## "AdvanceHE

Athena SWAN: Bronze and Silver department applications

## Athena SWAN Bronze Department Awards

Recognise that in addition to institution-wide policies, the department is working to promote gender equality and to identify and address challenges particular to the department and discipline.

## Athena SWAN Silver Department Awards

In addition to the future planning required for Bronze department recognition, Silver department awards recognise that the department has taken action in response to previously identified challenges and can demonstrate the impact of the actions implemented.

Note: Not all institutions use the term 'department'. There are many equivalent academic groupings with different names, sizes and compositions. The definition of a 'department' can be found in the Athena SWAN awards handbook.

## Completing the form

## DO NOT ATTEMPT TO COMPLETE THIS APPLICATION FORM WITHOUT READING THE ATHENA SWAN AWARDS HANDBOOK.

This form should be used for applications for Bronze and Silver department awards.

You should complete each section of the application applicable to the award level you are applying for.

Additional areas for Silver applications are highlighted throughout the form.

If you need to insert a landscape page in your application, please copy and paste the template page at the end of the document, as per the instructions on that page. Please do not insert any section breaks as to do so will disrupt the page numbers.

## Word Count

The overall word limit for applications are shown in the following table.
There are no specific word limits for the individual sections and you may distribute words over each of the sections as appropriate. At the end of every section, please state how many words you have used in that section.

We have provided the following recommendations as a guide.

| Department application | Bronze | Word used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Word limit | 12,000 (including 500 for COVID and 1000 for large unit) | 11,514 |
| Recommended word count |  |  |
| 1.Letter of endorsement | 500 | 730 |
| 2.Description of the department | 500 | 480 |
| 3. Self-assessment process | 1,000 | 893 |
| 4. Picture of the department | 2,000 | 2,945 |
| 5. Supporting and advancing women careers | 6,000 | 6,145 |
| 6. Case studies | n/a | n/a |
| 7. Further information | 500 | 321 |
| Name of institution Un | University of Liverpool |  |
| Department Sc | School of the Arts |  |
| Focus of department | AHSSBL |  |
| Date of application 28 | $28^{\text {th }}$ May 2021 |  |
| Award Level Br | Bronze |  |
| Institution Athena SWAN awardDate: Nov 2016 Level: Silver |  |  |
| Contact for application <br> Must be based in the department | Dr Fei Chen Ms Stephanie Kehoe |  |
| Email $\begin{array}{ll}\text { fei } \\ & \text { Step }\end{array}$ | feichen@liverpool.ac.uk Stephanie.Kehoe@liverpool.ac.uk |  |
| Telephone 01 | $\begin{aligned} & 01517942620 \\ & 01517951287 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Departmental website htt | https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/arts/ |  |

## 1. Letter of endorsement from the head of department

Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words

An accompanying letter of endorsement from the head of department should be included. If the head of department is soon to be succeeded, or has recently taken up the post, applicants should include an additional short statement from the incoming head.

Note: Please insert the endorsement letter immediately after this cover page.

From: Athena Swan [Athena.Swan@advance-he.ac.uk](mailto:Athena.Swan@advance-he.ac.uk)
Sent: 30 April 2021 16:13
To: Middleton, Sally [sallyim@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:sallyim@liverpool.ac.uk); Athena Swan [Athena.Swan@advance-he.ac.uk](mailto:Athena.Swan@advance-he.ac.uk)
Cc: Kehoe, Stephanie [Stephanie.Kehoe@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:Stephanie.Kehoe@liverpool.ac.uk); Chen, Fei [feichen@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:feichen@liverpool.ac.uk)
Subject: RE: Request for extra word allowance

Hi Sally,

Thanks for your message. Yes we are happy to grant the School of the Arts at the University of Liverpool an additional 1,000 words for their April 2021 submission, given the same circumstances as previously detailed around their faculty-like structure with several units. As before, the additional words are to allow the School to analyse the data effectively by gender for each unit/discipline, and detail the relevant challenges and opportunities.

Please include a copy of this email at the front of the application.

With best wishes,

Jess

Jessica Kitsell
Equality Charters Adviser
Preferred pronouns: she/her
E jessica.kitsell@advance-he.ac.uk
T +44 (0)20 74381025
See how Advance HE is supporting you during the COVID-19 pandemic with new member benefits and updates to services, programmes and events

From: Middleton, Sally [Sally.Middleton@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:Sally.Middleton@liverpool.ac.uk)
Sent: 29 April 2021 09:25
To: Athena Swan [Athena.Swan@advance-he.ac.uk](mailto:Athena.Swan@advance-he.ac.uk)
Cc: Kehoe, Stephanie [Stephanie.Kehoe@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:Stephanie.Kehoe@liverpool.ac.uk); Chen, Fei [Fei.Chen@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:Fei.Chen@liverpool.ac.uk)
Subject: Request for extra word allowance

Dear Athena SWAN team,

I'm writing to ask if it would be possible for our School of the Arts to be granted an additional 1,000 words for their application being submitted at the end of May? I realise that we have passed the two month deadline to request this, however the School were granted extra words for their last application (see attached) and didn't realise that this wouldn't automatically be carried over to this new application. We only realised that there had been confusion over this when discussing their application earlier this week.

As with their previous request for extra words, this is due to the complex make up of their School which consists of five departments. The departments differ in their staff/student profiles as well as having quite specific challenges around improving equality relating to their field. The additional words would be used to analyse the data effectively for each department and explain the context and challenges across the School.

I appreciate that this is short notice, but we would be very grateful if you were able to grant this extra word allowance. If you require any further information from us, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Many Thanks,

Sally

Sally Middleton (Pronouns: She/Her)
Gender Equality Officer
Equality \& Engagement Team

Human Resources Department
University of Liverpool
Hart Building
Mount Pleasant
Liverpool
L3 5TQ

Email: Sally.Middleton@liv.ac.uk

Tel: 01517946834

Dear Athena SWAN,
I am very proud to give my endorsement to this application. The School made an unsuccessful application in 2019, receiving useful and constructive feedback that has guided us this time. The feedback included the need to carry out more local and nuanced analysis in our five Departments, which we agreed and have done. The feedback also suggested that the Departments apply separately for Bronze Awards. In our case this was not possible, since all Professional Service support, budgets, decision- and policy-making are located at School level, and therefore the power to implement and monitor an action plan lies with the School. Indeed, at the University of Liverpool, AS awards are already held by many other Schools of our shape and size. For this reason, we welcomed the recommendation in Prof. Buckingham's review of Athena SWAN that larger units comprising cognate disciplines be encouraged to apply.

There have been a number of changes and developments since our 2019 application. For example, we had set ourselves as a key action to diversify the academic leadership of the School, which at the time had only two women in eleven positions on the extended School Management Team. We committed to advertising openly all Schoollevel roles and actively encouraged women to apply for such roles when they came up. Women now make up $33 \%$ of our SMT, and from August 2021 it will be 50\%. In 2020 the School also established its EDI committee, arising from an action in our 2019 application. Dr Fei Chen, the Chair of the EDI Committee, who is also the Athena SWAN academic lead, joined the extended SMT, and EDI is now a standing item on all School committee agendas. Each Department now has an EDI Champion and local working groups that lead Department-specific analysis and projects, including Athena SWAN. As a result, another key objective of our 2019 application has been productively advanced: to raise the profile and importance of gender equality and other EDI matters within the School, with the EDI committee proving a dynamic driver of positive change.

Our Action Plan this time covers many aspects of gender equality in the School, but three have emerged as most significant and urgent:

- a gendered award gap for UG and PGT students at First Class and Distinction level
- the progression and promotion of women, especially to Professorial positions
- the concerns expressed by academics about work-life balance, often exacerbated by the pandemic, although many have welcomed aspects of 'hybrid' working

It will be my responsibility, along with my Senior Management Team, to ensure that this plan is implemented and appropriately supported, including financially, whether or not this application is successful.

I have a strong personal commitment to Equality and Diversity and firmly believe that an equal and more diverse workplace is richer and more effective. At my previous institution, I was a member of the University's EDI Committee and worked closely on our push to address the attainment gap for our BAME students, leading on the project in my School. I have also mentored many female and BAME colleagues, and supported their participation in Aurora and StellarHE programmes. Women I have mentored have gone on to be Heads of School, Associate Deans, and in one case a PVC. I have been actively involved in the School's Athena SWAN self-assessment team since 2018, and drafted parts of section 4 in our previous application. I recruited to the SAT the Head of School Operations, Steve Winterton, and we invested in AS by appointing a Projects and Data Coordinator, Steph Kehoe, who is also AS PS Lead. I also led focus groups on gender equality with undergraduates, and worked with the Associate Dean Research on the design of our EDI research survey as part of our School research gender audit.

There are many initiatives in the School that promote gender equality - to mention just three, the student-led Femin.AE group in Architecture, the hugely successful 'Women in Music' event in 2021, and the Minerva's Owl project in Communication and Media. It is therefore a good moment to address the areas of concern that our analysis has identified. As a School we are wholeheartedly committed to addressing these issues. Finally, I confirm that the information presented in this application (including qualitative and quantitative data) is an honest, accurate and true representation of the School of the Arts.

Yours sincerely


Professor Peter Buse
Dean of the School of the Arts

| Abbreviations |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| AD | Associate Dean |
| ARCH | Architecture (Department) |
| AS | Athena SWAN |
| C\&M | Communications and Media (Department) |
| ECA | Early Career Academic |
| ECR | Early Career Researcher |
| EDI | Equality, Diversity and Inclusion |
| ENGL | English (Department) |
| F | Female |
| FT | Full Time |
| FTE | Full-Time Equivalent |
| HEA | Higher Education Academy |
| HESA | Higher Education Statistics Authority |
| HoD | Head of Department |

```
HoSO Head of School Operations
HR
HSS
KIT
LDC
M
MRE
MUSI
NSS
OST
PDR
PGR
PGT
PHIL
PPF
PS Professional Service staff
PT Part time
R&S Recruitment and Selection
RAE Research Assessment Exercise
RDIF Research Development and Initiative Fund
REF Research Excellence Framework
RO Research Only (contract pathway)
SAT Self-Assessment Team
SE Student Experience Team
SMT School Management Team
SOTA
T&R
T&S
UB Unconscious Bias (Training)
UG Undergraduate
UoL University of Liverpool
WP Widening Participation
Y/Y Year on Year for data comparison
Data sources used
Higher Education Statistics Agency Staff Record 2014/15 - 2019/20;
Higher Education Statistics Agency Student Record 2014/15 - 2019/20;
SOTA data: Staff Culture Survey 2018; focus groups with staff who have caring
responsibilities 2020; Research survey 2020;
Staff data, University of Liverpool Human Resources, snapshot date up to Jan 2021;
Student data, University of Liverpool Human Resources, snapshot date up to Jan
2021
References used
RIBA Business Benchmarking 2020
Ofqual 'A-Levels in 2019'
```

UK Music Diversity Report 2020
Women in Philosophy in the UK: A report by the British Philosophical Association and the Society for Women in Philosophy UK, 2011
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## 2. Description of the Department

Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words
Please provide a brief description of the department including any relevant contextual information. Present data on the total number of academic staff, professional and support staff and students by gender.
The School of the Arts (SOTA) was established in 2010, bringing together five academic departments: Architecture, Communication and Media (C\&M), English, Music, and Philosophy. It is led by the Dean with support from the School's Head of Operations (HoSO) and the School Management Team (SMT) (Figure 2.1). The executive SMT consists of Associate Deans in Education, Research \& Impact, and Strategy, as well as five Heads of Departments (HoDs) providing academic leadership and line management for staff in their disciplines. The extended SMT also includes the EDI lead, Recruitment and Admission lead and Director of PGR. Each HoD is supported by a Deputy Head and Departmental leads in Education, Research \& Impact, Admissions, Internationalisation, Employability, and Equality, Diversity \& Inclusion (EDI). The EDI structure was formed in early 2020 based on the previous Athena SWAN self-assessment team (SAT).


Figure 2.1 - SOTA Executive SMT structure (2021) women highlighted in orange. The membership of extended SMT is explained in the text (Figure was treated for anonymising reason).

As of January 2021, SOTA employs 276 academic staff on one of the three career pathways: Teaching and Research (134, 44\%F), Teaching and Scholarship (127, $30 \%$ F), and Research-Only (15, 53\%F) (Figure 2.2). They each belong to one of the Departments below.

|  | T\&S |  |  | T\&R |  |  | RO |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dept | F | M | F\% | F | $\mathbf{M}$ | F\% | F | M | F\% |
| ARCH | 11 | 39 | $22 \%$ | 12 | 20 | $38 \%$ | 1 | 4 | $20 \%$ |
| C\&M | 3 | 2 | $60 \%$ | 17 | 13 | $57 \%$ | 3 | 1 | $75 \%$ |
| ENGL | 11 | 4 | $73 \%$ | 20 | 21 | $49 \%$ | 2 | 2 | $50 \%$ |
| MUSI | 10 | 37 | $21 \%$ | 6 | 11 | $35 \%$ | 1 | 0 | $100 \%$ |
| PHIL | 2 | 7 | $22 \%$ | 4 | 9 | $31 \%$ | 1 | 0 | $100 \%$ |
| SOTA | 1 | 0 | $100 \%$ | 0 | 1 | $0 \%$ | 0 | 0 |  |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{3 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 4} \%$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{5 3} \%$ |

Figure 2.2 - SOTA academic demographics by contract types (2021)
The PS staff in SOTA ( $66,56 \% \mathrm{~F}$ ) provide a common service for the five departments, organised into the following teams: Marketing, Recruitment and Events (MRE), Research and Impact, Finance, Operations Support, Technical Support, and Student Experience (Figure 2.3). PS staff are employed on one of the three contract types: Clerical Grades 1-6 (30, 80\% F), Technical Grades 1-6 (14, 21\% F), and Professional Management, Specialist Administration Grades 6 and above (22, 59\% F) (Figure 2.4).


Figure 2.3 - SOTA's PS management structure (2021) with female team leaders highlighted in orange (Figure was treated for anonymising reason).


Figure 2.4 - SOTA PS staff split by gender and grade (2021)
Figure 2.5 shows the student demographics at the UG, PGT and PGR levels. The School not only offers a wide range of single honours programmes, but also interdisciplinary programmes at both the undergraduate and postgraduate levels. Combined Degrees in the School include, e.g., BA English and Philosophy, BA Game Design (a collaboration among SOTA subjects and Computer Science, launching in 2021-22), and BA Philosophy, Politics and Economics. The synergy is also evident in cross-discipline research centres, programmes and projects, such as the Stapledon Centre for Speculative Futures; the annual Liverpool Public Lectures in the Arts; and the AHRC-funded 'COVID-19 CARE: Culture and the Arts'.

|  | 2020/21 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{M}$ | TOTAL | F\% |
| ARCH | 1298 | 791 | 2089 | $62 \%$ |
| C\&M | 231 | 112 | 343 | $67 \%$ |
| ENGL | 82 | 74 | 156 | $53 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 6 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 8 8}$ | $62 \%$ |

Figure 2.5 - SOTA student demographics by degree levels (2021)
Through shared governance, resources, infrastructure and active research collaborations among staff, SOTA has fully integrated the five subjects. The School is located in Abercromby Square with Departments' own teaching and office spaces and shared conference facilities, meeting spaces, PGR workspaces, and seminar rooms (Figure 2.6). Staff have been working from home since March 2020 with mostly online teaching. The spaces have been made COVID secure and prepared to be open following further government guidance at the time of writing.

The University has made a significant investment (over £25 million) in recent years to improve facilities and construct new buildings for the School. This includes the refurbishment of the Gordon Stephenson building and Sir Alastair Pilkington building, and the new Tung Auditorium.


Gordon Stephenson Building
Figure 2.6-The School's locations and the renderings of the new buildings

## 3. The self-assessment process

Recommended word count: Bronze: 1000 words | Silver: 1000 words

Describe the self-assessment process. This should include:
(i) a description of the self-assessment team;

SOTA's SAT has been active since early 2017 and steered the previous AS submission. It formally transitioned into a School EDI Committee in Jan 2020 following a similar transition of the faculty Athena SWAN (AS) working group. The School committee's primary focus has been gender equality and the preparation of the AS resubmission. The committee is co-chaired by the academic lead Dr Fei Chen and the PS lead Ms Stephanie Kehoe. They are supported by five Departmental EDI Champions and a PS Champion, who each lead a working group in their respective Department. Two student representatives ( $1 \mathrm{~F}, 1 \mathrm{M}$ ) were recruited in September 2020, following an open call via the School EDI email address. There are also studentled EDI groups established in Architecture and English. As the School has varying staff and student demographics, this sub-structure embeds EDI within each

Department and the PS teams to carry out meaningful local actions (Figure 3.1 and 3.2).

EDI Champions were appointed via expressions of interest to the HoDs in each Department. The Associate Deans, five HoDs and PS team leaders are also part of the EDI committee. Together with the two EDI leads, they formed the core selfassessment team and have been actively contributing to the AS application (Figure 3.1). The appointed Champions ( $4 \mathrm{~F}, 3 \mathrm{M}$ ) also created their working groups in the Department (Figure 3.2) which attracted many ECA colleagues (50\% of the working groups) who are keen to contribute. The full EDI committee includes 31 women and 18 men at different career stages and contract pathways ( $63 \%$ F). They also vary in terms of age, ethnicity, social background, and parental/carer responsibilities. The gender split of the EDI team doesn't represent the gender profile of our staff so will be actioned on (Action 3.1).

To ensure the SAT members have time to conduct EDI activities, the Academic Lead receives 297 hours in SOTA's workload model (PPF), and each EDI Champion receives an allocation of 99 hours (split roles share the allowance). PS staff do not have a formal workload model, so their line managers were consulted to ensure they have time to participate.

| Name | Gender | Role \& Personal Details | Contract |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| EDI/AS Leads |  |  |  |  |
| Fei Chen |  |  |  |  |
| Steph Kehoe |  |  |  |  |
| Departmental Champions |  |  |  |  |
| Nick Webb |  |  |  |  |
| Juliana Kei |  |  |  |  |
| Gary Needham |  |  |  |  |
| Natalie Hanna |  |  |  |  |
| Mike Jones |  |  |  |  |
| Katherine Furman |  |  |  |  |
| Emily Kelly |  |  |  |  |
| Other SAT Members |  |  |  |  |
| Andrea Alfonso |  |  |  |  |
| Soumyen <br> Bandyopadhyay |  |  |  |  |
| Katia Balabanova |  |  |  |  |
| Peter Buse |  |  |  |  |
| Fintan Dineen |  |  |  |  |
| Glenda Gaspard |  |  |  |  |
| Michael Hauskeller |  |  |  |  |
| Alys Jones |  |  |  |  |


| Jane Lloyd |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Greg Lynall |  |  |  |
| Tracy Mann |  |  |  |
| Naszin Nasiru-Carew |  |  |  |
| Kay O'Halloran |  |  |  |
| David Summersgill |  |  |  |
| Catherine Tackley |  |  |  |
| Helen Thomas |  |  |  |
| Melanie Williams |  |  |  |
| Steven Winterton |  |  |  |
| Nathan Yearsley |  |  |  |
| Figur 3.1: There SAT |  |  |  |

Figure 3.1: The core SAT members managing the re-submission of AS application (Table was treated for anonymising reason)

| Departmental Working group | Gender | Role and person details | Contract |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Architecture |  |  |  |
| Sandy Britton |  |  |  |
| Hanmei Chen |  |  |  |
| Jiangtao Du |  |  |  |
| Anna Gidman |  |  |  |
| Francesca Pizazzoni |  |  |  |
| C\&M |  |  |  |
| Paolo Ruffino |  |  |  |
| Katherine Whitehurst |  |  |  |
| English |  |  |  |
| Sofia Lampropoulou |  |  |  |
| Ursula Kania |  |  |  |
| Bethan Roberts |  |  |  |
| Alex Broadhead |  |  |  |
| Siobhan Chapman |  |  |  |
| Lotte Verheijen |  |  |  |
| Morven Cook |  |  |  |
| Music |  |  |  |
| Freya Jarman |  |  |  |
| Oli Carman |  |  |  |
| Holly Tessler |  |  |  |
| Toni James |  |  |  |
| Ruth Minton |  |  |  |
| Richard Worth |  |  |  |
| Lee Tsang |  |  |  |
| Simran Singh |  |  |  |


| Philosophy |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Laura Gow |  |  |  |
| Robert James |  |  |  |
| McKenna |  |  |  |
| Vid Simoniti |  |  |  |
| PS |  |  |  |
| Dan Brown |  |  |  |
| Charlotte Fairclough |  |  |  |

Figure 3.2: The Departmental working group members. Together with the core SAT, they form the full SOTA EDI committee (Table was treated for anonymising reason)

SOTA's EDI committee reports to the Faculty EDI Committee. The two SOTA leads attend Faculty meetings at least four times a year. The PS lead is also a member of the evidence sub-group to assist with data gathering and analysis in Schools.

The SOTA leads also report to a University-level AS steering group, sharing best practice and reporting on progress with colleagues across the University (Figure 3.2).


Figure 3.3: EDI structure in the University, Faculty and SOTA
(ii) an account of the self-assessment process;

AS activities were formally discussed within the EDI Committee meetings four times a year. The EDI leads have monthly catchups with each Departmental Champion and student reps to consult action points, monitor progress and provide support.

