complex challenge of addressing HIV and violence against women. She has held several senior research and advisory positions, including acting as Core Research Team Member for the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence, Chair of the Expert Working Group to Assess the Global Burden of Inter-Personal Violence, Advisor to the UK Prevalence Study on the Mistreatment and Abuse of Older People, and Chair of the Public Health Benefits Working Group of the Rockefeller Foundation Microbicide Initiative. She has also served on WHO and UNAIDS Expert Consultations on HIV, violence against women, and on microbicides.

**Professor Paul Wilkinson** is full time Professor of Environmental Epidemiology. He was born and grew up in Somerset, trained in medicine and public health in Oxford and London, undertaking junior clinical posts mainly in cardiothoracic medicine, intensive care and oncology before beginning epidemiological research at the National Heart and Lung Institute (Royal Brompton and London Chest Hospitals) in 1990. From there he moved to the London School in 1994 to take up a position as lecturer in the Environmental Epidemiology Unit, now the Department of Social and Environmental Health Research, which he headed from 2003 to 2007. He has developed research interests in environmental influences on health, including climate change, and was appointed professor in 2012. The primary focus of his work is academic research, but he is also the teaching advisor for the Environment and Health stream of the MSc in Public Health, runs a module on Environmental Epidemiology and assists in the Distance Learning programme. He has had multiple advisory roles with the World Health Organization and other international bodies. He has one son aged seven years.
## LSHTM ATHENA SWAN ACTION PLAN

### Issue 1: Feedback from the BRONZE award, the analysis of the data over the past 3 years and the case studies has highlighted some potential barriers for women in relation to career development. There are many supportive policies in place already, but we note the following opportunities to further enhance and promote a career in the faculty of Public Health and Policy at LSHTM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Action items</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Progress and Outcomes</th>
<th>Status/Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify barriers to women progressing to senior posts</td>
<td>Continue to monitor numbers of staff, turnover rates, applicants and successful promotions, working part time vs. full time by grade and gender (the majority of staff working part-time are women)</td>
<td>SAT/Human Resources Department</td>
<td>Identify barriers faced by women working part-time and develop an appropriate action plan</td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise with the staff review committee the need to clarify requirements for promotion for staff working part time in the career map</td>
<td>Faculty Management Team, Dean of Faculty</td>
<td>Approval from FMG and presented at staff review committee. Develop action plan to update promotion policies</td>
<td>Raised at staff review committee in 2013</td>
<td>Develop action plan by June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify numbers of staff, applicants and promotions by funding status (core-HEFCE funding vs. research grants) so as to investigate issues for project funded staff and to assess differences in gender</td>
<td>Human Resources Department</td>
<td>To develop an appropriate action plan</td>
<td>Collection of data 2013-2014</td>
<td>Develop an action plan by January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify ways in which to systematically record length of time spent teaching on distant learning courses in order to more comprehensively monitor teaching load</td>
<td>Taught Course Director</td>
<td>To develop an action plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop an action plan by March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring for staff</td>
<td>Implement a strategy to support staff working part-time/flexibly or recently returned from a career break through a mentoring system or group meetings</td>
<td>SWAN champions</td>
<td>An inter-faculty team has been set up to discuss the best way to provide support and identify issues develop an action plan to address findings</td>
<td>Inter-faculty team to meet November 2012. Develop an action plan by February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness of potential mentors through Athena SWAN Faculty web page</td>
<td>SWAN champions</td>
<td>Named volunteers who have experience of working part time/taking career breaks for family reason will be published on the website for staff to contact for advice and support</td>
<td>Discussion of Athena SWAN web page has taken place at FMG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide testimonials from female staff about their experience on school website and Athena SWAN Faculty web page</td>
<td>SWAN champions</td>
<td>Staff will be approached to provide testimonials and it will be uploaded to website</td>
<td>An action plan for web page will be completed by Jan 2013 with the website up by March 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue with the initiative started after the School Bronze application, to promote career development opportunities through seminars covering: funding opportunities; development of proposals; and publication of research papers. To ensure that information from these seminars is also made available via email and web pages and particularly encourage female staff to participate.</td>
<td>Dean of Faculty</td>
<td>Career development managers will be approached to make presentations and handouts available on the LSHTM website.</td>
<td>Career development programme is on-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issue 2

Feedback from the BRONZE award, the analysis of the data over the past 3 years has highlighted some potential barriers for students in relation to transition from students to staff as well as combining work and research degrees. There are many supportive policies in place already and a high number of female students, but we note the following opportunities to further enhance the potential of students to pursue a career in the Faculty of Public Health and Policy at LSHTM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide further support for Research Degree students and post-doctoral researchers on developing an academic career</th>
<th>Continue with seminars led by faculty staff to orientate students and post-doc researchers on key research skills, such as writing scientific papers, and preparing funding applications to different research councils</th>
<th>RD supervisors, RD Coordinators, Head of Departments</th>
<th>Publicise opportunities on LSHTM email noticeboard, website and student induction materials</th>
<th>Action plan will be agreed at the next Research Degree Committee held in Spring 2012 (date tbc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage RD students to attend Research Proposal Workshops currently held 6 times a year to provide feedback on proposals developed prior to submission</td>
<td>Supervisors to encourage students to attend and present on their research in departmental seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Issue 3:** The analysis has revealed that there are many supportive family friendly policies in place within the Faculty, but some work could be done to enhance awareness of these policies and their uptake

| Disseminate current available family friendly /work life balance policies including in relation to preparation for REF | Promote on Faculty Athena SWAN page | SAT member, Faculty IT member | Posted on web page | Discussion of Athena SWAN web page has taken place at FMG
An action plan for web page will be completed by Jan 2013 with the web site up by March 2013

| Ensure these policies are discussed at FMG annually so as to remind managers to promote to all staff | Dean of Faculty, FMG | Meetings will be minuted | In process, FMG has already approved Athena SWAN action plan

| Additional support for women returning to work after maternity leave | Opportunities for women to seek advice from other staff who have experience of maternity leave and managing their work/life balance | SAT member | Potential mentors will be named on the SWAN Faculty website.
Further action plan to support women will be developed by the Inter Faculty working group | Inter Faculty group to meet in December 2012. Faculty members of working group have been agreed. |
### Issue 4: Promoting SWAN activities within the Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Action Plan Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote Athena SWAN in Faculty</td>
<td>SAT team</td>
<td>Agreement to set up a SWAN Champion network in the Faculty so as to aid disseminate information to staff and students and help identify issues and actions by 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate SWAN activities 2010-2015</td>
<td>SAT member</td>
<td>Completion of baseline survey and follow up of baseline to be implemented in 2013 and follow up in 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasise and maintain Athena SWAN presence in the Faculty</td>
<td>Dean of Faculty</td>
<td>Draft action plan that has been presented at FMG for comments and SWAN champions will be selected from each Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an Athena SWAN Faculty webpage</td>
<td>Faculty IT manager</td>
<td>Implemented 07/11/2012. Final version to be presented on 10th December 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote the Faculty as a SWAN recipient</td>
<td>SWAN champions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct tri-annual SAT meetings</td>
<td>SAT members</td>
<td>Meetings will be minuted with additional sub-group meetings for specific initiatives. Minutes will be available on the SWAN faculty website. First meeting scheduled for February 2013 and then on-going.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>