Since October 2020, the Leads have met fortnightly with the Dean and HoSO to discuss the AS application resubmission. Data and initial drafts were coordinated by the two leads and enriched by SMT and Departmental Champions subsequently. The draft has also received feedback from various people in the Faculty and the University.

Figure 3.3 summarises SAT activities to date including how the SAT has addressed the panel's recommendation following an unsuccessful application.

| Timeline | Data <br> Collected/Analysed | Key Findings | Actions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { May } \\ 2018 \end{array}$ | AS Staff Survey, 90 responses, 33\% response rate <br> Further investigation through staff interviews and student consultation | Identified three key areas: gendered awarding gap in UG and PGT students; under representation of women in leadership roles; uneven awareness of EDI agenda in the School. | Open recruitment of school roles including the EDI roles; Promoting Unconscious Bias training; Staff participation in recruitment decision-making; Nominate at least one female colleague per year for University Leadership programme; Establish a SOTA ECR/ECA network. |
| Jan 2019 | Additional HR staff data | Confirmed the key areas mentioned above. | Improved gender balance in staff in Architecture; Philosophy's adoption of the SWIP Good Practice Scheme |
| Oct 2019 | Progressed AS agenda and reviewed EDI priorities in the SMT Away Days | Set out School \& Departmental EDI priorities | Preparation for the SAT's transition to a School EDI structure |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Early } \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Created the SOTA Staff and Student Dashboard with updated data | Identified Departmental gender gaps | Departmental specific AS projects proposed (See below) and monitored |
| Jun 2020 | Gendered Office space analysis by the PS lead | Gender gap in office space occupation | Actions included in this application |
| Later half of 2020 | University RISE Survey Phase 1 (Research in an inclusive and sustainable environment) | Gendered impact of the pandemic on research | Benchmarking SOTA data with University data; Record the impact of pandemic in PDR |


|  | SOTA EDI Research <br> Survey for all <br> academic staff, 112 <br> responses, 98 <br> complete responses, <br> 39\% response rate | Gender gap in research <br> support and <br> environment | Recommendations <br> on REF, PGR <br> supervision, and <br> research <br> environment which <br> are included in this <br> application |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dec | SOTA working from <br> home (WFH) focus <br> group, 6 participants <br> from all Departments | Impact of WFH on staff | Actions included in <br> this application |
| 2020 | Additional HR staff <br> and student data | Findings included in this <br> application | Actions included in <br> this application |
| Feb <br> 2021 |  |  |  |

Figure 3.4: SAT activities to provide information for this application.
Informed by data both from the previous application and recent updates, the Champions were encouraged to assess gender inequality and other EDI issues in their local areas and propose projects to address them. Their activities form the key parts of this application and include:

- All Departments working on decentring or diversifying curricula of taught programmes and analysing gender representation in course materials and other EDI issues. PS Lead completed a separate analysis of SOTA reading lists to complement Departmental work.
- PS - Coordinated by the PS Champion, a School-wide guest lecture series 'Making a difference in the real world' delivered by international key figures between April and May 2021, funded by the University Beacon Fund; and a film of the slavery-related history of Abercromby Square building is planned.
- Architecture - scoping exercise of expanding recruitment channels to encourage women to apply for Professorships; Student-led EDI groups established in Feb 2021 including Women in Architecture (Femin.AE); Queer Students in Architecture etc. Each group circulates their newsletter in the Department regularly.
- Communication and Media (C\&M) - supporting female academics during the COVID-19 crisis through informal meetings (Minerva's Owl project), publication workshops and mentoring ECRs
- English - Analysing undergraduate and postgraduate student awarding and progression gaps between genders and addressing them.
- Music - partnership with external institutions and charitable organisations, such as the Philharmonic Hall, In Harmony and RESONATE, to address gender imbalance in student recruitment and progression
- Philosophy - assessing the gendered PGT awarding gap and implementing mitigating measures

Consultation was undertaken through the EDI standing item on the School's Education Committee, R\&I Committee and SMT, as well as regular meetings with other Schools in the University during preparation of the AS application.
(iii) plans for the future of the self-assessment team.

The Committee will continue sharing best practice across the School, Faculty, and University. Our EDI structure, specifically the Departmental Champions, have been promoted across the University as an example of best practice.

Since the unsuccessful application in 2019, we have acknowledged the challenge of data availability and accessibility. SOTA's Leads have worked with central teams to identify gaps and areas of missing data which has fed into university-wide projects, such as the University staff survey, the Data Improvement Project (DIP), as well as the set-up of Tableau workspaces (Action 3.2). Whilst writing the application, we also recognised that benchmarking data for C\&M industries has been difficult to acquire so we have proposed actions to tackle these (Action 3.3).

As the University has signed the Race Equality Charter in March 2021, the EDI committee will extend its activities in the future, but we will ensure that the AS action plan remains a priority.

## Key issues

Gender imbalance in the EDI committee; Lack of subject benchmark data in relevant industries and the need to capture new data to assess the effectiveness of actions in the future.

## Actions to address issues:

- 3.1 - Monitor gender split of EDI membership with the aim to increase participation of men, particularly in English
- 3.2 - Continue working with key colleagues at all levels to improve the availability of data, both quantitative and qualitative. This will be achieved through the bi-annual staff and student surveys, created at Faculty level
- 3.3 - Work with external organisations to improve data collection, as the SOTA analysis has identified the lack of benchmarking data, particularly in C\&M


## 4. A picture of the department

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

## A. Student data

If courses in the categories below do not exist, please enter $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$.
(i) Numbers of men and women on access or foundation courses;

N/A
(ii) Numbers of undergraduate students by gender;

Full- and part-time by programme. Provide data on course applications, offers, and acceptance rates, and degree attainment by gender.

This section used HESA benchmarking data for subject-level comparison as listed below (Figure 4.1). In summary, we have identified gendered awarding gap in all departments, particularly at the $1^{\text {st }}$ degree level.

| SOTA / Department | HESA subject grouping (JACS) and (CAH) |
| :--- | :--- |
| SOTA | SOTA benchmark created as an average of all 5 <br> departments listed below |
| Architecture | Architecture (K1)(13-01-03) |
| C\&M | Media Studies (P3)(18-01-05) |
| English | English Studies (Q3)(19-01-01) |
| Music | Music (W3) (21-01-05) |
| Philosophy | Philosophy (V5)(20-02-01) |

Figure 4.1 - HESA benchmark sources for student data

SOTA has consistently had a higher proportion of UG women (ave. 62\%) than men between 2015/16 and 2020/21. SOTA's F\% has also surpassed the HESA F\% benchmark by between 1-7\% each year (Figure 4.2, Figure 4.3). SOTA has no parttime students recruited into any UG programmes.


Figure 4.4 - UG population split by Gender and Department (2015/16 - 2020/21)


Figure 4.5 - UG total F\% in each department (2015/16 - 2020/21)
Each department has matched or surpassed their respective subject benchmarks and seen a steady F\% growth Y/Y, with English having the highest number of women (425) and F\% (80\%) in 20/21 (Figure 4.4, Figure 4.5). Only Music's F\% marginally falls beneath the HESA benchmark ( -1 to $-6 \%$ ), but Music has recruited more students $\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{Y}$.

C\&M's F\% of student population is consistently between $15-25 \%$ above HESA benchmarks. Whilst the number of men has slowly increased $Y / Y$, improving the gender balance, this phenomenon of large F\% requires further investigation (Action 4.1).

Architecture, C\&M and English have a year-two entry of students from a partner university in China, Xi'an Jiaotong Liverpool University (XJTLU). After receiving a briefing from the three Departments in SOTA, students in China decide in year two of their studies (equivalent to year one at Liverpool) whether to transfer to Liverpool or remain to complete their degree.

Each year female XJTLU students have made up at least $20 \%$ of the UG cohorts in Architecture and C\&M, except last year when international recruitment was affected by COVID-19. Whilst the XJTLU entry contributed positively to the Departments' overall F\%, the non-XJTLU F\% in the three departments is still higher than HESA benchmarks (Figure 4.6).

|  |  | XJTLU students |  |  |  | Non-XJTLU students |  |  |  | XJTLU F as <br> $\%$ of Total F | XJTLU F as \% of Total Student |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dept | Year | F | M | Total | \%F | F | M | Total | \%F |  |  |
| UUUUU | 2015/16 | 168 | 102 | 270 | 62\% | 195 | 255 | 450 | 43\% | 46\% | 23\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 137 | 85 | 222 | 62\% | 217 | 228 | 445 | 49\% | 39\% | 21\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 130 | 71 | 201 | 65\% | 241 | 233 | 474 | 51\% | 35\% | 19\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 161 | 102 | 263 | 61\% | 223 | 226 | 449 | 50\% | 42\% | 23\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 143 | 113 | 256 | 56\% | 219 | 231 | 450 | 49\% | 40\% | 20\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 89 | 64 | 153 | 58\% | 265 | 247 | 512 | 52\% | 25\% | 13\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sum_{\infty}^{\infty}$ | 2015/16 | 61 | 8 | 69 | 88\% | 143 | 56 | 199 | 72\% | 30\% | 23\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 72 | 9 | 81 | 89\% | 181 | 56 | 237 | 76\% | 28\% | 23\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 82 | 9 | 91 | 90\% | 199 | 79 | 278 | 72\% | 29\% | 22\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 102 | 15 | 117 | 87\% | 223 | 93 | 316 | 71\% | 31\% | 24\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 85 | 17 | 102 | 83\% | 216 | 93 | 309 | 70\% | 28\% | 21\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 44 | 9 | 53 | 83\% | 238 | 96 | 334 | 71\% | 16\% | 11\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 害 | 2015/16 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 80\% | 308 | 115 | 423 | 73\% | 1\% | 1\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 7 |  | 7 | 100\% | 357 | 133 | 490 | 73\% | 2\% | 1\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 7 |  | 7 | 100\% | 411 | 145 | 556 | 74\% | 2\% | 1\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 89\% | 404 | 132 | 536 | 75\% | 2\% | 1\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 11 | 3 | 14 | 79\% | 402 | 115 | 517 | 78\% | 3\% | 2\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 12 | 2 | 14 | 86\% | 413 | 106 | 519 | 80\% | 3\% | 2\% |

Figure 4.6 - XJTLU students by Gender and Department from 2015/16 to 20/21

## UG Applications, Offers and Registrations

SOTA has seen an increase in application numbers from women between 2015/16 and 2020/21, and they made up $62 \%$ of all applications on average (Figure 4.7). This may be partly due to the removal of the cap on universities' recruitment capacity in $2015 / 16$. The offer rates for women are consistently higher than that of men $(84 \% \mathrm{~F}$, $73 \% \mathrm{M}$ ), but the registration rates of women and men are comparable ( $22 \% \mathrm{~F}$, $21 \%$ M). Similar observations can be identified at the Departmental level and there is no obvious gender gap in the recruitment pipeline in any Department.

| Year | Female | Male | Total | F\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2015 / 16$ | 2080 | 1458 | 3538 | $59 \%$ |
| $2016 / 17$ | 2419 | 1480 | 3906 | $62 \%$ |
| $2017 / 18$ | 2518 | 1541 | 4059 | $62 \%$ |
| $2018 / 19$ | 2330 | 1448 | 3778 | $62 \%$ |
| $2019 / 20$ | 2365 | 1355 | 3720 | $64 \%$ |
| $2020 / 21$ | 2567 | 1500 | 4068 | $63 \%$ |

Figure 4.7 - SOTA UG applications by gender (15/16 - 20/21)

C\&M has not only seen an increase in the number of applications from women but also $\mathrm{F} \% \mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{Y}$. A similar trend is identified in Music. F\% in applications increased in English due to a gradual decrease in applications from men (Action 4.1). According to Ofqual data for 2019, the number of school children, particularly boys taking

English (Literature, Language and combined) at A-level has decreased over the past decade, partly due to changes to the national curriculum at GCSE (Ofqual, 2019). The application offers and registration numbers in Architecture and Philosophy have remained stable (Figure 4.8, Figure 4.9).

| DEPT | Gender | Apps | Offs | Regs | \% Apps to Offs | \% Offs to Regs | \% Apps to Regs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ARCH | Female | 3695 | 2561 | 956 | 69\% | 37\% | 26\% |
|  | Male | 3334 | 1993 | 795 | 60\% | 40\% | 24\% |
|  | Total | 7029 | 4554 | 1751 | 65\% | 38\% | 25\% |
|  | \% Female | 53\% | 56\% | 55\% |  |  |  |
| C\&M | Female | 2561 | 2223 | 690 | 87\% | 31\% | 27\% |
|  | Male | 890 | 728 | 206 | 82\% | 28\% | 23\% |
|  | Total | 3451 | 2951 | 896 | 86\% | 30\% | 26\% |
|  | \% Female | 74\% | 75\% | 77\% |  |  |  |
| ENGL | Female | 5276 | 4709 | 795 | 89\% | 17\% | 15\% |
|  | Male | 1581 | 1270 | 246 | 80\% | 19\% | 16\% |
|  | Total | 6857 | 5979 | 1041 | 87\% | 17\% | 15\% |
|  | \% Female | 77\% | 79\% | 76\% |  |  |  |
| MUSI | Female | 1120 | 849 | 201 | 76\% | 24\% | 18\% |
|  | Male | 1521 | 1040 | 280 | 68\% | 27\% | 18\% |
|  | Total | 2641 | 1889 | 481 | 72\% | 25\% | 18\% |
|  | \% Female | 42\% | 45\% | 42\% |  |  |  |
| PHIL | Female | 1761 | 1639 | 330 | 93\% | 20\% | 19\% |
|  | Male | 1493 | 1337 | 265 | 90\% | 20\% | 18\% |
|  | Total | 3254 | 2976 | 595 | 91\% | 20\% | 18\% |
|  | \% Female | 54\% | 55\% | 55\% |  |  |  |

Figure 4.8 - Total UG applications, offers and registrations split by gender and department from 2015/16 to 2020/21


|  | Year | Female | Male | Total | F\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2015/16 | 621 | 649 | 1270 | 49\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 563 | 517 | 1082 | 52\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 609 | 534 | 1143 | 53\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 573 | 516 | 1089 | 53\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 568 | 485 | 1053 | 54\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 732 | 622 | 1355 | 54\% |
| $\underset{0}{\Sigma}$ | 2015/16 | 337 | 126 | 463 | 73\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 430 | 152 | 586 | 73\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 443 | 173 | 616 | 72\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 444 | 147 | 591 | 75\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 398 | 136 | 534 | 75\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 480 | 155 | 635 | 76\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{0}}{\overline{0}} \\ & \text { 든 } \end{aligned}$ | 2015/16 | 713 | 298 | 1011 | 71\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 1009 | 324 | 1334 | 76\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 973 | 310 | 1283 | 76\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 833 | 223 | 1056 | 79\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 883 | 230 | 1113 | 79\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 874 | 211 | 1085 | 81\% |
| $\stackrel{00}{n}$ | 2015/16 | 162 | 205 | 367 | 44\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 161 | 273 | 434 | 37\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 182 | 273 | 455 | 40\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 177 | 265 | 442 | 40\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 206 | 226 | 432 | 48\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 212 | 271 | 483 | 44\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 흥 } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { 음 } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | 2015/16 | 247 | 180 | 427 | 58\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 256 | 214 | 470 | 54\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 311 | 251 | 562 | 55\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 303 | 297 | 600 | 51\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 310 | 278 | 588 | 53\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 269 | 241 | 510 | 53\% |

Figure 4.9 - UG applications by gender and department (2015/16 - 2020/21)

## UG Awards

In the period analysed, SOTA's UG women are more likely to achieve a 2.1 grade (av. $64 \%$ ) compared to men (av. 56\%). However, men are more likely to achieve a 1 st degree (av. 22\%) than women (av. 16\%) (Figure 4.10).


Figure 4.10 - SOTA UG awards (2015/16 - 2019/20)

| Dept | Gender | 1st |  |  | 2.1 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3/Pass |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | HESA | SOTA | \% Dif | HESA | SOTA | \% Dif | HESA | SOTA | \% Dif | HESA | SOTA | \% Dif |
| ARCH | F | 27\% | 19\% | -8\% | 40\% | 56\% | 16\% | 27\% | 23\% | -4\% | 6\% | 2\% | -4\% |
|  | M | 27\% | 26\% | -1\% | 44\% | 48\% | 4\% | 23\% | 23\% | 0\% | 6\% | 2\% | -4\% |
| C\&M | F | 25\% | 8\% | -17\% | 56\% | 60\% | 4\% | 17\% | 29\% | 12\% | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% |
|  | M | 21\% | 9\% | -12\% | 51\% | 45\% | -6\% | 23\% | 40\% | 17\% | 4\% | 6\% | 2\% |
| ENGL | F | 25\% | 17\% | -8\% | 61\% | 75\% | 14\% | 12\% | 8\% | -4\% | 2\% | 1\% | -1\% |
|  | M | 26\% | 14\% | -12\% | 56\% | 74\% | 18\% | 16\% | 11\% | -5\% | 3\% | 0\% | -3\% |
| MUSI | F | 31\% | 29\% | -2\% | 55\% | 59\% | 4\% | 12\% | 11\% | -1\% | 2\% | 2\% | 0\% |
|  | M | 29\% | 26\% | -3\% | 51\% | 59\% | 8\% | 17\% | 14\% | -3\% | 3\% | 1\% | -2\% |
| PHIL | F | 25\% | 15\% | -10\% | 64\% | 77\% | 13\% | 10\% | 7\% | -3\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% |
|  | M | 28\% | 17\% | -11\% | 58\% | 69\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 0\% | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% |
| SOTA | F | 26\% | 16\% | -10\% | 58\% | 64\% | 6\% | 14\% | 18\% | 4\% | 2\% | 2\% | 0\% |
|  | M | 26\% | 22\% | -4\% | 52\% | 56\% | 4\% | 19\% | 21\% | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% | -2\% |

Figure 4.11 - Total UG awards achieved between 15/16-19/20 in comparison to average of HESA benchmarks of same period.

Compared to the average HESA benchmarks in the last five years, all departments are negatively divergent for both men (SOTA avg. -4\%) and women (SOTA avg. -10\%) at the $1^{\text {st }}$ award level (Figure 4.11, Figure 4.12). This is particularly true for C\&M students ( $-17 \% \mathrm{~F},-12 \% \mathrm{M}$ ), and large percentages were awarded a $3^{\text {rd }}(12 \% \mathrm{~F}, 17 \%$ M). The Department thinks this may be due to lowering entry tariffs in past years from $A B B$ to $B B C$ or BCC to meet recruitment targets. The students thus need more support to reach desired results (Action 4.2).

Architecture had the largest gendered awarding gap among the five Departments, which was more evident in the last two years (11\% difference). One reason may be that studio modules in Architecture are not marked anonymously and count for 50\% of the total credits in the UG programme (Action 4.3). Furthermore, the gender of tutors teaching studio is imbalanced (see staff section for details).



Figure 4.12 - UG Degree awards from 2015/16 to 2020/21 split by Gender and Department

## Key issues

Declining applications from men in C\&M English; lower percentages of both genders obtaining 1st degrees in all Departments, in particular C\&M; gendered awarding gap in Architecture.

## Action to address issues:

- 4.1 - Ensure men are featured in C\&M and English programme materials, as well as ensuring staff and student ambassadors of both genders are involved in outreach activities to encourage schoolboys choosing C\&M and English at A-Level
- 4.2 - Increase formative assessment components in all departments to improve results; investigate how women and men perform in different types of assessment and whether there is disparity in XJTLU cohort and Home/EU cohort.
- 4.3-Anonymise studio marking in Architecture and ensure tutors complete unconscious bias training
(ii) Numbers of men and women on postgraduate taught degrees.

Full- and part-time. Provide data on course application, offers and acceptance rates and degree completion rates by gender.

The analysis in this section reveals some gendered gap in registration and awarding at the Distinction level in Music, Philosophy and English.

From 15/16 to $20 / 21$ women make up 76\% of SOTA's PGT cohort, exceeding the HESA average (55\%) in the same period. The largest F\% is found in English (83\%) and Music ( $76 \%$ ). The data shows a declining trend of $\mathrm{F} \%$ in SOTA, visibly in Music and Philosophy (except last year in Philosophy) (Figure 4.13, Figure 4.14). In 2020/21, the PGT F\% (67\%) is much closer to the UG F\% (62\%) due to a low intake of OSI students ( $-13 \%$ compared to past years) which normally have higher F\%.


Figure 4.13 - SOTA's PGT population split by gender with HESA benchmarks (2015/16 - 2020/21)



Figure 4.14 - PGT population split by Gender and Department compared to HESA benchmarks (2015/16-2020/21)

SOTA currently offers 14 PGT programmes across five departments (Figure 4.15). English programmes have a high proportion of women which is consistent with the gender split in applications. The F\% in Architecture and Music either match or exceed the HESA benchmarks, while the F\% in C\&M and Philosophy are below the benchmarks. In C\&M, we observe a steady growth of the numbers of women in MA Media and Communication. Effective from 2021/22, C\&M will have five new PGT programmes which may change the gender demographic at PGT level (Action 4.4).

The two Philosophy programmes show a clear disparity of F\% (Action 4.5). The low F\% in MA Philosophy (23\%) may be derived from gendered demographics in the wider subject areas ( $33 \% \mathrm{~F}$ in taught masters according to WIP data 2011). In comparison to UG F\% (avg. 54\%), this indicates a pipeline issue (more in the later section). MA Art, Philosophy and Cultural Institutions doesn't require a philosophy UG degree and recruits more women (av. 80\%). This may be because the programme contains arts and culture components which attract women.

Music's PGT female population has an average $+35 \%$ increase in comparison to UG (av. $41 \%$ ), aligning itself much closer to the HESA benchmark ( $63 \%$ ). It can be attributed to the MA Music Industry Studies and MMus recruiting a larger number of women, specifically from China. China has a growing music industry and Chinese students intend to operate their own businesses as instrumental tutors or hope to enter the industry as managers once they've completed their study. However, we need more investigation with the new cohort to provide further evidence (Action 4.6)

|  | Programme | Gender | Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 |
|  | MA/MSc Architecture | Female | 18 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 9 |
|  |  | Male | 17 | 14 | 10 | 16 | 8 | 11 |
|  |  | Total | 35 | 26 | 23 | 27 | 21 | 20 |
|  |  | F\% | 51\% | 46\% | 57\% | 41\% | 62\% | 45\% |
|  | MSC Building Information Modelling | Female |  | 0 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
|  |  | Male |  | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 13 |
|  |  | Total |  | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 16 |
|  |  | F\% |  | 0\% | 57\% | 43\% | 43\% | 19\% |
|  | MSc Climate Resilience \& Environmental Sustainability | Female | 11 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 11 |
|  |  | Male | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
|  |  | Total | 13 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 17 |
|  |  | F\% | 85\% | 80\% | 50\% | 75\% | 50\% | 65\% |
| $\underset{0}{\infty}$ | MA Media and Communication | Female |  | 10 | 18 | 15 | 15 | 27 |
|  |  | Male |  | 10 | 13 | 8 | 4 | 13 |
|  |  | Total |  | 20 | 31 | 23 | 19 | 40 |
|  |  | F\% |  | 50\% | 58\% | 65\% | 79\% | 68\% |
|  | MSC Strategic Communication | Female |  | 5 | 11 | 17 | 21 | 7 |
|  |  | Male |  | 2 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 3 |
|  |  | Total |  | 7 | 15 | 25 | 32 | 10 |
|  |  | F\% |  | 71\% | 73\% | 68\% | 66\% | 70\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{T}{\omega} \\ & \frac{D}{J} \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | MA Applied Linguistics | Female | 11 | 15 | 14 | 22 | 15 | 11 |
|  |  | Male | 5 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 7 |
|  |  | Total | 16 | 18 | 16 | 30 | 21 | 18 |
|  |  | F\% | 69\% | 83\% | 88\% | 73\% | 71\% | 61\% |
|  | MA English | Female | 17 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 19 | 2 |
|  |  | Male | 8 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 11 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 25 | 23 | 26 | 24 | 30 | 2 |
|  |  | F\% | 68\% | 78\% | 65\% | 71\% | 63\% | 100\% |
|  | MA English Literature | Female |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |
|  |  | Male |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  | 34 |
|  |  | F\% |  |  |  |  |  | 71\% |
|  | MA Teach English to Speakers of Other Languages | Female | 84 | 71 | 90 | 95 | 87 | 71 |
|  |  | Male | 12 | 11 | 4 | 14 | 14 | 8 |
|  |  | Total | 96 | 82 | 94 | 109 | 101 | 79 |
|  |  | F\% | 88\% | 87\% | 96\% | 87\% | 86\% | 90\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\Sigma}{D} \end{aligned}$ | MA Business of Classical Music | Female |  |  | 6 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
|  |  | Male |  |  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 8 | 7 | 6 | 4 |
|  |  | F\% |  |  | 75\% | 100\% | 83\% | 50\% |
|  | MA Music Industry Studies | Female | 20 | 32 | 21 | 15 | 16 | 31 |
|  |  | Male | 3 | 14 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 19 |
|  |  | Total | 23 | 46 | 30 | 28 | 26 | 50 |
|  |  | F\% | 87\% | 70\% | 70\% | 54\% | 62\% | 62\% |
|  | MMUS | Female | 16 | 13 | 26 | 15 | 17 | 14 |
|  |  | Male | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
|  |  | Total | 18 | 15 | 26 | 17 | 17 | 21 |
|  |  | F\% | 89\% | 87\% | 100\% | 88\% | 100\% | 67\% |
|  | MA Art, Philosophy and Cultural Institutions | Female | 15 | 10 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 15 |
|  |  | Male | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
|  |  | Total | 15 | 11 | 17 | 12 | 11 | 19 |
|  |  | F\% | 100\% | 91\% | 76\% | 67\% | 64\% | 79\% |
|  | MA Philosophy | Female | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
|  |  | Male | 5 | 4 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
|  |  | Total | 6 | 5 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 13 |
|  |  | F\% | 17\% | 20\% | 21\% | 31\% | 18\% | 31\% |

Figure 4.15 - PGT programme population split by Gender (2015/16 - 2020/21)

| Residence Status | Gender | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HOME/EU | F | 39 | 39 | 41 | 52 | 45 | 81 |
|  | M | 19 | 33 | 42 | 42 | 36 | 54 |
|  | Total | 58 | 72 | 83 | 94 | 81 | 135 |
|  | F\% | 67\% | 54\% | 49\% | 55\% | 56\% | 60\% |
| OSI (ex. Chinese) | F | 23 | 21 | 13 | 26 | 19 | 29 |
|  | M | 8 | 9 | 12 | 17 | 11 | 18 |
|  | Total | 31 | 30 | 25 | 43 | 30 | 47 |
|  | F\% | 74\% | 70\% | 52\% | 60\% | 63\% | 62\% |
| Chinese | F | 140 | 132 | 185 | 157 | 158 | 121 |
|  | M | 30 | 31 | 20 | 36 | 37 | 40 |
|  | Total | 170 | 163 | 205 | 193 | 195 | 161 |
|  | F\% | 82\% | 81\% | 90\% | 81\% | 81\% | 75\% |
| Grand Total | F | 202 | 192 | 239 | 235 | 222 | 231 |
|  | M | 57 | 73 | 74 | 95 | 84 | 112 |
|  | Total | 259 | 265 | 313 | 330 | 306 | 343 |
|  | F\% | 78\% | 72\% | 76\% | 71\% | 73\% | 67\% |
| \% Chinese F of total F <br> \% Chinese F of total pop. |  | 69\% | 69\% | 77\% | 67\% | 71\% | 52\% |
|  |  | 54\% | 50\% | 59\% | 48\% | 52\% | 35\% |

Figure 4.16 - SOTA PGT population split by Gender and Residence Status (Nationality) (2015/16-2020/21)

Chinese women count for nearly $50 \%$ of all SOTA's PGT students and average $71 \%$ of all PGT women in the period analysed, except the pandemic year ( $35 \%$ of total and $52 \%$ of total women last year) (Figure 4.16). They are concentrated in MA/MSc Architecture, MA TESOL and MA Music Industry Studies (Figure 4.17). All PGT students receive in-sessional language support provided by the English Language Centre within the University. Some ELC courses are tailored to suit the subject contexts.

| DEPT | Residence | Gender | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home/EU | F | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 8 |
|  |  | M | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 13 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 21 |
|  |  | \% F | \#DIV/0! | 0\% | 0\% | 17\% | 33\% | 75\% | 38\% |
|  | OSI (ex <br> Chinese) | F | 7 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 38 |
|  |  | M | 3 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 33 |
|  |  | Total | 10 | 8 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 20 | 71 |
|  |  | \% F | 70\% | 63\% | 36\% | 50\% | 50\% | 55\% | 54\% |
|  | Chinese | F | 22 | 12 | 16 | 13 | 12 | 6 | 81 |
|  |  | M | 16 | 14 | 8 | 11 | 7 | 19 | 75 |
|  |  | Total | 38 | 26 | 24 | 24 | 19 | 25 | 156 |
|  |  | \% F | 58\% | 46\% | 67\% | 54\% | 63\% | 24\% | 52\% |
|  | \% Chinese F of total F |  | 76\% | 71\% | 80\% | 65\% | 67\% | 26\% | 64\% |
|  | \% Chinese F of total pop. |  | 46\% | 32\% | 44\% | 31\% | 38\% | 11\% | 33\% |
| $\sum_{\infty}^{\infty}$ | Home/EU | F | 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 25 | 56 |
|  |  | M | 1 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 15 | 43 |
|  |  | Total | 4 | 16 | 16 | 11 | 12 | 40 | 99 |
|  |  | \% F | 75\% | 38\% | 38\% | 55\% | 83\% | 63\% | 57\% |
|  | OSI (ex <br> Chinese) | F | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 21 |
|  |  | M | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  |  | Total | 2 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 26 |
|  |  | \% F | 50\% | 75\% | 100\% | 70\% | 100\% | 100\% | 81\% |
|  | Chinese | F | 4 | 6 | 19 | 19 | 23 | 6 | 77 |
|  |  | M | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 1 | 30 |
|  |  | Total | 4 | 7 | 26 | 27 | 36 | 7 | 107 |
|  |  | \% F | 100\% | 86\% | 73\% | 70\% | 64\% | 86\% | 72\% |
|  | \% Chinese F of total F <br> \% Chinese F of total pop. |  | 50\% | 40\% | 66\% | 59\% | 64\% | 18\% | 50\% |
|  |  |  | 40\% | 22\% | 41\% | 40\% | 45\% | 12\% | 33\% |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \frac{N}{J} \\ & \sum_{U}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} & \text { Home/EU } \\ & \text { M } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \text { \%F } \\ & \mathrm{F}\end{array}$ | 23 | 22 | 21 | 25 | 21 | 32 | 144 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 12 | 9 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 63 |
|  |  | 35 | 31 | 29 | 35 | 33 | 44 | 207 |
|  |  | 66\% | 71\% | 72\% | 71\% | 64\% | 73\% | 70\% |
|  |  | 11 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 49 |
|  | OSI (ex M | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 23 |
|  | Chinese) | 13 | 11 | 8 | 15 | 13 | 12 | 72 |
|  |  | 85\% | 73\% | 63\% | 60\% | 62\% | 67\% | 68\% |
|  |  | 78 | 74 | 95 | 100 | 92 | 68 | 507 |
|  | Chinese | 12 | 8 | 4 | 13 | 14 | 9 | 60 |
|  |  | 90 | 82 | 99 | 113 | 106 | 77 | 567 |
|  | \% F | 87\% | 90\% | 96\% | 88\% | 87\% | 88\% | 89\% |
|  | \% Chinese F of total F | 70\% | 71\% | 79\% | 75\% | 76\% | 63\% | 72\% |
|  | \% Chinese F of total pop. | 57\% | 60\% | 70\% | 61\% | 61\% | 51\% | 60\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \underline{U} \\ & \stackrel{D}{\Sigma} \end{aligned}$ | F | 3 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 3 | 39 |
|  | Home/EU | 2 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 14 | 49 |
|  |  | 5 | 14 | 15 | 24 | 13 | 17 | 88 |
|  | \% F | 60\% | 50\% | 40\% | 58\% | 46\% | 18\% | 44\% |
|  | F | 4 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 19 |
|  | OSI (ex M | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 11 |
|  | Chinese) Total | 5 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 30 |
|  | \% F | 80\% | 71\% | 0\% | 60\% | 67\% | 56\% | 63\% |
|  | Chinese | 30 | 33 | 47 | 20 | 30 | 39 | 199 |
|  |  | 2 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 26 |
|  |  | 32 | 40 | 48 | 23 | 33 | 49 | 225 |
|  | \% F | 94\% | 83\% | 98\% | 87\% | 91\% | 80\% | 88\% |
|  | \% Chinese F of total F | 81\% | 73\% | 89\% | 54\% | 79\% | 83\% | 77\% |
|  | \% Chinese F of total pop. | 71\% | 54\% | 73\% | 38\% | 61\% | 52\% | 58\% |
| 좀OO름픔 | Home/EU | 10 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 15 | 50 |
|  |  | 4 | 4 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 58 |
|  |  | 14 | 8 | 22 | 18 | 20 | 26 | 108 |
|  | \% F | 71\% | 50\% | 36\% | 33\% | 35\% | 58\% | 46\% |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll} & \\ \text { OSI (ex } \\ \text { Chinese) } & \text { F } \\ & \text { M } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \% \mathrm{~F}\end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
|  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
|  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 |
|  |  | 0\% | \# DIV/0! | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 67\% | 57\% |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll} & \\ \text { Chinese }\end{array}$ | 6 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 29 |
|  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
|  |  | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 32 |
|  |  | 100\% | 88\% | 100\% | 83\% | 100\% | 67\% | 91\% |
|  | \% Chinese F of total F \% Chinese F of total pop. | 38\% | 64\% | 50\% | 42\% | 11\% | 11\% | 35\% |
|  |  | 29\% | 44\% | 26\% | 20\% | 5\% | 6\% | 20\% |

Figure 4.17 - PGT student population split by Gender, Department and Residence Status (Nationality) (2015/16-2020/21)

## PGT Population by Full Time and Part Time

The F\% of part-time students is generally lower than F\% in full-time cohort but the PT numbers are very small (Figure 4.18).


|  |  | Full Time |  |  |  |  | Part Time |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dept | Year | Female | Male | Total | F\% | HESA F\% | Female | Male | Total | F\% | HESA F\% |
| $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{K}}$ | 2015/16 | 195 | 51 | 246 | 79\% | 58\% | 5 | 6 | 11 | 45\% | 50\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 186 | 68 | 254 | 73\% | 58\% | 6 | 5 | 11 | 55\% | 51\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 230 | 65 | 295 | 78\% | 60\% | 8 | 7 | 15 | 53\% | 52\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 226 | 83 | 309 | 73\% | 60\% | 8 | 11 | 19 | 42\% | 53\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 212 | 77 | 289 | 73\% | 60\% | 9 | 7 | 16 | 56\% | 50\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 216 | 103 | 319 | 68\% |  | 13 | 9 | 22 | 59\% |  |

Figure 4.18 - PGT Population by Gender and Full-Time, Part-Time indicators (201521)

PGT Applications, Offers, Registrations
SOTA has seen steady growth of applications Y/Y, with the F\% generally over 70\% which is consistent with the F\% registered (Figure 4.19).


| Year | Female | Male | Total | \% F |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2015 / 16$ | 1564 | 556 | 2120 | $74 \%$ |
| $2016 / 17$ | 1685 | 544 | 2229 | $76 \%$ |
| $2017 / 18$ | 1825 | 666 | 2491 | $73 \%$ |
| $2018 / 19$ | 2066 | 736 | 2802 | $74 \%$ |
| $2019 / 20$ | 2444 | 917 | 3361 | $73 \%$ |
| $2020 / 21$ | 3142 | 1244 | 4386 | $72 \%$ |

Figure 4.19 - SOTA PGT applications by gender (2015-2021)

| DEPT | Gender | Apps | Offs | Regs | \% Apps to Offs | \% Offs to Regs | \% Apps to Regs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ARCH | Female | 1930 | 1563 | 125 | 81\% | 8\% | 6\% |
|  | Male | 1814 | 1468 | 121 | 81\% | 8\% | 7\% |
|  | Total | 3744 | 3031 | 246 | 81\% | 8\% | 7\% |
|  | \% Female | 52\% | 52\% | 51\% |  |  |  |
| C\&M | Female | 2729 | 1159 | 257 | 42\% | 22\% | 9\% |
|  | Male | 1127 | 484 | 73 | 43\% | 15\% | 6\% |
|  | Total | 3856 | 1643 | 330 | 43\% | 20\% | 9\% |
|  | \% Female | 71\% | 71\% | 78\% |  |  |  |
| ENGL | Female | 5794 | 4711 | 599 | 81\% | 13\% | 10\% |
|  | Male | 1245 | 814 | 135 | 65\% | 17\% | 11\% |
|  | Total | 7039 | 5525 | 734 | 78\% | 13\% | 10\% |
|  | \% Female | 82\% | 85\% | 82\% |  |  |  |
| MUSI | Female | 1832 | 1401 | 259 | 76\% | 18\% | 14\% |
|  | Male | 417 | 298 | 87 | 71\% | 29\% | 21\% |
|  | Total | 2249 | 1699 | 346 | 76\% | 20\% | 15\% |
|  | \% Female | 81\% | 82\% | 75\% |  |  |  |
| PHIL | Female | 598 | 392 | 84 | 66\% | 21\% | 14\% |
|  | Male | 191 | 142 | 57 | 74\% | 40\% | 30\% |
|  | Total | 789 | 534 | 141 | 68\% | 26\% | 18\% |
|  | \% Female | 76\% | 73\% | 60\% |  |  |  |

Figure 4.20 - PGT total applications, offers and registrations split by Gender and Department between 2015 and 2021

Architecture and C\&M's admissions were gender balanced. English's offer rate is in favour of women, and the registration rate is similar between women and men. Music's female registration rate is evidently lower than that of men (-11\%), particularly in MA Music Industry Studies, although the average female offer rate in all programmes is higher. This is likely because Chinese female applicants have applied for many universities to achieve their best offer. The greatest gender disparity lies in Philosophy, where the number of applications from women is much more than men, particularly in MA Arts, Philosophy and Cultural Institutions However, in both programmes, men have a slightly higher offer rate (+8\%) and much higher registration rate (+19\%). (Action 4.5) (Figure 4.20, Figure 4.21).

|  | Programme | Gender | APPS | OFFS | REGS | \% Apps to Offs | \% Offs <br> to Regs | \% Apps to Regs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MA/MSC Architecture | Female | 932 | 820 | 58 | 88\% | 7\% | 6\% |
|  |  | Male | 885 | 736 | 59 | 83\% | 8\% | 7\% |
|  |  | Total | 1817 | 1556 | 117 | 86\% | 8\% | 6\% |
|  |  | F\% | 51\% | 53\% | 50\% |  |  |  |
|  | MSC Building Information Modelling | Female | 148 | 111 | 13 | 75\% | 12\% | 9\% |
|  |  | Male | 285 | 209 | 29 | 73\% | 14\% | 10\% |
|  |  | Total | 433 | 320 | 42 | 74\% | 13\% | 10\% |
|  |  | F\% | 34\% | 35\% | 31\% |  |  |  |
|  | MSc Climate Resilience \& Environmental Sustainability | Female | 524 | 423 | 26 | 81\% | 6\% | 5\% |
|  |  | Male | 366 | 277 | 14 | 76\% | 5\% | 4\% |
|  |  | Total | 890 | 700 | 40 | 79\% | 6\% | 4\% |
|  |  | F\% | 59\% | 60\% | 65\% |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\infty}{\Sigma}$ | MA Media and Communication | Female | 1783 | 401 | 85 | 22\% | 21\% | 5\% |
|  |  | Male | 577 | 175 | 46 | 30\% | 26\% | 8\% |
|  |  | Total | 2360 | 576 | 131 | 24\% | 23\% | 6\% |
|  |  | F\% | 76\% | 70\% | 65\% |  |  |  |
|  | MSC Strategic Communication | Female | 557 | 372 | 45 | 67\% | 12\% | 8\% |
|  |  | Male | 348 | 254 | 21 | 73\% | 8\% | 6\% |
|  |  | Total | 905 | 626 | 66 | 69\% | 11\% | 7\% |
|  |  | F\% | 62\% | 59\% | 68\% |  |  |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{I}{\varrho} \\ & \frac{1}{J} \\ & \frac{0}{U} \end{aligned}$ | MA Applied Linguistics | Female | 723 | 617 | 77 | 85\% | 12\% | 11\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | 262 | 211 | 25 | 81\% | 12\% | 10\% |
|  |  | Total | 985 | 828 | 102 | 84\% | 12\% | 10\% |
|  |  | F\% | 73\% | 75\% | 75\% |  |  |  |
|  | MA English | Female | 364 | 149 | 71 | 41\% | 48\% | 20\% |
|  |  | Male | 126 | 54 | 36 | 43\% | 67\% | 29\% |
|  |  | Total | 490 | 203 | 107 | 41\% | 53\% | 22\% |
|  |  | F\% | 74\% | 73\% | 66\% |  |  |  |
|  | MA English Literature | Female | 101 | 44 | 25 | 44\% | 57\% | 25\% |
|  |  | Male | 42 | 18 | 10 | 43\% | 56\% | 24\% |
|  |  | Total | 143 | 62 | 35 | 43\% | 56\% | 24\% |
|  |  | F\% | 71\% | 71\% | 71\% |  |  |  |
|  | MA Teach English to Speakers of Other Languages | Female | 3630 | 3204 | 421 | 88\% | 13\% | 12\% |
|  |  | Male | 538 | 418 | 53 | 78\% | 13\% | 10\% |
|  |  | Total | 4168 | 3622 | 474 | 87\% | 13\% | 11\% |
|  |  | F\% | 87\% | 88\% | 89\% |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\cup}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{1}{D} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | MA Business of Classical Music | Female | 102 | 88 | 20 | 86\% | 23\% | 20\% |
|  |  | Male | 28 | 25 | 5 | 89\% | 20\% | 18\% |
|  |  | Total | 130 | 113 | 25 | 87\% | 22\% | 19\% |
|  |  | F\% | 78\% | 78\% | 80\% |  |  |  |
|  | MA Music Industry Studies | Female | 860 | 674 | 118 | 78\% | 18\% | 14\% |
|  |  | Male | 223 | 180 | 67 | 81\% | 37\% | 30\% |
|  |  | Total | 1083 | 854 | 185 | 79\% | 22\% | 17\% |
|  |  | F\% | 79\% | 79\% | 64\% |  |  |  |
|  | MMUS | Female | 677 | 507 | 85 | 75\% | 17\% | 13\% |
|  |  | Male | 126 | 70 | 10 | 56\% | 14\% | 8\% |
|  |  | Total | 803 | 577 | 95 | 72\% | 16\% | 12\% |
|  |  | F\% | 84\% | 88\% | 89\% |  |  |  |
|  | MA Art, Philosophy and Cultural Institutions | Female | 454 | 278 | 55 | 61\% | 20\% | 12\% |
|  |  | Male | 65 | 45 | 15 | 69\% | 33\% | 23\% |
|  |  | Total | 519 | 323 | 70 | 62\% | 22\% | 13\% |
|  |  | F\% | 87\% | 86\% | 79\% |  |  |  |
|  | MA Philosophy | Female | 61 | 53 | 15 | 87\% | 28\% | 25\% |
|  |  | Male | 104 | 83 | 38 | 80\% | 46\% | 37\% |
|  |  | Total | 165 | 136 | 53 | 82\% | 39\% | 32\% |
|  |  | F\% | 37\% | 39\% | 28\% |  |  |  |

Figure 4.21 - PGT total applications, offers and registrations split by Gender and Programme between 2015 and 2021

## PGT Award Classifications

Despite the large F\% in SOTA, the percentage of women who were awarded Merit or above was consistently lower than that of men ( $47 \%$ F, $64 \% \mathrm{M}$ ). This trend is even more evident at the Distinction level (8\%F, 19\% M) (Figure 4.22).


| Gender | Year | Distinction | Merit | Pass | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2015 / 16$ | 16 | 73 | 83 | 172 |
|  | $2016 / 17$ | 13 | 75 | 95 | 183 |
|  | $2017 / 18$ | 14 | 83 | 125 | 222 |
|  | $2018 / 19$ | 21 | 74 | 121 | 216 |
|  | $2019 / 20$ | 19 | 78 | 115 | 212 |
|  | $2015 / 16$ | 7 | 26 | 18 | 51 |
|  | $2016 / 17$ | 15 | 26 | 24 | 65 |
|  | $2017 / 18$ | 13 | 24 | 16 | 53 |
|  | $2018 / 19$ | 12 | 35 | 32 | 79 |
|  | $2019 / 20$ | 15 | 36 | 28 | 79 |

Figure 4.22 - PGT Award classifications by gender in SOTA (2015-20)

| Department | Gender | Total Distinction | Total Gender Population | \% achieved Distinc | \% Dif between Genders | Population difference between Genders |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Architecture | F | 20 | 98 | 20\% | 1\% | 11 |
|  | M | 17 | 87 | 20\% |  |  |
| C\&M | F | 17 | 107 | 16\% | 8\% | 55 |
|  | M | 4 | 52 | 8\% |  |  |
| English | F | 24 | 545 | 4\% | -14\% | 439 |
|  | M | 19 | 106 | 18\% |  |  |
| Music | F | 14 | 197 | 7\% | -17\% | 147 |
|  | M | 12 | 50 | 24\% |  |  |
| Philosophy | F | 8 | 58 | 14\% | -17\% | 26 |
|  | M | 10 | 32 | 31\% |  |  |
| SOTA | F | 83 | 1005 | 8\% | -11\% | 678 |
|  | M | 62 | 327 | 19\% |  |  |

Figure 4.23 - Department breakdown of total Distinctions awarded split by Gender (2015/16-19/20)

At the Department level (Figure 4.23), the gendered disparity in obtaining Distinction lies mostly in English, Music and Philosophy. English and Music have the highest number of women but the lowest percentage of them was awarded Distinction.

In English, the awarding gap is most evident in MA TESOL and MA English Literature of which the majority are OSI women ( $88 \%$ and $71 \%$ respectively). The English EDI group had already planned to diversify assessment types for MA TESOL in the coming year (21/22) and monitor the impact on the awarding gap. They also discovered that the multiple pathways leading to the final degree of MA English Literature have gendered disparity in assessments of modules, so they intend to introduce a coordinated approach to marking and moderation (Action 4.7).

In Music, with Chinese women consisting more than half of the PGT cohort, the awarding gap has been attributed to heavily weighted essays, which OSI students find challenging. Thus the Department has introduced more formative assessments and assessment types. (Action 4.8).

In Philosophy, this issue has already been actioned. The Department's EDI group has reviewed the marking and moderation process and revised the marking criteria for Dissertations on both MA programmes to better award strengths of interdisciplinary and practice-led research, which women seem to favour. The implementation of the
new criteria in 2022-23 will be supported by staff training throughout 2021-22. This will be monitored to assess their effectiveness (Action 4.9). The gender imbalance has also been addressed by redesigning curricula and syllabi to better meet diverse research interests and showcase more women authors.

## Key issues

Low female registration rate in MA Music Industry Studies; low female registration rate in Philosophy; gendered awarding gap at Distinction level in English, Music and Philosophy

## Actions to address issues:

- 4.4 - Monitor the gender demographic of the new C\&M programmes and ensure the recruitment materials promote the AS/EDI agenda, led by programme leads
- 4.5 - Investigate the graduate intentions of Philosophy UG students to better attract them for PGT studies
- 4.6 - Understand female Chinese student rationale for registering on MA Music Industry Studies and MMus via survey. To be implemented in next cohort and led by programme leads
- 4.7-In English, diversify assessment types to include more formative assessments and monitor the impact on the awarding gap in MA TESOL; moderate assessment results among different pathways in MA English Literature; staff continue to diversify curriculum.
- 4.8 - Music introduces formative assessment to better prepare Chinese female students for essays and diversify assessment components
- 4.9 - Monitor Philosophy's awarding gap between MA in Art Aesthetics and Cultural Institutions to measure the effectiveness of new assessment measures
(iv) Numbers of men and women on postgraduate research degrees.

Full- and part-time. Provide data on course application, offers, acceptance and degree completion rates by gender.

We identified that SOTA's PGR intake was mostly from overseas in all Departments and a gender imbalance can be observed in Architecture and Music. When
aggregated, SOTA's PGR population shows gender balance over the years and F\% has increased in 20/21 (53\%) (Figure 4.24). The overall F\% is lower than the HESA benchmark and the trends are similar between full time and part time intakes (Figure 4.26).

At the Departmental level, Architecture, Music and Philosophy's F\% are lower than HESA benchmarks, with the biggest difference in Architecture (av. -19\%), followed by Philosophy (av. -18\%) and Music (av. -3\%) (Figure 4.25) (Action 4.10). The latter two departments had small intakes though.

PGR Population by Gender (SOTA)


| Dept | Year | Female | Male | Total | F\% | HESA F\% | \% Dif |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\&}{6}$ | 2015/16 | 54 | 56 | 110 | 49\% | 50\% | 0\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 55 | 59 | 114 | 48\% | 50\% | -1\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 56 | 64 | 120 | 47\% | 50\% | -3\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 60 | 65 | 125 | 48\% | 50\% | -2\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 63 | 72 | 135 | 47\% | 51\% | -4\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 82 | 74 | 156 | 53\% |  |  |

Figure 4.24 - PGR Populations split by Gender with HESA benchmark (2015/16 2020/21)


| Dept | Year | Female | Male | Total | F\% | HESA F\% | \% Dif |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2015/16 | 10 | 25 | 35 | 29\% | 50\% | -21\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 11 | 25 | 36 | 31\% | 48\% | -17\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 11 | 30 | 41 | 27\% | 48\% | -21\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 12 | 28 | 40 | 30\% | 46\% | -16\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 12 | 28 | 40 | 30\% | 49\% | -19\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 16 | 26 | 42 | 38\% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| $\sum_{0}^{\infty}$ | 2015/16 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 75\% | 56\% | 19\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50\% | 57\% | -7\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 67\% | 57\% | 10\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 25\% | 56\% | -31\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 70\% | 56\% | 14\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 9 | 3 | 12 | 75\% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{5}}{\overline{(5)}} \\ & \text { 든 } \end{aligned}$ | 2015/16 | 29 | 11 | 40 | 73\% | 66\% | 6\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 26 | 8 | 34 | 76\% | 65\% | 11\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 25 | 10 | 35 | 71\% | 65\% | 6\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 32 | 9 | 41 | 78\% | 67\% | 11\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 31 | 9 | 40 | 78\% | 68\% | 10\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 38 | 12 | 50 | 76\% |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OM } \\ & \stackrel{y}{3} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2015/16 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 40\% | 38\% | 2\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 7 | 10 | 17 | 41\% | 39\% | 2\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 7 | 12 | 19 | 37\% | 38\% | -1\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 8 | 14 | 22 | 36\% | 40\% | -4\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 8 | 21 | 29 | 28\% | 40\% | -12\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 7 | 15 | 22 | 32\% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \geqslant \\ & \frac{7}{\circ} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{0}{7} \\ & \frac{0}{1} \end{aligned}$ | 2015/16 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 29\% | 36\% | -7\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 31\% | 37\% | -6\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 17\% | 38\% | -21\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 14\% | 40\% | -26\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 13\% | 40\% | -28\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 1 | 10 | 11 | 9\% |  |  |
| (lla |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\&}{\circ}$ | 2015/16 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 100\% | 51\% | 49\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 50\% | 51\% | -1\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 10 | 6 | 16 | 63\% | 51\% | 12\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 55\% | 52\% | 3\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 50\% | 50\% | 0\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 11 | 8 | 19 | 58\% |  |  |

Figure 4.25 - PGR population split by Gender and Department (2015/16 - 2020/21)

PGR by Full-Time and Part-Time indicators

| Status | Year | Female | Male | Total | F\% | HESA F\% | \% Dif |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\stackrel{\oplus}{E}}{\bar{\Xi}}$ | 2015/16 | 34 | 38 | 72 | 47\% | 50\% | -3\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 38 | 41 | 79 | 48\% | 51\% | -3\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 41 | 47 | 88 | 47\% | 52\% | -5\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 41 | 48 | 89 | 46\% | 53\% | -7\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 46 | 54 | 100 | 46\% | 51\% | -5\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 63 | 54 | 117 | 54\% |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\stackrel{\otimes}{E}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sigma}}$ | 2015/16 | 20 | 18 | 38 | 53\% | 52\% | 1\% |
|  | 2016/17 | 17 | 18 | 35 | 49\% | 52\% | -3\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 15 | 17 | 32 | 47\% | 51\% | -4\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 19 | 17 | 36 | 53\% | 52\% | 1\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 17 | 18 | 35 | 49\% | 48\% | 1\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 19 | 20 | 39 | 49\% |  |  |

Figure 4.26 - PGR population split by Gender and Full-Time, Part-Time status (2015/16 - 2020/21)

## PGR Applications, Offers and Registrations

Since 2017-18, SOTA received slightly more applications from women than men Y/Y and this is reflected in the registration rates. (Figure 4.27)

| Year | Gender | Apps | Offs | Regs | \% Apps <br> to Offs | \% Offs to Regs | \% Apps <br> to Regs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015-16 | Female | 91 | 36 | 19 | 40\% | 53\% | 21\% |
|  | Male | 98 | 41 | 20 | 42\% | 49\% | 20\% |
|  | F \% | 48\% | 47\% | 49\% |  |  |  |
| 2016-17 | Female | 101 | 40 | 21 | 40\% | 53\% | 21\% |
|  | Male | 102 | 38 | 19 | 37\% | 50\% | 19\% |
|  | F \% | 50\% | 51\% | 53\% |  |  |  |
| 2017-18 | Female | 119 | 42 | 21 | 35\% | 50\% | 18\% |
|  | Male | 98 | 36 | 21 | 37\% | 58\% | 21\% |
|  | F \% | 55\% | 54\% | 50\% |  |  |  |
| 2018-19 | Female | 160 | 53 | 22 | 33\% | 42\% | 14\% |
|  | Male | 120 | 42 | 19 | 35\% | 45\% | 16\% |
|  | F \% | 57\% | 56\% | 54\% |  |  |  |
| 2019-20 | Female | 162 | 54 | 31 | 33\% | 57\% | 19\% |
|  | Male | 124 | 44 | 27 | 35\% | 61\% | 22\% |
|  | F \% | 57\% | 55\% | 53\% |  |  |  |
| 2020-21 | Female | 148 | 59 | 25 | 40\% | 42\% | 17\% |
|  | Male | 133 | 55 | 25 | 41\% | 45\% | 19\% |
|  | F \% | 53\% | 52\% | 50\% |  |  |  |
| Total | Female | 781 | 284 | 139 | 36\% | 49\% | 18\% |
|  | Male | 675 | 256 | 131 | 38\% | 51\% | 19\% |
|  | F \% | 54\% | 53\% | 51\% |  |  |  |

Figure 4.27 - SOTA PGR applications, offers and registrations split by Gender (2015/16 - 2020/21)

Architecture and English received the highest number of PGR applications (30\% Architecture, 38\% English) and registrations. In Architecture, 83\% of the applications were from OSI students ( $45 \% \mathrm{~F}$ ), who were often funded by their respective governments or other international sources. English also has a high number of OSI applicants (70\%) but the F\% shows positive divergence to HESA benchmarks. Therefore, the majority of SOTA PGRs were not graduates of UK universities, contributing to the pipeline issue discussed below (Action 4.10).

In Music, F\% has dropped due to the increase of men Y/Y. Philosophy's F\% is 27\% on average across each residence category (Home, EU, OSI, Web), with a slightly higher proportion of OSI women (39\%). The Department's PGR admission numbers have been very small due to limited funding opportunities offered in the UK (Action 4.11).

## PGR Award

There is no gendered gap in completion rate (Figure 4.28). Women have a slightly higher withdrawal rate, but on average, took less time to complete.

|  |  | Time to Complete (Years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Status | <=4 | 4 to 5 | 5 to 6 | 6 to 7 | Total | Mean Years | Withdrawn |
| Female | F/T | 27 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 39 | 4.01 | 8 |
| Female | P/T |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 6.50 | 6 |
|  | F/T | 26 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 40 | 4.15 | 7 |
| e | P/T |  |  |  | 5 | 5 | 6.50 | 4 |

Figure 4.28 - SOTA PGR completion times (years)

## Key issues

Gender imbalance in overseas intake at the PGR level in Architecture, and to some extent Music; low Home/EU intake in Philosophy

## Actions to address issues:

- 4.10-Improve gender balance of PGRs in Architecture, Music, and Philosophyensure a gender balanced interview panel and promote female staff as role models.
- 4.11 - SOTA's PGT and PGR leads will work together to devise workshops and networking events for female PGT students with current PGR role models, encourage applications for postgraduate scholarships, and offer informal 'meet female staff and current female students' events for prospective female candidates
(v) Progression pipeline between undergraduate and postgraduate student levels.

Identify and comment on any issues in the pipeline between undergraduate and postgraduate degrees.

SOTA's $\mathrm{F} \%$ at different levels are quite consistent, with the highest percentage of women at the PGT level and lowest at the PGR level (approx. -24\% difference). The gap was smaller last year (Figure 4.29).

The pipeline issue is evident in Architecture where the F\% is similar at the UG and PGT levels but significantly lower at the PGR level. Philosophy saw the same trend, but the numbers are very small. One explanation regarding Architecture is that most architectural graduates choose to pursue a professional qualification in practice after their accredited degrees (at UG and Master levels). The ones pursuing a research degree are often interested in an academic career and many of them are from overseas due to the lack of UK funding (Action 4.10; 4.11).

In Music, a much higher F\% can be observed at the PGT level due to the large number of Chinese women. English and C\&M don't show any pipeline problem. C\&M's PGR recruitment has been very small (Figure 4.30).

| SOTA | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 1 6}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 1 9}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 / 2 1}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M |
| UG | $59 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| PGT | $78 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| PGR | $49 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $47 \%$ |

Figure 4.29 - SOTA female and male population percentages at UG, PGT and PGR levels (2015/16 - 2020/21)

| ARCH | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 1 6}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 1 9}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 / 2 1}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M |
| UG | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| PGT | $60 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| PGR | $29 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $62 \%$ |


| C\&M | 2015/16 |  | 2016/17 |  | 2017/18 |  | 2018/19 |  | 2019/20 |  | 2020/21 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leve | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M |
| UG | 76\% | 24\% | 80\% | 20\% | 76\% | 24\% | 75\% | 25\% | 78\% | 22\% | 80\% | 20\% |
| PGT | 80\% | 20\% | 56\% | 44\% | 63\% | 37\% | 67\% | 33\% | 71\% | 29\% | 68\% | 32\% |
| PGR | 75\% | 25\% | 50\% | 50\% | 67\% | 33\% | 25\% | 75\% | 70\% | 30\% | 75\% | 25\% |


| ENGL | 2015/16 |  | 2016/17 |  | 2017/18 |  | 2018/19 |  | 2019/20 |  | 2020/21 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M |
| UG | 73\% | 27\% | 73\% | 27\% | 74\% | 26\% | 75\% | 25\% | 78\% | 22\% | 80\% | 20\% |
| PGT | 81\% | 19\% | 84\% | 16\% | 89\% | 11\% | 82\% | 18\% | 80\% | 20\% | 81\% | 19\% |
| PGR | 73\% | 28\% | 76\% | 24\% | 71\% | 29\% | 78\% | 22\% | 78\% | 22\% | 76\% | 24\% |


| MUSI | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 1 6}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 1 9}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 / 2 1}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M |
| UG | $39 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
| PGT | $88 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| PGR | $40 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $68 \%$ |


| PHIL | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 1 6}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 1 9}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 / 2 1}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M |
| UG | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| PGT | $76 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $41 \%$ |
| PGR | $29 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $91 \%$ |

Figure 4.30 - Departmental female and male population percentages at UG, PGT and PGR levels (2015/16 - 2020/21)

Key issues

Leaky pipeline in Architecture and Philosophy and to some extent Music

Actions to address issues:

- Refer to Action 4.10 and 4.11.


## B. Academic and research staff data

(i) Academic staff by grade, contract function and gender: research-only, teaching and research or teaching-only.

Look at the career pipeline and comment on and explain any differences between men and women. Identify any gender issues in the pipeline at grades/job type/academic contract type.

The analysis in this section identified the lack of women in higher grades and general gender imbalance in Music.

In January 2021, women made up $38 \%$ (105) of the academic workforce in SOTA. Apart from C\&M, F\% in all Departments fell under the HESA benchmarks. However, the HESA benchmarks for Music include dance and drama, which tend to have a higher proportion of female staff. The SOTA Music Department's largest programme is Music Technology, which attracts male academics.

| Department | SOTA | HESA | \% Dif |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Architecture | $28 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $-9 \%$ |
| Communications \& Media | $59 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| English | $55 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $-3 \%$ |
| Music | $26 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $-16 \%$ |
| Philosophy | $30 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $-1 \%$ |

Figure 4.31 - SOTA departmental F\% (Jan 2021) in comparison to HESA benchmarks (2019/20 data)


Figure 4.32 - SOTA staff split by gender and grade (2021)

|  | 2015 |  |  | 2016 |  |  | 2017 |  |  | 2018 |  |  | 2019 |  |  | 2020 |  |  | 2021 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% |
| 6 | 15 | 36 | 29\% | 16 | 32 | 33\% | 19 | 34 | 36\% | 25 | 35 | 42\% | 18 | 43 | 30\% | 23 | 49 | 32\% | 21 | 53 | 28\% |
| 7 | 18 | 31 | 37\% | 19 | 42 | 31\% | 25 | 40 | 38\% | 23 | 37 | 38\% | 32 | 38 | 46\% | 33 | 41 | 45\% | 35 | 36 | 49\% |
| 8 | 8 | 16 | 33\% | 9 | 14 | 39\% | 9 | 20 | 31\% | 11 | 19 | 37\% | 16 | 24 | 40\% | 16 | 21 | 43\% | 20 | 25 | 44\% |
| 9 | 10 | 20 | 33\% | 11 | 25 | 31\% | 11 | 26 | 30\% | 14 | 30 | 32\% | 14 | 31 | 31\% | 19 | 36 | 35\% | 18 | 35 | 34\% |
| Prof | 8 | 13 | 38\% | 9 | 15 | 38\% | 10 | 18 | 36\% | 9 | 22 | 29\% | 10 | 20 | 33\% | 11 | 24 | 31\% | 11 | 22 | 33\% |
| TOTAL | 59 | 116 | 34\% | 64 | 128 | 33\% | 74 | 138 | 35\% | 82 | 143 | 36\% | 90 | 156 | 37\% | 102 | 171 | 37\% | 105 | 171 | 38\% |

Figure 4.33 - SOTA staff split by gender and by grade (2015-2021)

| Grade | F | M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 6 | 17 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 17 | 5 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 12 | 9 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 8 | 15 |
| Prof | 3 | 9 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ |

Figure 4.34 - Difference in the number of staff at each salary grade, split by gender, between Jan 2015 and Jan 2021

In the period analysed, SOTA's overall $\mathrm{F} \%$ has increased $\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{Y}$ (+4\%) (Figure 4.32, Figure 4.33). It is evident that the biggest increase was at Grade 7 (+17) and Grade 8 $(+12)$ due to new recruitment, of which the F\% surpassed the School average (38\%) (Figure 4.34) (Action 4.12). Comparatively, the largest M increase was found at Grade 6 (+17) as GTAs (28) and Grade 9 (+15).

Regarding the gender profile according to career pathways and FT/PT (Figure 4.35, 4.36), F \% is mainly lower in the T\&S pathways among both FT and PT groups. It has risen in the T\&R pathways $\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{Y}$ as explained above and the number of staff on the RO pathway is small. The large number of men on T\&S pathway are AFTs, Music instrumental tutors, as well as GTAs (see next section for details).

The professorial grade shows a declining trend of $\mathrm{F} \%$, as men have a net increase $(+9)$ at this level, in comparison to women (+3) in the period. Architecture and Philosophy have not recruited or promoted any female professors but have both promoted or recruited men (Architecture 2, Philosophy 3).

|  |  | 2015 |  |  | 2016 |  |  | 2017 |  |  | 2018 |  |  | 2019 |  |  | 2020 |  |  | 2021 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pathway | Grade | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% |
| T\&S | 6 | 15 | 35 | 30\% | 15 | 30 | 33\% | 19 | 31 | 38\% | 22 | 32 | 41\% | 15 | 38 | 28\% | 19 | 47 | 29\% | 19 | 49 | 32\% |
|  | 7 | 12 | 23 | 34\% | 16 | 32 | 33\% | 14 | 32 | 30\% | 10 | 24 | 29\% | 10 | 23 | 30\% | 10 | 28 | 26\% | 12 | 25 | 27\% |
|  | 8 | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 2 | 33\% | 2 | 3 | 40\% | 4 | 7 | 36\% | 5 | 11 | 31\% | 3 | 10 | 23\% | 4 | 11 | 43\% |
|  | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 100\% | 3 | 2 | 60\% | 4 | 4 | 50\% | 3 | 4 | 43\% |
|  | TOTAL | 28 | 59 | 32\% | 32 | 64 | 33\% | 35 | 66 | 35\% | 37 | 63 | 37\% | 33 | 74 | 31\% | 36 | 89 | 29\% | 38 | 89 | 30\% |
| T\&R | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 7 | 5 | 8 | 38\% | 3 | 8 | 27\% | 8 | 5 | 62\% | 6 | 9 | 40\% | 14 | 10 | 58\% | 17 | 11 | 61\% | 17 | 10 | 63\% |
|  | 8 | 7 | 15 | 32\% | 7 | 11 | 39\% | 7 | 17 | 29\% | 7 | 12 | 37\% | 11 | 13 | 46\% | 13 | 11 | 54\% | 16 | 13 | 55\% |
|  | 9 | 9 | 19 | 32\% | 10 | 24 | 29\% | 10 | 25 | 29\% | 13 | 29 | 31\% | 11 | 28 | 28\% | 14 | 31 | 31\% | 15 | 30 | 33\% |
|  | Prof | 8 | 13 | 38\% | 9 | 15 | 38\% | 10 | 18 | 36\% | 9 | 22 | 29\% | 10 | 20 | 33\% | 11 | 24 | 31\% | 11 | 22 | 33\% |
|  | TOTAL | 29 | 55 | 35\% | 29 | 58 | 33\% | 35 | 65 | 35\% | 35 | 72 | 33\% | 46 | 72 | 39\% | 55 | 77 | 42\% | 59 | 75 | 44\% |
| RO | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 1 | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 3 | 0\% | 3 | 3 | 50\% | 3 | 4 | 43\% | 4 | 2 | 67\% | 2 | 4 | 33\% |
|  | 7 | 1 | 0 | 100\% | 0 | 2 | 0\% | 3 | 3 | 50\% | 7 | 4 | 64\% | 8 | 5 | 62\% | 6 | 2 | 75\% | 6 | 1 | 86\% |
|  | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0\% |
|  | 9 | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% |
|  | TOTAL | 2 | 2 | 50\% | 3 | , | 33\% | 4 | 7 | 36\% | 10 | 8 | 56\% | 11 | 10 | 52\% | 11 | 5 | 69\% | 8 | 7 | 53\% |

Figure 4.35 - Gender profile of All staff by Career Pathway and Grade (2015-2021, colour indicators identifying peaks and troughs within each career pathway

|  |  | 2015 |  |  | 2016 |  |  | 2017 |  |  | 2018 |  |  | 2019 |  |  | 2020 |  |  | 2021 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pathway | Grade | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% |
| T\&S | 6 | 13 | 32 | 29\% | 15 | 30 | 33\% | 19 | 31 | 38\% | 22 | 32 | 41\% | 14 | 38 | 27\% | 18 | 44 | 29\% | 18 | 47 | 28\% |
|  | 7 | 12 | 19 | 39\% | 10 | 22 | 31\% | 8 | 24 | 25\% | 4 | 17 | 19\% | 6 | 19 | 24\% | 6 | 23 | 21\% | 8 | 0 | 100\% |
|  | 8 | 1 | 0 | 100\% | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 3 | 0\% | 0 | 3 | 0\% |
|  | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 100\% | 1 | 0 | 100\% | 1 | 0 | 100\% | 1 | 0 | 100\% |
|  | TOTAL | 26 | 51 | 34\% | 26 | 53 | 33\% | 28 | 56 | 33\% | 28 | 50 | 36\% | 22 | 59 | 27\% | 25 | 70 | 26\% | 27 | 50 | 35\% |
| T\&R | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 0 | 2 | 0\% | 1 | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 4 | 0\% | 1 | 4 | 20\% | 1 | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% |
|  | 8 | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 0 | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 100\% | 1 | 0 | 100\% |
|  | 9 | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 2 | 0\% | 0 | 2 | 0\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% |
|  | Prof | 0 | 2 | 0\% | 1 | 4 | 20\% | 1 | 4 | 20\% | 0 | 2 | 0\% | 0 | 4 | 0\% | 1 | 7 | 13\% | 1 | 5 | 17\% |
|  | TOTAL | 2 | 5 | 29\% | 2 | 8 | 20\% | 2 | 8 | 20\% | 0 | 8 | 0\% | 1 | 10 | 9\% | 3 | 10 | 23\% | 2 | 7 | 22\% |
| RO | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 1 | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 2 | 0\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 1 | 2 | 33\% |
|  | 7 | 1 | 0 | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 3 | 2 | 60\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 100\% |
|  | TOTAL | 1 | 0 | 100\% | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 0 | 2 | 0\% | 2 | 3 | 40\% | 3 | 4 | 43\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 2 | 2 | 50\% |

Figure 4.36 - Gender profile of Part Time staff by Career Pathway and Grade (2015-2021), RAG indicates F\% peaks and troughs within each career pathway

|  | ARCH |  |  | C\&M |  |  | ENGL |  |  | MUS |  |  | PHIL |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% |
| 6 | 7 | 32 | 18\% | 3 | 1 | 75\% | 7 | 4 | 64\% | 4 | 11 | 27\% | 0 | 5 | 0\% |
| 7 | 9 | 5 | 64\% | 6 | 4 | 60\% | 8 | 3 | 73\% | 7 | 22 | 24\% | 4 | 2 | 67\% |
| 8 | 4 | 6 | 40\% | 6 | 5 | 55\% | 8 | 5 | 62\% | 1 | 7 | 13\% | 1 | 2 | 33\% |
| 9 | 4 | 13 | 24\% | 5 | 5 | 50\% | 4 | 10 | 29\% | 3 | 5 | 38\% | 2 | 2 | 50\% |
| Prof | 0. | 7 | 0\% | 3 | 1 | 75\% | 6 | 5 | 55\% | 2 | 3 | 40\% | 0 | 5 | 0\% |
| TOTAL | 24 | 63 | 28\% | 23 | 16 | 59\% | 33 | 27 | 55\% | 17 | 48 | 26\% | 7 | 16 | 30\% |

Figure 4.37 - All departmental staff split by gender and grade as headcount (Jan 2021) (incl. Architecture fractional tutors and Music instrumental tutors). Largest gender cluster at each grade highlighted in table for each department

The Departmental breakdown confirms the trend (Figure 4.37). A key action is to ensure that each Department support their female ECAs and senior women for promotion (Action 5.5; 5.5; 5.6; 5.16; 5.17). It also highlights the absence of female professors in Architecture and Philosophy since 2014. Both Departments are committed to attract female professors when vacancies become available or through internal promotion (Action 4.12; Action 4.13). Since Spring 2020, the Architecture EDI group has undertaken a national benchmarking exercise exploring potential academic expertise that female professors have and investigated the communication pathways and networks such as Women in Architecture, Urbanistas etc. to extend the reach of job postings. This strategy is also used to recruit female visiting professors in Architecture.

By excluding AFTs (addressed in the next section), women make up $35 \%$ of Architecture's staff, much closer to the HESA benchmark (37\%).

In Music, the exclusion of instrumental tutors raises the departmental F\% to 33\%, which still falls below the HESA benchmark (43\%), although as noted above, there is no direct HESA benchmark for Music. Figure 4.37 identifies that Music is the only Department where women are in the minority at each grade level, although having a female HoD (Action 4.14).

|  | ARCH |  |  | MUS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | F | M | F\% | F | M | F\% |
| 6 | 2 | 4 | $33 \%$ | 4 | 11 | $27 \%$ |
| 7 | 9 | 5 | $64 \%$ | 4 | 4 | $50 \%$ |
| 8 | 4 | 6 | $40 \%$ | 1 | 6 | $14 \%$ |
| 9 | 4 | 13 | $24 \%$ | 3 | 5 | $38 \%$ |
| Prof | 0 | 7 | $0 \%$ | 2 | 3 | $40 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 9}$ | $33 \%$ |

Figure 4.38 - The numbers of Architecture and Music staff excluding AFTs and Music instrumental tutors, split by gender and grade (Jan 2021)

## Key issues

Lack of female professors in Architecture and Philosophy; gender imbalance at Grade 9 and above in SOTA; gender imbalance in Music

## Actions to address issues:

- 4.12-Use the findings from the Architecture investigation to ensure vacancy advertisements reach potential female candidates.
- 4.13 - The Philosophy EDI working group to complete a similar exercise to Architecture to understand how to attract more female applicants for future professorships, e.g. through the WIP network
- 4.14 - Develop relationships with relevant organisations such as Women in Music and Soundgirls to help us reach a diversity of candidates for available roles. Make sure the advertisements of roles encourage applications from underrepresented groups.
(ii) Academic and research staff by grade on fixed-term, open-ended/permanent and zero-hour contracts by gender.

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

The RO pathway is typically fixed term, and posts are tied to funded projects. F\% is slightly higher (54\%) (Figure 4.39) (Action 4.15).

The T\&S pathway has the highest proportion of both men and women on fixed term, PT contracts (F 11, M 17). Those PT staff under one-year service are GTAs (11 F, 15 M) who are PGRs in SOTA. Female GTAs count $42 \%$ which is lower than SOTA's PGR F\% (53\%). This gender imbalance needs to be addressed in future recruitment (Action 4.16) and GTA training has been proposed since 2020/21 (explained in Section 5).


Figure 4.39 - Staff who are on Fixed Term contracts, displayed in Full-Time and Part-Time status, by gender (Jan 2021)

| Dept | F | M | F\% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| English | 8 | 2 | $\mathbf{8 0 \%}$ |
| Music | 3 | 9 | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ |
| Philosophy | 0 | 4 | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 \%}$ |

Figure 4.40 - GTAs working in SOTA split by Department (Jan 21)

| Grade | Female | Male | Total | F\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 3 | 18 | 21 | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | $\mathbf{0} \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ |

Figure 4.41 - staff on 0 hours contracts in SOTA (Jan 2021)
All zero-hour contracts in SOTA are held by instrumental tutors in Music (Figure 4.41). These contracts are necessary to be retained because the demand for specific instrument tutors depends on student cohorts each year. This is a standard practice across the sector.

Instrumental tutors are recruited informally via departmental connections to local institutions, such as Liverpool Philharmonic and music hubs. UK Music's 2020 diversity report states that women make up 50\% of the UK's music industry, which is much higher than the F\% of instrumental tutors (14\%). Due to the fluctuating demand of instrumental tutors each year, a formalised recruitment process is not feasible. The HoD is committed to improve gender balance in tutor recruitment by following HR equality policies from May 2021. Academic staff involved will also be required to undertake Unconscious Bias (UB) training, in addition to the mandatory EDI training. (Action 4.17)

Gender imbalance is observed in AFTs (part-time design tutors from architectural practice) where women made up only $15 \%$ (5) in 2021. This is considerably lower than the RIBA 2020 benchmark (34\%) of the architectural industry. The Architecture EDI group found that existing staff were predominantly recruited via existing staff's industry links, which may have been subject to unconscious bias, so a formalised recruitment process will be introduced (Action 4.18).

Architecture also regularly invites practicing architects as guests to attend students' design reviews. In 2020, there were 82 guest critics in total, with women representing $37 \%$ (30). Architecture is conscious of ensuring gender balance and ethnic diversity among guest critics in the future (Action 4.19).

## Key issues

Support women on Fixed Term contracts; improve gender balance in AFTs, Music instrumental tutors, and GTAs

## Actions to address issues:

- 4.15 - Ensure that women on Fixed Term RO pathways are given mentoring and training throughout their contract and ensure they are aware of redeployment policies and opportunities
- 4.16 - Monitor GTA gender demographics within all Departments $\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{Y}$ to ensure representation is balanced; enhance transparency of GTA recruitment in Music and Philosophy
- 4.17 - In Music, HoD ensures HR policies are incorporated into the recruitment process for instrumental tutors and all academic staff searching for instrumental tutors must have completed unconscious bias training, as well as the mandatory EDI training
- 4.18 - Formalise recruitment process for AFTs, so they undergo the same scrutiny from HR/equal opportunities. Liaison with RIBA and local young architect's association to enhance reach and improve gender balance.
- 4.19 - Monitor gender balance in Architectural guest critics from Sep 2021


## (iii) Academic leavers by grade and gender and full/part-time status.

Comment on the reasons academic staff leave the department, any differences by gender and the mechanisms for collecting this data.

From September 2015 to August 2019, 57 staff have left SOTA due to reasons other than end of tenure $-44 \%$ of these leavers were female (25). The most common reason for leaving is resignation, with females representing $47 \%$ (18) of this category. This data is held at central University level. Currently, the University is updating the centralised exit interview process aiming to gain further understanding on reasons for leaving (Action 4.20).

|  | Sep15-Aug16 |  | Sep16-Aug17 |  | Sep17-Aug18 |  | Sep18-Aug19 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leaving Reason | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male |
| Death | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| End of tenure | 5 | 8 | 19 | 21 | 24 | 27 | 21 | 27 |
| Lapse of appointment | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Redundancy Fixed Term | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Resignation | 4 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Retirement | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Voluntary disengagement (other) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Voluntary disengagement (retire) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ |

Figure 4.42 - Academic leavers by gender (15/16 - 18/19)

## Key issues

No data to provide the reason for staff resignation

## Action to address issues:

- 4.20 - Once the central University project has been implemented, SOTA will monitor responses for any gendered impact.


## 5. Supporting and Advancing Women's Careers

Recommended word count: Bronze: 6000 words | Silver: 6500 words
A. Key career transition points: academic staff
(i) Recruitment.

Break down data by gender and grade for applications to academic posts including shortlisted candidates, offer and acceptance rates. Comment on how the department's recruitment processes ensure that women (and men where there is an underrepresentation in numbers) are encouraged to apply.

SOTA follows the University's recruitment policy and a key recruiter is appointed for each post (usually the HoD). The recruiter must have completed Recruitment and Selection, and UB training. They must ensure EDI principles are embedded in the recruitment process. The advertisement materials are checked for criteria and language that might discriminate against certain groups. They also refer to our AS and EDI commitment to encourage applicants from underrepresented groups. Shortlisting and interview panels are required to have a gender balance and use structured interview questions and presentation topics consistently for all candidates, but not all interview panel members have completed UB training (Action 5.1).

Job descriptions are sent to all staff in advance and staff are encouraged to attend the presentations of the shortlisted candidates and fill in a standard feedback sheet afterwards. During 2018, staff attending presentations by candidates for senior positions raised concerns about the potential for bias in the wording of a feedback question ('does the candidate meet your expectations of a Professor/Dean'). After discussion amongst the AS SAT team, Dean, HoSO and HR, a re-worded version was adopted ('How does the candidate meet the criteria for the role?'). The Staff Survey carried out in 2018 showed that 89\% staff in SOTA didn't have concerns over equality during their own recruitment process.

Recruitment data shows women make up 39\% of applicants from 2015 to 2020 (Figure 5.1). Women generally have higher shortlisting rates (12\%) than men (10\%), and higher
success rates (4\%) than men (3\%). SOTA has appointed 59 women and 62 men in the past five years which has improved the gender balance in the school. Nevertheless, Architecture and Philosophy have no female professor (Action 4.12; 4.13 in Section 4).

|  |  | Applied |  |  | Shortlisted |  |  | Successful |  |  | F\% <br> Shortlisted | F\% Successful | M\% <br> Shortlisted | M\% <br> Successful |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pathway | Grade | Female | Male | F\% | Female | Male | F\% | Female | Male | F\% |  |  |  |  |
|  | Grade 6 | 55 | 164 | 25\% | 9 | 27 | 25\% | 3 | 5 | 38\% | 16\% | 5\% | 16\% | 3\% |
| T\&S | Grade 7 | 124 | 260 | 32\% | 14 | 17 | 45\% | 6 | 8 | 43\% | 11\% | 5\% | 7\% | 3\% |
|  | Grade 8 | 35 | 45 | 44\% | 5 | 6 | 45\% | 2 | 1 | 67\% | 14\% | 6\% | 13\% | 2\% |
|  | Grade 6 | 88 | 68 | 56\% | 21 | 13 | 62\% | 5 | 3 | 63\% | 24\% | 6\% | 19\% | 4\% |
| RO | Grade 7 | 305 | 256 | 54\% | 31 | 14 | 69\% | 15 | 5 | 75\% | 10\% | 5\% | 5\% | 2\% |
|  | Grade 8 | 7 | 21 | 25\% | 0 | 7 | 0\% | 0 | 2 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 33\% | 10\% |
| T\&R | Grade 7 | 481 | 762 | 39\% | 45 | 54 | 45\% | 13 | 16 | 45\% | 9\% | 3\% | 7\% | 2\% |
|  | Grade 8 | 271 | 440 | 38\% | 34 | 44 | 44\% | 8 | 8 | 50\% | 13\% | 3\% | 10\% | 2\% |
|  | Grade 9 | 78 | 146 | 35\% | 11 | 26 | 30\% | 1 | 5 | 17\% | 14\% | 1\% | 18\% | 3\% |
|  | Professorial | 49 | 160 | 23\% | 5 | 11 | 31\% | 3 | 7 | 30\% | 10\% | 6\% | 7\% | 4\% |
|  | Total | 1540 | 2385 | 39\% | 181 | 233 | 44\% | 59 | 62 | 49\% | 12\% | 4\% | 10\% | 3\% |

Figure 5.1 - Total SOTA recruitment data (applications, shortlist, successful) split by Gender, Contract Pathway and Grade (2015-20)

## Key issue

## Possible bias of other members of interview panels

## Action point to address the issue:

- 5.1 - Interview panel members all need to complete the Recruitment and Selection, EDI and Unconscious Bias training.
(ii) Induction.

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

Within a week of starting, new staff meet their line manager and other staff relevant to their roles and are given an induction pack. It includes information about the School, the University, as well as a new starter checklist which includes information about key stakeholders and building access etc. More information in the induction intranet is also pointed out to them. The University also has a dedicated New Starters area on the HR webpage which includes information about the city and University policies and procedures. New staff are required to complete and return the checklist, as well as completing the obligatory and role-related training modules. A mentor is also assigned and a tour is arranged with a technician. Several follow-up discussions are arranged with the HoDs throughout their first year to ensure that any concerns regarding confirmation of appointment and progression are addressed. For ECRs/ECAs, extra workload allowance is given (see workload model section).

Part-time staff, such as the AFTs and Music instrumental tutors, receive a shorter induction which includes the essentials, and directions to the New Starters area on the HR webpage. Architecture organises an induction day for AFTs in September before teaching starts, which includes UB training since 2020.

The Operation Support Team (OST) organise a schedule of meetings for new staff to meet relevant stakeholders in the School. Since 2017/18, OST arranges an annual welcome event for new staff, and the Dean hosts a welcome lunch (coffee over Zoom this year due to COVID-19) in March since 2018/19. This complements the University's annual induction meeting which introduces staff to the University senior management and other stakeholders outside SOTA. The VC also hosts an annual welcome party where all new starters in the University are invited. These events were well attended by women (Figure 5.2).

Due to working from home (WFH), OST were not able to arrange a Welcome Event in 20/21. But it is scheduled for September/October 2021.

|  | Invited |  |  | Attended |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Female | Male | F\% | Female | Male | F\% |
| 2016 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 9 | $25 \%$ |
| 2017 | 12 | 10 | $55 \%$ | 7 | 4 | $64 \%$ |
| 2018 | 9 | 11 | $45 \%$ | 6 | 6 | $50 \%$ |
| 2019 | 29 | 16 | $64 \%$ | 17 | 6 | $74 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 \%}$ |

Figure 5.2 - New staff who were invited/attended OST's annual Welcome event split by gender
(iii) Promotion

Provide data on staff applying for promotion and comment on applications and success rates by gender, grade and full- and part-time status. Comment on how staff are encouraged and supported through the process.

All staff appointed at Grade 7 or Grade 8 on all career pathways enter a three-year probation period. Staff on G7 automatically progress to Grade 8 once they pass probation. All other promotions proceed through Annual Review. Between 2015 and 2019, 74 applications were made through the annual review process ( 29 F and $39 \%$ of total), in line with the gender split of all staff (38\%F, Jan 21). Among the Departments, the same number of men and women were promoted in Philosophy (3), in Architecture, 9 M and 5 F , in C\&M, 5 M and 3 F , in English, 8 M and 10 F , and in Music, 8 M and only 2 F were promoted.

There were 4 unsuccessful applications, 1 F and 3 M . At the professorial level, more men (6) than women (3) applied, and 4 men and 3 women were promoted in the past five years (Figure 5.3).

Regarding T\&S staff, the success rate for women was $100 \%$ (10F), while $92 \%$ for men (12 applied and 11 promoted). There was no T\&S promotion in C\&M, Music and Philosophy due to the small number of eligible staff in this category. There was no application from T\&S staff for promotion to Professor (Action 5.2).


Figure 5.3 - Promotion by gender and by year

Both the University and the School support staff applications for promotion. The University offers 'Insight to Promotion' workshops since 2016 with dedicated sessions for women and for T\&S staff (Action 5.3). SOTA staff's attendance has increased from 10 and 9 in 2016 and 2017 respectively, to 23 in 2019 (no session was ran in 2020 due to the pandemic). There was no gender gap in attendees and fewer staff from Philosophy (3 in total) and Music (5 in total) attended the workshops compared to the other three Departments. In the School, staff discuss their current and future promotion plans in PDRs. Such discussion is a mandatory requirement for a current promotion application, which is carried out with the HoD for applications for Senior Lectureship (SL), and with the Dean for Readership and Professorship. The HoD writes a statement of support for SL applicants while the Dean does the same for Reader and Professorial applications.

The SOTA Staff Survey 2018 shows that only 30\% staff agree that the promotion process is transparent, and $34 \%$ believe it's fair. However, the majority ( $69 \%$ ) didn't think gender bias hindered their promotion prospects. In the Research Survey 2020, staff asked for guidance on activities that would improve their chance for promotion, a better explained application process well in advance, as well as support in the preparation of application materials (Action 5.4; 5.5). Some T\&S staff expressed concern about how 'scholarship' is defined and assessed in promotion. Some others mentioned that women may need more encouragement to apply for promotion and the impact of maternity and caring responsibilities should be considered.

Apart from probationary candidates, the promotion round in 2019-20 did not proceed due to financial challenges of COVID-19 and it is not clear at the time of the writing when it will be resumed.

## Case Study: Professor Josie Billington

(Table was treated for anonymising reason)

Key issues

Dissatisfaction and lack of understanding of the promotion process, and lack of encouragement for women to apply for promotion

## Action to address issues:

- 5.2 - Forming a T\&S staff network within the School and across the faculty, e.g. with ULMS, to promote peer support and communication of career trajectory.
- 5.3 - EDI Committee will encourage staff to engage with UoL 'Insights to Promotion' events through the EDI Newsletter and EDI email address, particularly for staff in Philosophy and Music; provide SOTA case studies for the related web page, including studies from women and T\&S
- 5.4 - Form a gender balanced CV/Career Review Committee which is open between July and Sep each year. Staff who consider applying for promotion this year or the next year will be encouraged to approach the committee for advice on application materials or career development.
- 5.5 - The Dean will host an annual roadshow of career trajectory 'what's next?' for staff with senior women presenting their career stories.


## (iv) Department submissions to the Research Excellence Framework (REF)

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

| Department | F | M | Total | F\% | Eligible F\% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Architecture | 26 | 85 | 111 | $23 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| C\&M | 84 | 96 | 180 | $47 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| English | 98 | 121 | 219 | $45 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| Music | 28 | 54 | 82 | $34 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Philosophy | 15 | 51 | 66 | $23 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 \%}$ |

Figure 5.4 - REF outputs by Gender and Department (outputs in Architecture included design portfolios)

For REF2014 the School submitted $85 \%$ of all eligible staff (80). Among them, women (26) counted for $33 \%$. For REF2021, as per University guidelines, SOTA submitted all T\&R staff (144 in total, 61 women). The total outputs submitted for internal selection was 656, of which $38 \%$ were from women (head count) which matches the eligible F\% in SOTA (Figure 5.4). However, Architecture, C\&M and Philosophy submitted proportionally fewer outputs from women (Action 5.6).

Outputs were reviewed and selected by an internal reading panel in each Department. The reviewers in Architecture only include Professors and in Philosophy, SL staff and above (Action 5.7). Outputs were rated using the same star system as the REF, and in SOTA, $89 \%$ of the outputs were internally rated $3^{*}$ and above. There isn't an obvious gender gap with the average scores for the outputs (women 3.07, men 3.15). However, in Architecture, a much smaller percentage of outputs from women were rated 3* and above compared to that of men (Figure 5.5). The gender disparity was confirmed in the Research Survey 2020, in which more men (40) than women (20) said the rating of their outputs was fair. More women than men ( $-11 \%$ difference) reported that they did not receive feedback to their outputs in a timely and appropriate way (Action 5.8).

| Department | Female | Male |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Architecture | $64 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
| C\&M | $100 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| English | $89 \%$ | $88 \%$ |
| Music | $87 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| Philosophy | $87 \%$ | $90 \%$ |

Figure 5.5 - Percentages of outputs rated 3* and above by gender and by department

SOTA has returned 14 impact case studies (ICSs) which are reviewed by staff of both genders and at different grades including ECAs. A good gender balance has been achieved in the authors except in Architecture (Figure 5.6). The Research Survey 2020 suggests that men were over two times more likely to feel 'supported' to develop an ICS when compared with women (Action 5.10).

| Department | Case study <br> number | Female | Male | F\% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Architecture | 3 | 2 | 7 | $22 \%$ |
| C\&M | 3 | 2 | 2 | $50 \%$ |
| English | 4 | 4 | 3 | $57 \%$ |
| Music | 2 | 2 | 1 | $67 \%$ |
| Philosophy | 2 | 1 | 1 | $50 \%$ |

Figure 5.6 - Impact case study with contributors by gender and by department

## Key issues

Lack of diversity and possible bias of internal reviewers of research outputs in Architecture and Philosophy; women in Architecture, C\&M and Philosophy returned fewer outputs and fewer women led ICS in Architecture

## Action to address issues:

- 5.6 - School R\&I team to provide refreshed information on the purpose of the reading programme and to explore reasons for the under representation of women in returned outputs. Ensure the number of outputs returned by women is in proportion to the gender split.
- 5.7 - Make sure internal reviewers include T\&R staff at all grades and both genders in Architecture and Philosophy. Internal reviewers to complete EDI training and Unconscious Bias training. Departments to hold scoring workshops with input from former REF panel members (internal or external).
- 5.8 - Departmental Research Leads ensure consistent communication of review feedback on the grading of outputs. Ensure the communication is timely and appropriate.
- 5.9 - Impact Leads at departmental, School and Faculty level strategically identify and encourage women to lead impact case studies, particularly in Architecture. Support women in developing research impact through the RDIF fund and other funding opportunities in the University.


## B. Career development: academic staff

(i) Training

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

The University offers both mandatory role-related and optional training opportunities to support staff role and career development. Obligatory training is self-administered via online platforms, and includes subjects such as, Equality and Diversity, Health and Safety, and Information Security. Completion rates are recorded and monitored by HR. By Jan 2021, there have been 849 completions of 5 obligatory modules by SOTA academic staff, with the completion rates of $65 \% \mathrm{~F}$ and $58 \% \mathrm{M}$ (Figure 5.7) (Action 5.10).

Optional training is identified through the PDR process and mentoring. This covers a wide range of modules, such as Recruitment and Selection, UB, Teaching Observation, PGR supervision etc.

There are also University-wide training programmes. This includes leadership courses focusing specifically on women, such as Springboard targeting junior women and Aurora targeting women in grades 7-9. The School provided funding to support in total 4 women for Aurora since 2015. The Future Research Team Leader programme is also available for both genders, in which 11 staff ( $6 \mathrm{~F}, 5 \mathrm{M}$ ) from SOTA have participated since 2014.

| Department | Female | Male |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Architecture | $61 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| C\&M | $76 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| English | $72 \%$ | $65 \%$ |
| Music | $39 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Philosophy | $77 \%$ | $74 \%$ |

Figure 5.7- Obligatory training uptake by gender by department (snapshot Feb 2021)
Staff Survey 2019 suggests a need to raise staff awareness of the various training programmes, because only $51 \%$ of women agreed that they had received the training they need to assist with their career development, in comparison to $72 \%$ of men (Action 5.11). The Research Survey 2020 shows that women were more likely to self-nominate ( 13 F vs 4 M ) to attend a leadership course, whereas men were more likely to be recommended by colleague/line-manager (5 F vs 15 M ) (Action 5.12).

## Key issues

Low completion rate of obligatory training; insufficient awareness on nonobligatory training; lack of encouragement for women to attend training

## Actions to address issues:

- 5.10 - SMT will track completion of obligatory training, and work through HoDs to increase completion rates, particularly in Music.
- 5.11 - HoDs will identify key non-obligatory training, especially that are relevant for career progression, and encourage attendance through PDR. Universitywide training opportunities to be included in Induction materials, particularly those opportunities focusing on women. SOTA EDI newsletter and School Forum will be used to disseminate training opportunities and enhance visibility of them.
- 5.12 - Ensure gender balance when recommending candidates for external training courses.


## (ii) Appraisal/development review

Describe current appraisal/development review schemes for staff at all levels, including postdoctoral researchers and provide data on uptake by gender. Provide details of any appraisal/review training offered and the uptake of this, as well as staff feedback about the process.

All academic and PS staff are required to have a PDR annually. PDR reviewers are either the individual's line manager or other senior staff on their career pathway. Figure 5.8 identifies that Architecture didn't have any female PDR reviewers and Philosophy has only 2 (Action 5.13). Reviewers are fully trained via an e-learning module or a workshop provided by the Academy. PDR discussions cover role, contribution, plans and priorities, development and support. Both reviewer and reviewee have access to the online form, and each must sign off the discussion and objectives set.

PDR take-up is improving Y/Y. SOTA recorded 97\% completion rate of PDRs in 2020, a steady growth from 93\% last year, 76\% and 67\% in 2018 and 2017 respectively. However, $55 \%$ of academics responding to the Staff Survey 2018 didn't think PDRs were helpful in developing their career. Staff comments include making promotion criteria more transparent, especially for T\&S staff (Action 5.14). This was also mentioned in the Research Survey 2020.

PDR is used to gauge individual circumstances in relation to the impact of COVID-19 in the recent round which will be used to provide context for the longer-term review of
progress against objectives. Such a discussion in PDR was recommended in the University RISE survey 2020 but has already been carried out in SOTA this year.

|  | Grade | Female | Male | F\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ARCH | 9 |  | 2 | 0\% |
|  | 10 |  | 5 |  |
| C\&M | 9 | 1 | 3 | 40\% |
|  | 10 | 1 |  |  |
| ENGL | 9 | 2 | 6 | 39\% |
|  | 10 | 5 | 5 |  |
| MUSI | 9 | 1 |  | 50\% |
|  | 10 | 1 | 2 |  |
| PHIL | 9 | 2 | 3 | 29\% |
|  | 10 |  | 2 |  |
| SOTA | 10 |  | 1 | 0\% |
| TOTAL |  | 13 | 29 | 45\% |

Figure 5.8 - PDR reviewers in each Department split by gender and grade (2021)

Key issues
Lack of clear link between PDR and promotion and lack of clarity of promotion criteria for T\&S staff

## Actions to address issues:

- 5.13 - Improve gender balance among PDR reviewers in Architecture by involving women at Grade 9 as reviewers
- 5.14 - PDR reviewers will be briefed annually about promotion criteria and various School leadership roles as they come available, so they can discuss these issues with PDR reviewees.
(iii) Support given to academic staff for career progression

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

The University and School offer a range of support, particularly for women, ECRs and T\&S staff. The Faculty has established an ECR Network for new lecturers, postdocs and PGR students and organised a series of events on funding, policy, consultant work and impact. Since 2019/20, SOTA has established a biannual ECR Forum to discuss relevant issues informally and the recent forum held in Oct 2020 was attended by 20 (11F and 9M).

SOTA staff are all encouraged to participate in both the Department-level and University mentoring scheme. New appointments and ECRs are allocated a mentor from their departments. The Research Survey 2020, however, shows that among 43 respondents who are lecturers (including ECR) and post-docs, only 20 said they have a research mentor. This shows that many are either not aware of or have not utilised the mentoring arrangement (Action 5.15).

All academic staff including T\&S staff have access to the SOTA Research Development and Initiative Fund (RDIF) which is explained in Section 5.v. Research and Impact leave also supports career progression. Academic staff, including T\&S and non-probationary ECRs, are eligible to apply after every 5 full semesters of teaching and administration. Applications are reviewed and recommended by the R\&I Committee, and the final decision is made by the relevant HoDs and the Dean. Since 2015, SOTA supported 81 research leave cases among 83 applications (34F, 42\%) (Figure 5.9).


Figure 5.9-Research leave applications and awards by Department and gender
SOTA offers a Teaching Qualification Fund since 2018/19 to support staff to apply for Fellowship or Senior Fellowship of the HEA. So far, 4 women and 7 men were supported.

For postdocs, the University started PROSPER, a career development programme in 2019 to enable them to explore multiple career pathways, and the pilot project this
year recruited 57 postdocs across three faculties, with one participant from SOTA (Action 5.1).

Women have been particularly supported during the pandemic. For example, C\&M has created a community of women for exchanging ideas and experiences through a monthly online informal discussion between Oct. 2020 and Feb 2021. Activities include publication workshops with a publisher and ECRs mentorship.

## Case study: Dr Ataa Alsalloum

Table was treated for anonymising reason)

Key issues
Insufficient use of mentoring network by ECAs in the school and low participation in University programme for postdocs

## Actions to address issues:

- 5.15 - Monitor ECAs' engagement with mentoring, supporting their personal preference and allocation of mentors. Mentors ensure at least one meeting with their mentees per semester, and ensure discussions covering grant capture and research outputs.
- 5.16 - Encourage postdocs to engage in the PROSPER programme through their supervisors and past participants.
(iv) Support given to students (at any level) for academic career progression.

Comment and reflect on support given to students at any level to enable them to make informed decisions about their career (including the transition to a sustainable academic career).

Since 2011, SOTA has a Placement and Employability Committee with an academic coordinator from each Department. The Committee operates a school wide UG placement module SOTA300 since 2012, in collaboration with a wide range of industry partners, nationally and internationally (Figure 5.10). So far, participants have been mainly female (83\%F) (Action 5.17). Since 2018, C\&M have introduced a Year-in-Industry component in their degree programmes, which has helped 9 women (out of 14) secure year-long paid placements in industry. Philosophy has also introduced this component but hasn't started recruiting students yet.

SOTA also runs two extra-curricular schemes for UGs - FilmBuddy and Mindless Mag. The former offers a one-to-one mentoring service to students by Film and TV production industrial partners. The latter is a 4-week online Digital Micro-Internship programme in digital storytelling jointly provided by the Mindless Academy.

|  | F | M | F\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SOTA300 | 194 | 39 | $83 \%$ |

Figure 5.10 - SOTA300 students by gender (2015/16-2020/21)

The School works with the University Career Service to promote initiatives and events for students. "Artworks", for example, is a rolling careers \& employability programme led by relevant practitioners and alumni, with attendance accredited to the Higher Education Academy Report (HEAR). In 2018, SOTA introduced an Employability Support Award to assist students in relevant initiatives. However, a UG student focus group revealed that many students were unaware of the peer coaching component of the University Career Service (Actions 5.18). Furthermore, each SOTA Department organises its own careers events that involve networking and alumni talks, such as the biannual 'Career Days' in Architecture, 'How to get a graduate job' in Philosophy, 'Career Cabaret' and 'Skill Week' in English, and 'Career Matters' in C\&M.

The Faculty offers the Undergraduate Research Scheme (URS) since 2018/19 and the Graduate Research Internship Scheme (GRIS) since 2019/20 to help students gain research experience through working with a named supervisor for four or six weeks (or 70 hrs ) during the summer. The recruitment is through an open competitive process and both programmes offered up to 80 funded placements in 2020 and 2021. SOTA offered match funding to the successful candidates last year. SOTA's take-up has been strong with 50 F and 15 M participants, although most were from English (32F, 3M) (Action 5.19).

At the PGR level, the Liverpool Doctoral College (LDC) coordinates formal skills development for PGRs. PGR students are required to complete a bi-annual Development Needs Analysis (DNA) where they identify training needs and
opportunities with their supervisors. Furthermore, any problems and issues are identified through the PGR Staff Student Liaison Committee which reports to the PGR committee to inform actions. These committees meet 4 times a year. In the Annual Progress Review, PGR students make presentations to all and are interviewed by an independent panel of two staff other than the student's supervisors on their progress.

PGRs in SOTA also actively participate in the UoL cross-faculty initiative Engage@Liverpool, a network promoting interdisciplinary research. Training on research methods can also be gained through the University's partnership with 'Methods NorthWest' and the National Centre for Research Methods. Furthermore, PGRs receive training from the ESRC and AHRC Northwest Doctoral Training Partnerships.

SOTA initiated and piloted the Liverpool Network of Knowledge Exchange (LiNK), involving collaboration with cultural industries in the region. Female PGR students represented most applicants to LiNK and of the placements obtained; between 2014 and 2018, SOTA allocated 33 placements ( 14 M and 19 F ) from 46 applications ( 21 M and 25 F). In 2017, LiNK was taken over by the Faculty and later integrated into the LDC.

PGRs can work as GTAs in Music, English and Philosophy (Section 4). Training was provided in each Department but since this year, formal training is organised by the Deputy PGR director. SOTA also started to create a learning platform on CANVAS, the GTA Community Hub, for all GTAs to access relevant resources including the Obligatory training modules. GTAs are also encouraged to attend the University's Teaching and Learning Conference as well as various teaching related workshops by the Academy.

| Dept | Year | Awarded |  | Rejected |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Female | Male | Female | Male |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \text { 品 } \end{aligned}$ | 2017/18 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2018/19 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 2019/20 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2020/21 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| $\sum_{\infty}^{\infty}$ | 2017/18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2018/19 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 2019/20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2020/21 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2017/18 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2018/19 | 22 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
|  | 2019/20 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
|  | 2020/21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\frac{U}{n}$ | 2017/18 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2018/19 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
|  | 2019/20 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2020/21 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\frac{1}{\bar{x}}$ | 2017/18 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2018/19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2019/20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2020/21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 『 | 2017/18 | 24 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2018/19 | 34 | 21 | 5 | 4 |
|  | 2019/20 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
|  | 2020/21 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| Grand Total |  | 74 | 42 | 6 | 5 |

Figure 5.11 - PGR support applications and awards

SOTA offers funding up to $£ 600$ on a competitive basis to support PGRs attending international conferences. Since 2017, SOTA supported 42M and 74F with the success rates of $89 \% \mathrm{M}$ and $95 \%$. Fewer men utilised this funding than women (Action 5.20) (Figure 5.11).

The recent RISE Survey by the University identified that due to COVID-19, PhD students had limited opportunities for cohort building and faced mental health and wellbeing challenges. To tackle this, the School offered specific support, including a PGR Wellbeing ambassador organising coffee mornings, and promoting games, activities, virtual tours and other 'stress-busting' activities. At the Departmental level, meetings with PGRs were increased, and PGRs in English, Music and Philosophy were supported to organise online research seminars and workshops and some were open to the public.

Currently, there is no formal guidance or policy for PGRs to take maternity/paternity/parental/adoption leave apart from those funded by the UKRC. The LDC is in the process of producing such a policy and SOTA will support and promote participation from PGRs (Action 5.21).

## Key issues

Low participation of replacement activities in men of the UG cohort and PGR cohort; lack of maternity/paternity/adoption/parental leave guidance for PGRs

## Actions to address issues:

- 5.17 - SOTA's Employability Lead to encourage male students applying for/obtaining placement opportunities, through profiles of former male placement holders featured on Department and University Careers webpages, and meet the University's 2026 target of 50\% take-up
- 5.18 - Department Employability leads will promote the new Careers coaching system in conjunction with Faculty embedded Careers Service, e.g. through inclusion in first year Welcome Week activities and second year Refreshers Week
- 5.19 - Raise awareness of the URS and GIRS opportunities among students in Architecture, C\&M, Music and Philosophy, via student-facing newsletter, class shoutouts and publicity of past participants
- 5.20 - Organise funding application workshop for PGR students and ensure male participants in the workshop
- 5.21-Adopt and raise awareness of LDC's PGR

Parental/maternity/adoption/paternity leave policies among PGRs
(v) Support offered to those applying for research grant applications.

Comment and reflect on support given to staff who apply for funding and what support is offered to those who are unsuccessful.

Between 2015 and July 2020, SOTA staff submitted 358 grant applications to external funders, of which $43 \%$ were from women ( 155 applications, both as PIs and CIs) (Figure 5.12). Women have a higher success rate than men, except for 2015 and 2020 $(34 \% \mathrm{~F}, 29 \% \mathrm{M})$. However, the average award amount for women per application is $£ 39,588$, while men $£ 68,215$. This is because in 2019,2020 , a few large awards were made to men in Architecture, C\&M and Philosophy from UK research councils, independent funding bodies and industry.

|  |  | Applications |  |  | Awards |  |  | Conversion |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dept | Year | Female | Male | F\% | Female | Male | F\% | Female | Male |
| U <br> U <br> U <br> U <br> U | 2015 | 2 | 17 | 11\% | 1 | 17 | 6\% | 50\% | 100\% |
|  | 2016 | 4 | 19 | 17\% | 10 | 8 | 56\% | 250\% | 42\% |
|  | 2017 | 7 | 23 | 23\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | 2018 | 9 | 13 | 41\% | 0 | 3 | 0\% | 0\% | 23\% |
|  | 2019 | 5 | 8 | 38\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | 2020 | 7 | 12 | 37\% | 0 | 3 | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% |
| $\sum_{\infty}^{\infty}$ | 2015 | 7 | 5 | 58\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 0\% | 20\% |
|  | 2016 | 2 | 6 | 25\% | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 50\% | 17\% |
|  | 2017 | 5 | 6 | 45\% | 8 | 5 | 62\% | 160\% | 83\% |
|  | 2018 | 5 | 5 | 50\% | 0 | 3 | 0\% | 0\% | 60\% |
|  | 2019 | 14 | 8 | 64\% | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 7\% | 13\% |
|  | 2020 | 24 | 16 | 60\% | 6 | 3 | 67\% | 25\% | 19\% |
|  | 2015 | 10 | 3 | 77\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | 2016 | 8 | 1 | 89\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | 2017 | 5 | 1 | 83\% | 2 | 2 | 50\% | 40\% | 200\% |
|  | 2018 | 7 | 6 | 54\% | 15 | 3 | 83\% | 214\% | 50\% |
|  | 2019 | 9 | 7 | 56\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | 2020 | 7 | 8 | 47\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% |
| $\frac{.0}{n}$ | 2015 | 2 | 1 | 67\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | 2016 | 0 | 4 | 0\% | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0\% |
|  | 2017 | 1 | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | 2018 | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 1 | 2 | 33\% | 100\% | 200\% |
|  | 2019 | 2 | 3 | 40\% | 2 | 1 | 67\% | 100\% | 33\% |
|  | 2020 | 2 | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% |
| 층$\bar{O}$足을 | 2015 | 1 | 4 | 20\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | 2016 | 2 | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | 2017 | 0 | 5 | 0\% | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0\% |
|  | 2018 | 2 | 6 | 25\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | 2019 | 3 | 7 | 30\% | 6 | 4 | 60\% | 200\% | 57\% |
|  | 2020 | 2 | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% |
| $\frac{\underset{6}{6}}{\stackrel{1}{6}}$ | 2015 | 22 | 30 | 42\% | 1 | 18 | 5\% | 5\% | 60\% |
|  | 2016 | 16 | 32 | 33\% | 11 | 9 | 55\% | 69\% | 28\% |
|  | 2017 | 18 | 37 | 33\% | 10 | 7 | 59\% | 56\% | 19\% |
|  | 2018 | 24 | 31 | 44\% | 16 | 11 | 59\% | 67\% | 35\% |
|  | 2019 | 33 | 33 | 50\% | 9 | 6 | 60\% | 27\% | 18\% |
|  | 2020 | 42 | 40 | 51\% | 6 | 7 | 46\% | 14\% | 18\% |
| Grand Total |  | 155 | 203 | 43\% | 53 | 58 | 48\% | 34\% | 29\% |

Figure 5.12 - Grant applications by Department and gender (since 2015)

As mentioned above, RDIF is a SOTA resource to support staff's external grant applications and other research activities. RDIF bids are assessed by the R\&I Committee, and since 2017, 317 applications were received (162M, 155F) and 268 were awarded (137M and 131F). The success rate for both genders was 85\% (Figure 5.13). The University also offers internal funding such as KE\&I vouchers, ODA Seed Fund and ECR \& Returner Fund to support research and impact activities, of which the latter two were suspended last year due to COVID. By July 2020, in SOTA, 14 staff ( $8 \mathrm{~F}, 6 \mathrm{M}$ ) secured a KE\&I voucher, 11 ( $6 \mathrm{~F}, 5 \mathrm{M}$ ) were awarded an ODA fund, and 4 (2F, 2M) awarded the ECR\& Returner Fund.

|  |  | Application |  | Awarded |  | Conversion |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dept | Year | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { T } \\ & \text { 㘶 } \end{aligned}$ | 2017/18 | 14 | 18 | 14 | 17 | 100\% | 94\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 15 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 80\% | 80\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 9 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 89\% | 73\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 50\% | 100\% |
| $\sum_{\infty}^{\infty}$ | 2017/18 | 9 | 12 | 8 | 10 | 89\% | 83\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 11 | 16 | 10 | 13 | 91\% | 81\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 13 | 20 | 10 | 17 | 77\% | 85\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 100\% | 67\% |
|  | 2017/18 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 85\% | 100\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 93\% | 85\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 25 | 6 | 20 | 3 | 80\% | 50\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 50\% | 100\% |
| $\frac{.0}{n} \frac{0}{\Sigma}$ | 2017/18 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 100\% | 90\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 롬 | 2017/18 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 71\% | 100\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 60\% | 75\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| $\frac{1}{4}$ | 2017/18 | 41 | 46 | 38 | 43 | 93\% | 93\% |
|  | 2018/19 | 52 | 59 | 45 | 50 | 87\% | 85\% |
|  | 2019/20 | 55 | 48 | 44 | 37 | 80\% | 77\% |
|  | 2020/21 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 57\% | 78\% |
| Grand Total |  | 155 | 162 | 131 | 137 | 85\% | 85\% |

Figure 5.13 - RDIF applications and awards split by Department and gender since 2017 (note: the 2021 data ends at Feb 2021)

SOTA staff attend University and Faculty events providing guidance on funding calls and the application process. The School also runs its own events, including research networking events and grant application workshops. For example, a workshop on 'Recycling bids' led by Prof Charles Forsdick was organised in March 2021. The School's dedicated Research \& Impact team provides bespoke pre- and post-award support for the costing and management of projects. It also organises peer review of draft applications, provides examples of successful applications, and helps staff to navigate the University's process for application approval.

Additional support is provided at Departmental level through individual research meetings with mentors and/or the Research Lead (the latter held on an annual/ biannual basis), and through peer-review. English has appointed a Research Funding Lead since 2019/20 who offers voluntary research 'MOTs' to staff to explore funding opportunities. The Research Survey 2020 shows that 70.5\% of respondents (79) felt they were supported by the University/Faculty/School/academic colleagues in applying for external funding, but women felt less supported than men (Action 5.22).

The RISE survey showed that COVID-19 had a gendered impact on research. University-wide, applications from men in 2020 increased by $11.6 \%$ compared to 2019, while those submitted by women decreased by 19\%. In SOTA, however, from Jan to July 2020, more applications were submitted by women ( $51 \%$ F, $49 \%$ M) ( 40 M, 42 F ) as either PI or CIs. 7 M and 6 F were successful. Compared to 2019, the numbers of applications increased by $21 \%$ for men and $27 \%$ for women. This may be attributed
to success in COVID-related funding calls on which the School coordinated networking opportunities among interested staff.

Key Issues

Women feel less supported than men in funding applications

## Action to address issues:

- 5.22 - R\&I team disseminates more targeted communication of funding calls to relevant staff and bespoke funding support; deliver focused training for less experienced applicants/ECAs; Encourage mentors to be Co-I on funding bids.


## D. Flexible working and managing career breaks

Note: Present professional and support staff and academic staff data separately.
(i) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: before leave.

Explain what support the department offers to staff before they go on maternity and adoption leave.

SOTA follows the University's maternity, paternity and adoption/surrogacy leave policies which are held on the HR intranet. Staff are directed to this information when they first discuss their pregnancy/adoption with their line manager who can consult the HR Business Partner for further guidance if needed. Workload is rearranged to ensure the staff can take time off to attend antenatal care. In C\&M, teaching support is provided for women who experience morning sickness. Plans for maternity cover, Keep in Touch (KIT) days, and workload upon return are also discussed at the early stage to gauge expectation and clarify concerns. Risk assessment on the member of staff's working environment is conducted and necessary adjustments are made accordingly. A pool of University Family Friendly Mentors can also offer advice on maternity/ paternity or adoption leave policies and address concerns.

The University has allowed paid leave days to support people undergoing fertility treatment, or employees whose partners are undergoing such treatment.
(ii) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: during leave.

Explain what support the department offers to staff during maternity and adoption leave.

Staff are entitled up to 52 weeks of maternity or adoption leave with the first 8 weeks on full pay, regardless of length of service. Staff are also encouraged to take up to 10
paid KIT days. This allows them to stay connected with the workplace and plan their return to work. The staff can formally request these days or hours on an ongoing basis from HR. For example, a member of staff in C\&M took 3 of these days in 2020 for PhD supervision and attending an interview for a School role. SOTA has no formal procedure to monitor the uptake of KIT days.
(iii) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: returning to work

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

Prior to returning to work, the member of staff discusses their work plan and work hours with their line manager. This meeting focuses on timetabling, ensuring that teaching and research commitments fit around childcare needs. PDRs are also opportunities for addressing gender-specific work issues for returned staff. Furthermore, the University's Flexible Working Policy is an important means of support for staff returning to work (see the section below).

There is no dedicated room within the School for milk expressing and milk storage, although the University offers three rooms for that purpose. The University has joined the Bambis Breastfeeding Friendly Charter (a Liverpool local breastfeeding support group) so staff, students and visitors are welcome to breastfeed in any University premises. With the expectation that many staff will be working in a hybrid pattern following the pandemic, the Operations Team will be assessing the usage of SOTA facilities to create milk expression rooms (Action 5.23).

Other means of support in place include the University's Early Career Researcher and Returner Fund since 2018 to enable returning staff to re-establish or explore new areas of research. A returner in Architecture has received this fund following her maternity leave in 2019.

Furthermore, the University's Children's Centre provides Ofsted-registered childcare weekdays and free childcare for staff who work on Saturday Open Days. The Children's Centre is within five minutes walking distance of the main School building. The University also offers two carers' car parks for staff unable to start work before 8.45am due to caring responsibilities.

Key issues

Lack of milk expression/breastfeeding rooms in the School

## Actions to address issues:

- 5.23 - Explore milk expressing/breastfeeding rooms in the new or refurbished buildings of SOTA after the pandemic and raise awareness about the portable mini fridges made available by UoL for milk storage.
(iv) Maternity return rate.

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

15 women took maternity leave in the past five years and all of them returned to work. All 5 women taking leave in 2019 have returned but not reached the 18 months mark by the time of the writing (Figure 5.14).

| Year | Total | Still employed <br> after 18 mo |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 3 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 2 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 3 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | 2 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | 5 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

Figure 5.14 - Total number of SOTA women who took maternity, showing retention after 18 months
(v) Paternity, shared parental, adoption, and parental leave uptake.

Provide data and comment on the uptake of these types of leave by gender and grade. Comment on what the department does to promote and encourage take-up of paternity leave and shared parental leave.

4 staff took paternity leave, 1 man took adoption leave and 1 woman took parental leave in the past five years. During 2015-17, for example, two T\&R staff in Music took Adoption Leave and Shared Parental Leave, each taking six months consecutive leave (Figure 5.15).

|  | Female |  |  | Male |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Paternity | Parental | Adoption | Paternity | Parental | Adoption |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| 2017 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 2018 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| 2019 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |

Figure 5.15 - Staff who used paternity, parental and adoption policies split by gender (2015-2019)

## Provide information on the flexible working arrangements available.

The University's Flexible Working Policy allows staff to request changes to their contract hours, working patterns and location of work based on caring responsibilities, disability, religious observance, or other circumstances. The change can be either temporary or permanent. The policy is open to all from the start of their employment. Approval sits with the line manager and will be granted within reason.

In the Research Survey 2020, 5 staff (1M, 4F) said they had adjusted their workloads upon return from parental leave. In English, two ECRs and two later-career staff dropped their contracted hours in the past few years. In Architecture, 1 professor (M) went from 1.0 to 0.2 as part of a phased retirement. In C\&M, two staff went from 1.0 to $0.2(1 \mathrm{M}, 1 \mathrm{~F})$.

Staff awareness of the University's family-friendly and flexible working policies varies. In the Staff Survey 2018, 32 (39\%) - 20M (63\%), 12F (37\%) agreed that they had been 'well informed about University policies on flexible working', while 33 (40\%) $15 \mathrm{M}(45 \%)$, 18F (55\%) did not (Action 5.24; 5.25). The related policies and information about the University's Wellbeing Hub were circulated in the SOTA EDI newsletters in Feb 2021 to address the challenges faced by staff during the pandemic.

Both the 2018 and 2020 surveys report staff frustration related to work-life balance. In the latter survey, although 25 men and 22 women ( 95 in total) reported that they have caring responsibilities for children, 10 women are either the primary or sole carer compared to only 2 men in these categories (the rest are co-carers). Only 3 women and 10 men said they were supported in achieving work-life balance. The pandemic worsened the gendered problem. In the focus group conducted in Dec 2020 by the academic lead, staff all agreed that WFH has been challenging and the majority welcomed a more flexible or hybrid working patterns in the future (Action 5.26). Some commented on strengthening 'emailing discipline' among staff to ease the stress of dealing with working emails outside their working hours (Action 5.27).
(vii) Transition from part-time back to full-time work after career breaks.

Outline what policy and practice exists to support and enable staff who work parttime after a career break to transition back to full-time roles.

SOTA follows HR policy in managing part-time employees wishing to return to full-time work. Requests are considered by the HoD, who puts forward a business case to the Dean and HoSO addressing feasibility and operational need. In total, 27 (13F, 14M) have done the transition since 2015.

## issues

Lack of awareness of the University Family-friendly and flexible working policies; continued struggle with work-life balance, particularly in women

## Actions to address issues:

- 5.24 - To raise awareness of the University FF mentors among staff, a Family Friendly Guide will be produced and given to new starters.
- 5.25 - Allocation of 15 mins ‘Did you know’ sessions in the SOTA staff forum to raise awareness of the Family Friendly Policies, Returner Fund, Children's Centre and carer car park. The forum is arranged twice every year and a session has already been delivered in Feb 2021. SOTA EDI Newsletter is also a means to signpost these policies and opportunities.
- 5.26 - Normalise hybrid working in academic staff, allowing flexibility of working locations.
- 5.27 - Promote considerate communication strategy in SOTA by including a disclaimer in individual's email signature to not expect replies in others' nonworking hours which can vary due to flexible working and caring responsibility etc. The Dean and HoDs to strongly steer this action.


## E. Organisation and culture

(i) Culture

Demonstrate how the department actively considers gender equality and inclusivity. Provide details of how the Athena SWAN Charter principles have been, and will continue to be, embedded into the culture and workings of the department.

The School's commitment to gender equality is shown in various areas of activity (Case study: Women in Philosophy). The students consulted as part of the 2018 Survey were overwhelmingly positive about SOTA culture and reported that they had not encountered sexist behaviour or attitudes from staff or fellow students. In terms of teaching, there are gender-focused modules taught in the School, such as Language and Gender, Women Writers, Contemporary Women's Poetry, Feminist Media Analysis, and Music, Gender and Sexuality. Nevertheless, the depth and breadth of teaching on gender varies across Departments. It is more limited in Architecture than in English, for example. The potential for greater integration of gender in some programmes will be examined and addressed in the ongoing work on decolonising/diversifying the curriculum mentioned earlier.

## Case Study: Women in Philosophy

The Philosophy department has adopted the Good Practice Scheme (GPS) developed by the Society of Women in Philosophy (SWIP) and British
Philosophical Association. Dr Laura Gow, a lecturer in the Philosophy Department, developed a document outlining the GPS recommendations and how they could be implemented in the department. All staff discussed this document in an initial meeting, after which a policy was drawn up outlining the department's commitment to addressing gender inequalities. It was formally adopted after a unanimous vote during a minuted meeting.

The recommendations cover a range of issues, including gender bias relating to teaching, recruiting new staff, department culture, staff-student relationships, caregivers. Some of the changes made in Philosophy include anonymising potential REF submissions prior to external review, measures to increase the visibility of women philosophers within the department, ensuring 50/50 male and female speakers for department events, and rescheduling department seminars so they take place between 10am-5pm. The department has implemented these and similar changes - for example, a recent job posting asked for anonymous cover letters and CVs, and our departmental colloquium has a $50 / 50$ gender balance.
(Table was treated for anonymising reason)

The EDI PS Lead has carried out an office space analysis taking a data snapshot in March 2020 and revealed that on average, office space for women is $12.3 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ and men $13.9 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, and $47 \%$ women are sharing an office compared to $25 \%$ of men. This imbalance is evident in all grades, career pathways (except for ROs) and at the departmental level (except in Music). For instance, at Grade 8, the number of men is nearly twice the number of women but less likely to share space ( $23 \% \mathrm{M}$ share, $57 \%$ F share); $50 \%$ women on T\&R contract share office space while only $17 \%$ men share, English has the biggest variance of average space, with women having 3.3 $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ less than men, while such variance in Architecture is $3 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. The normalisation of hybrid working after the pandemic will allow the School to build equality into allocation of space, particularly in refurbished and new buildings (Action 5.28).

SOTA EDI committee has passed the EDI Charter in Oct 2020 highlighting the School's commitment to EDI in all aspects of its operation including gender equality. EDI leads have membership in the SMT, Education committee, and R\&I committee. The Departmental EDI champions ensure EDI agenda is embedded at the Departmental level. Various EDI projects were proposed since mid-2020 and mentioned in Section 3 (Figure 5.16). The Athena SWAN and other EDI work is publicised on the School's website, as well as Departmental websites. Quarterly newsletters are sent to staff on EDI activities in SOTA. Architectural student-led groups also circulate their newsletter Zine to all staff and students in the Department (Figure 5.17). During the pandemic, the School set up an online parents and carers network via Microsoft Teams


Figure 5.16: SOTA EDI guest lecture series running between April and May 2021, organised by the PS EDI working group


Figure 5.17 Samples of the School Newsletter and student-led groups newsletter

## Key issues

## Balance in gendered office space allocation

## Actions to address issues:

- 5.28 - Ensure equality impact assessment is carried out when allocating office space in the refurbished and new buildings in the coming years
(ii) HR policies.

Describe how the department monitors the consistency in application of HR policies for equality, dignity at work, bullying, harassment, grievance and disciplinary processes. Describe actions taken to address any identified differences between policy and practice. Comment on how the department ensures staff with management responsibilities are kept informed and updated on HR polices.

The implementation of HR policies is monitored at the University level, with information fed back to SOTA through its HR Business Partner, who attends monthly meetings with the Dean and HoSO, and regularly speaks with SMT to discuss SOTA-specific issues. The Dean and HoSO hold monthly strategy and operations meetings with the HoDs to discuss HR matters and provide clarifications. Any inconsistencies or anomalies are raised and addressed in this context. Any significant changes to policies are disseminated via the monthly University Leadership Forum. HR policies are on the agenda for these meetings.

The University has developed 'Report and Support', an online Bullying and Harassment Report system through which incidents can be directly reported, anonymously if desired, and support offered to individuals.
(iii) Representation of men and women on committees.

Provide data for all department committees broken down by gender and staff type. Identify the most influential committees. Explain how potential committee members are identified and comment on any consideration given to gender equality in the selection of representatives and what the department is doing to address any gender imbalances. Comment on how the issue of 'committee overload' is addressed where there are small numbers of women or men.

The School has 9 committees and membership is representative of the staff demographics ( $87 \mathrm{M}, 68 \mathrm{~F}$ ) (Figure 5.18). The gender split of committee chairs is almost equal and more women will become committee leads from Sep 2021. A gender imbalance is observed in the RAWP sub-committee where women only count for $11 \%$ (Action 5.29).

In the past, School leadership roles were assigned in consultation with individual members of staff. Discussions usually took place on a case-by-case basis. Since 2018-19, the School has advertised these opportunities openly, a practice that will continue. We recognise that the committee roles are central to career progression. We started a regular audit of the workload of each role in the PPF. We will update the PPF accordingly if changes raise.

| Committee | Chair | F | M | F\% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Management Team | M | 12 | 14 | $46 \%$ |
| EDI Committee | F | 13 | 11 | $54 \%$ |
| Education Committee | M | 11 | 9 | $55 \%$ |
| School Scrutiny Panel | F | 2 | 1 | $67 \%$ |
| Academic Integrity Committee | F | 4 | 4 | $50 \%$ |
| Recruitment, Admissions and Widening |  |  |  |  |
| Participation Sub-Committee |  |  |  |  |$\quad \mathrm{M}$

Figure 5.18-Gender split of SOTA committee membership as of Feb 2021

## Key issues

## Gender imbalance in the RAWP sub-committee

## Actions to address issues:

- 5.29 - Improve gender balance of RAWP Sub-Committee and ensure gender split in all SOTA committees to match the staff demographic by continuing to advertise School leadership roles openly and recruiting these roles through application and interview process.
(iv) Participation on influential external committees.

How are staff encouraged to participate in other influential external committees and what procedures are in place to encourage women (or men if they are underrepresented) to participate in these committees?

Opportunities to participate in external committees are advertised School-wide, or if the role is subject specific, in the Department. The PDR process is used to identify and support participation in external committees where appropriate, irrespective of gender.

The SOTA Survey 2018 shows that $58 \%$ of SOTA's academic staff participating on external committees are women, and that the percentage has been increasing during 2014-18. Participation includes governing roles on national and regional projects, subject-specific associations, and national conference committees. For example, Professor Sandeep Parmar from English was awarded the AHRC/BBC New Generation Thinker in 2015. Dr Sophie Oliver from English received the same award in 2020.
(v) Workload model.

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

Each Department in SOTA had been using their own models to plan workload among staff for years. Piloted in 2016, SOTA has redeveloped a unified workload model, known as the PPF (Portfolio Planning Framework), alongside a central University initiative to ensure fairness, transparency and manageable workloads for all academic staff. It was implemented from 2020/21.

During its development, consultation was held with a range of stakeholders, including HoDs, Directors of Studies, the School EDI committee, and workload leads in other Schools, as well as in the wider Faculty and University.

Academic staff on 1 FTE are expected to work 1650 nominal hours per academic year. These hours are divided between teaching and research or scholarship, as well as collegiality (including leadership and administration roles). Each academic pathway has a benchmark distribution for these categories:

- T\&S - 60 teaching /20 scholarship /20 collegiality
- T\&R - 40 teaching /40 research /20 collegiality
- RO - 90 research /10 collegiality

Additional adjustments in the PPF are given in the following situations:

- Allowances for all new staff members, both probationary and nonprobationary, to support personal development and acclimation.
- Allowances for ECAs (inclusive of all academic pathways), over a three-year period, to support personal and professional development.

Academic staff will be sent their own workload reports twice a year to show the planned workload in the beginning, and the actual workload at the end. Staff are encouraged to use these reports to inform their PDR discussions.

SOTA's PPF is formally reviewed every year for the year ahead. Any proposed changes must be approved by SMT, the EDI committee, as well as go through an Equality Impact Assessment internally to be presented alongside the changed document. This process will help to ensure that the implementation has fair distribution by gender, as well as to identify any other equality issues, e.g. disability-related reasonable adjustment.

The importance of the PPF is underlined by concerns about work/life balance raised through the Staff Survey 2018 and the focus group 2020. For example, one respondent felt that women were disproportionately undertaking 'supportive' roles:
'I have certainly been on the receiving end of male line managers allocating workload differentially according to stereotyped expectations of gender (e.g., male colleagues being asked to take on areas of responsibility, female colleagues being allocated "supportive" roles or administrative scut-work).' (Female academic). (Action 5.30)

Since the PPF is only recently implemented, no feedback from staff about its fairness and transparency has been received (Action 5.31).

## Key issues

Lack of feedback from staff on the PPF's fairness and transparency; lack of evidence to show workload split by gender

## Actions to address issues:

- 5.30 - Carry out analysis on each tariff in PPF by gender to understand the gendered role differences
- 5.31 - Carry out feedback from staff on PPF after the first year of implementation PPF
(vi) Timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings.

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

SOTA follows University practice in scheduling formal meetings on Wednesday afternoons when there normally was no timetabled teaching (except last year due to COVID), to be completed before 5 pm . Efforts are made to schedule internally focussed guest lectures and departmental meetings during $10 \mathrm{am}-4 \mathrm{pm}$, but this is harder for outward-facing events and associated socialising. Of the staff who responded to the

Staff Survey 2018, 65\%F respondents believed that not being able to participate in out-of-core-hour work-related activities had a negative impact on career enhancement and progression. For men this was $26 \%$.

Before the pandemic, SOTA hosted regular staff coffee mornings to provide socialising opportunities. During the pandemic, SOTA formed a Parent and Carer Network which organised information meetings online. However, the focus group carried out with SOTA staff by the EDI lead in Nov 2020 showed that staff felt 'flatness and isolation' after online meetings and teaching; they miss 'the spontaneous interaction with colleagues and students', 'casual discussions', 'informal interaction' etc. Looking ahead, we will explore the benefit of online meetings with staff and make further effort to ensure social gathering is inclusive. (Action 5.32).

## Key issues

Facilitation of inclusive informal social gatherings within the School

## Actions to address issues:

- 5.32 - Continue offline fortnightly coffee mornings for informal social gathering and explore the hybrid meeting arrangements with staff to inform school guidance on meeting arrangement post-pandemic
(vii) Visibility of role models.

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

SOTA is committed to increasing the visibility of women. The School frequently hosts visits from female role models, such as the speakers in the 2019 Women in Architecture and the 2021 International Women's Day celebration in Music (Figure 5.1) (Action 5.33). There are women in the school who occupy high- profile external roles. Professor Sandeep Parmar from English was appointed to the AHRC Advisory Board in 2020 and she has been a Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature. Dr Rosa Urbano from Architecture was a reviewer for UKRI Future Leaders Fellowship Scheme since 2018 and the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission since 2017. Prof Kay O'Halloran from C\&M is a Visiting Distinguished Professor at Shanghai Jiaotong University.

## Celebrating women architects across the decades

Published on 12 March 2019


Women in Architecture 2019

## Women in Music: A Liverpool Story

 RetoldPublished on 18 March 2019


Women in Music 2019


Women in Music 2021


Women in Music 2021

Figure 5.19: Events celebrating International Women’s Day in 2019 and 2021

The School has now started routinely monitoring the gender of speakers and chairs at seminars, workshops, and guest lectures, and actively inviting female participants to ensure gender balance in events (Action 5.34). Music will be formally signing up to Key Change, a European initiative that requires members to achieve gender balance in all music events and activities (Action 5.35).

## Key issues

## Insufficient visibility of women role models

## Actions to address issues:

- 5.33 - Include active and inspiring pictures of women in promotional material
- 5.34 - Continue monitoring and ensure gender balance in School events and activities
- 5.35 - Music department formally signing up to Key Change initiative
(viii) Outreach activities.

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

All academic staff, at all career stages, participate in Open Days on a rotational basis, with support from the department Recruitment Leads, who try to ensure a gender balance of student helpers. Since 2019, SOTA hosts annual Public Lecture series featuring one speaker from each Department. The event was attended by over 200 people in person, and 500 registered guests via Zoom during the pandemic. There have been 15 speakers so far ( $8 \mathrm{~F}, 7 \mathrm{M}$ ).

Staff and students also participate in various additional outreach activities. Examples include schools workshops/visit offered by all Departments and the popular Lunchtime Concert Series offered by Music. Philosophy's Rachael Wiseman organised reading groups with young people and talks on radio as part of her 'Women in Parenthesis' research project which promotes knowledge of female philosophers and widens participation in philosophy among women and girls (Figure 5.20). Since 2020, C\&M staff are involved in mentoring young people through the charity Arts Emergency. Music staff are working with Resonate Music Hub (who supply music tutors to primary and secondary schools) to reach out to schools particularly in deprived areas. Professor Catherine Tackley in Music won the award for Outstanding Contribution to Public Engagement in 2019. The School's Work Placement Experience module provides accredited routes for student participation in outreach activities with cultural organizations, charities, and educational institutions across the region.



Rachel Wiseman's 'Philosophy by Prof. Tackley won the award for Postcard' public engagement project Outstanding Contribution to Public Engagement in 2019

Figure 5.20 SOTA outreach activities

## 7. Further Information

## RECOMMENDED WORD COUNT: BRONZE: 500 WORDS | SILVER: 500 WORDS

Please comment here on any other elements that are relevant to the application.

With five distinctive academic departments, SOTA is growing every year in its student numbers, staff groups and physical spaces. Among the School's development strategies, gender equality is one of the key concerns. This self-assessment has identified some key challenges that we are committed to addressing in coming years. These include:

- Gendered awarding gaps at the UG and PGT level, both within specific disciplines and when compared nationally;
- Staff gender imbalance at different career stages with a large proportion of women at junior level and limited number of female professors;
- Continued struggle of work-life balance among women which became more evident during the Covid-19 pandemic

To address these challenges, we have started a School-wide subject-specific initiative of decentring and diversifying the curriculum. We intend to learn from best practice of other schools in the sector to make our teaching provision more inclusive, accessible and reflective to our diverse student bodies, for example, the large group of Chinese female students on many SOTA programmes.

For staff, we have introduced various actions to support female ECAs for their career progression through mentoring, training, internal funding support and PDRs. We've begun to investigate the ways through which we could attract senior women for our forthcoming professorships in Architecture and Philosophy, as well as to support
existing senior women for promotion. We are steering a cultural change by encouraging hybrid working, flexible working and implementing Family-friendly policies to support women tackling multiple responsibilities in life.

The Covid-19 pandemic has posed huge challenges, but through the School's solidarity and enormous support, we have achieved some amazing success in funding capture and students' outcomes. The pandemic also brings opportunities for us to build even stronger gender equality into our post pandemic operation, e.g. space allocation when we return to campus. With the comprehensive EDI structure within the School, we believe the actions proposed can be effectively implemented, allowing SOTA to continue being an equal, diverse and inclusive community.

## 8. Action plan

We are committed to these actions and will ensure that they remain School priorities, however, we recognise that the effects of COVID-19 may affect our ability to deliver within the intended timescales. We will continue to review and update the action plan as the situation develops.
Our priority areas and associated actions are highlighted in Italic in the table below. As summarised in the Dean's endorsement letter and the additional information section above, they are:

- the gendered awarding gap for UG and PGT students at First Class and Distinction level (Actions 4.2, 4.3, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9)
- the recruitment and progression of women, especially to Professorial positions (Actions 4.12, 4.13, 4.14, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5)
- the concerns expressed by academics about work-life balance, often exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic (Actions 5.25, $5.26,5.27,5.31,5.32)$

Input: What level of resources will be needed?
(G) Green - Low resource needed: structures and resources are already in place to enable us to achieve this(A) Amber - Medium resource needed: some additional resources needed
(R) Red - High resource needed: e.g. requires significant additional resources; wider organisational support needed; involves several actions

Impact: How significant will successful outcomes be?(G) Green - Low impact: strengthens or builds on existing policies/practices/structures(A) Amber - Medium impact: new but discrete/targeted outcome; supporting wider impact
(R) Red - High impact: new outcome affecting wider School; cultural change

| \# | Objective/ Issue identified | Rationale | Action/progress before May 2021 | Action | Measure | Time frame | Action Owners | l n p u t | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{l} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{p} \\ & \mathrm{a} \\ & \mathrm{c} \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.1 | Gender imbalance of SOTA EDI <br> Committee and subgroup membership | Women make up $63 \%$ of SOTA's EDI Committee which is much higher than the SOTA Jan 21 F\% (38\%) |  | 3.1 Monitor gender split of EDI membership with the aim to increase participation of men, particularly in English. When vacancies arise on the committee we advertise these School wide with specific encouragement for male staff to put themselves forward. | Gender split to be equal or match annual SOTA staff gender demographic (2021-38\%) | Sept <br> (Annual) | EDI Leads <br> EDI <br> Champions | $\stackrel{\bullet}{G}$ | $\AA$ |
| 3.2 | Capture new data to assess the effectiveness of actions | Whilst writing the Bronze application we identified that certain data was sometimes difficult to obtain, e.g. reasons for leaving job posts | EDI Leads contributed to the creation of a Faculty survey in 2020 that was eventually subsumed into the University pulse survey | 3.2.1 Continue liaising with key colleagues at all levels to improve the availability of data, both quantitative and qualitative. In particular, the bi-annual staff and student surveys to ensure that the survey includes SOTA specific questions with gender categorisation so the results can be used to monitor the progress of the AS action plans; <br> 3.2.2 Collaborate with the other Schools in the Faculty to enable local benchmarking | Obtain and analyse the University and faculty survey data and this is a standing item in EDI committee meetings | Ongoing | SOTA EDI <br> Leads | $\stackrel{\bullet}{G}$ | A |


| 3.3 | Lack of subject benchmark data in relevant industries | Whilst writing the Bronze application we identified gaps in industry benchmarking data, particularly in C\&M | Members of SOTA's EDI Committee have spoken to multiple subject-specific professional organisations to retrieve benchmarking data. Through these conversations, the lack of relevant benchmarking has been highlighted to those organisations. | 3.3 Work with external organisations to improve data collection, particularly C\&M | Provision of benchmarking data for industries, particularly for the next Athena SWAN application (anticipated Silver 2024) | Ongoing | Relevant person/s in Dept (HoDs/ EDI Champions) | G | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.1 | Increase application numbers from male students in C\&M and English at the UG level | Data analysis shows a declining trend of men applying for English programmes, a consequence of declining numbers of boys choosing English (Literature, Language and combined) at GCSE/A-Level (Ofqual, 2019) <br> Similarly, C\&M's F\% is +15\% higher than the HESA benchmark, affecting the overall SOTA F\% |  | 4.1.1 Conduct an audit of all existing marketing, communications and recruitment materials and activities at UG level related to C\&M English programmes to identify any areas where EDI could be enhanced e.g. images, language and liaise with MRE team to implement changes; <br> 4.1.2 Ensure staff and student ambassadors of both genders are involved in outreach activities to encourage schoolboys choosing C\&M and English at A-Level | Increase male application numbers by 5\% by 2024 | Sept 2024 | C\&M and English EDI group, <br> Admission <br> Team, HoDs and <br> Associate Dean for Education | A | A |



Closing the gendered
4.3 awarding gap in Architecture at the $1^{\text {st }}$ class level

Data shows Architecture has the largest gender gap at $1^{\text {st }}$ class degree ( $7 \%$ difference between male and female)

### 4.3.1 Implement anonymous

 marking in studio work; studio work to be marked by tutors from a different studio to make sure the markers don't know the students' projects; A pilot run will be implemented in Feb 2022 with one studio and roll out to all thereafter;4.3.2 Review student scores for different types of assessment of non-studio modules at the end of year 1 to ascertain whether the trend is consistent;
4.3.3 Explore how other architectural schools tackle this issue and share best practice using membership with RIBA and ARB;
4.3.4 Monitor the pilot run of studio marking whether gender imbalance is addressed and if needed implement appropriate adjustments


| 4.4 | Monitor gender balance in new C\&M PGT programmes | The introduction of 5 new PGT programmes in C\&M may alter the gender demographics and comparison to HESA benchmarks | 4.4.1 Monitor gender demographic of the new programmes introduced in 21/22 <br> 4.4.2 Ensure recruitment materials promote the AS/EDI agenda | Ensure gender split in new programmes continues to matches HESA benchmarks | Starting in Oct 2021 | C\&M PGT <br> Lead, <br> Programme Leads, MRE | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\text { G }}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { G }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.5 | Increase female PGT registration rate in Philosophy | In Philosophy, the number of applications from women is much more than men, particularly in MA Arts, Philosophy and Cultural Institutions, however men have a slightly higher offer rate in the two programmes ( $+8 \%$ ) and much higher registration rate ( $+19 \%$ ). | 4.5.1 Understand the graduate intention of UG Philosophy students to better attract them for PG studies <br> 4.5.2 Follow up communication with candidates, particularly women, who have accepted the offer to answer questions and highlight our commitment to AS <br> 4.5.3 Audit the PGT admission process in Philosophy and makes sure the admissions staff have completed Unconscious Bias training <br> 4.5.4 Ensure female staff are involved in the recruitment of PGT programme and women, as well as both staff and student in Open Days <br> 4.5.5 Monitor offer and registration rates in Philosophy annually for 5 years, starting from Sep 2021 | Matching the registration rate with offer rates for both genders by 2024 <br> Gender split in the two programmes matches HESA benchmark of Philosophy and Art (tentative) by 2025 | Starting <br> Sept 21 <br> Sep 2024 <br> Sep 2025 | Recruitment team in <br> Philosophy, <br> Philosophy <br> EDI group, <br> Associate <br> Dean <br> Education | A | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\mathrm{R}}$ |


| 4.6 | Understand female Chinese student rationale for registering on MA Music Industry Studies and MMus | Large majority of MA Music Industry Studies and MMus population are women, specifically from China. We need to understand their intentions in choosing the programme. |  | 4.6 Conduct a short survey with current female Chinese students on these two programmes to gather data in Sep 2021 | Analyse the survey data to inform an action plan with detailed measures to adjust the programme content to support this group's career prospects by Sep 2022 | Sept 2021 <br> Sept 2022 | PGT Lead in Music, Prog Leads, Music EDI Champion | A | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.7 | Gendered awarding gap at Distinction level in English programmes, particularly MA TESOL and MA English Literature | $-14 \%$ difference between women achieving Distinction in comparison to men, derived primarily from MA TESOL and MA English Literature that have a large population of OSI women ( $88 \%$ and 71\% respectively) |  | 4.7.1 Diversify assessment types to include more formative assessments <br> 4.7.2 Annual review of the awarding gap in MA TESOL and MA English Literature, starting Sept 21 <br> 4.7.3 Staff to continue diversifying the curriculum | Improvement in awarding gap, closed by at least 5\% by 2023 <br> Annual review of awarding gap until 2025 | Report starts Sept 21 <br> Gap reduced by 2023 <br> Review until 2025 | English PGT <br> Lead/ Prog <br> Leads/ <br> English EDI <br> Champion | A | $\stackrel{\bullet}{R}$ |
| 4.8 | Gendered awarding gap at Distinction level in Music | -17\% difference between women achieving Distinction in comparison to men. As Chinese women make up more than half of the PGT cohort, the awarding gap has been attributed to heavily weighted essays, which OSI students find challenging | In Music, additional formative assessments have been added to better prepare female Chinese students for essay writing. | 4.8.1 - Music to continue introducing formative assessments and to diversify assessment components <br> 4.8.2 - Annual review of the awarding gap, starting Sept 21 | Award gap closed by 5\% by 2023 <br> Annual review of awarding gap until 2025 | Report starts Sept 21 <br> Review until 2025 | Music PGT <br> Lead/Prog <br> Leads/ <br> Music EDI <br> Champion | G | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\mathrm{R}}$ |
| 4.9 | Awarding gap between Philosophy's two PGT programmes | -17\% difference between women achieving Distinction in comparison to men, with main difference coming from MA Art, Philosophy and Cultural Institutions which | Updated marking criteria to reflect interdisciplinary aspects of MA Art, Philosophy and Cultural Institutions | 4.9.1 Conduct staff training on marking interdisciplinary programmes in line with updated marking criteria; <br> 4.9.2 Monitor award attainment on MA Art, Philosophy, and Cultural Institutions programme | Awarding gap reduced by 5\% by 2023 | Annually (Oct) | Prog. Lead/ PHIL Champion | G | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\mathrm{R}}$ |


|  |  | is predominantly female (avg. 80\%) |  | to ensure interdisciplinary criteria are embedded |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.10 | Underrepresentation of female PGR students in Architecture, Music and Philosophy | Architecture's female PGR population has been on average $-19 \%$ below HESA benchmarks. <br> Music's female PGR population has remained static for the past 3 years (avg. 8) whilst male students have increased Y/Y <br> Philosophy has had one female PGR student for 4 years, on average -18\% below HESA benchmarks |  | 4.10.1 Review all recruitment materials in these departments to identify any areas where diversity and inclusivity could be enhanced e.g. images, language; <br> 4.10.2 Developing more collaborative doctoral awards in the UK to increase the number of funded PGR positions in addition to existing provision to diversify the PGR cohort; <br> 4.10.3 Ensure any funded PGR positions/ scholarship is also advertised in women-led networks as well as usual platforms <br> 4.10.4 Annual report produced to monitor number of female PGR applicants | Decrease the gap between F\% in Architecture, Philosophy with F\% in HESA data by $10 \%$ by Sep 2023, and match the HESA benchmark by Sep 2025 | Sep 2023 <br> Sep 2025 | Music/ Philosophy/ Architecture PGR Leads; SOTA PGR Leads | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\mathrm{R}}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\mathrm{R}}$ |


| 4.11 | Support pipeline of female students, particularly from Home, between PGT and PGR in Architecture, Music and Philosophy | As explained in Rationale in the above action, female students in these departments are lower than HESA benchmarks. Additionally, it is identified that Home/EU students are low in the cohorts in comparison to OSI students |  | 4.11.1 PGT and PGR Leads to devise workshops and networking events to engage female PGT students with current PGR role models, as well as female staff <br> 4.11.2 Highlight SOTA commitment to AS in all recruitment events <br> 4.11.3 Promote and actively encourage applications for postgraduate scholarships and offer informal events for prospective female candidates <br> 4.11.4 Annual review and report detailing number of female applicants, particularly from SOTA PGT programmes | Annual review to show that actions increase the number of Home applications and registrations increase by 10\% by 2024 | Annual review starts Oct-21 <br> Target increase achieved by 2024 | Architecture, Music and Philosophy PGT and PGR Leads | A | $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{R}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.12 | Recruitment or promotion of women in professorial positions in Architecture | There have been no female professors in Architecture since at least 2014 | Scoping exercise completed by the Architecture EDI working group to identify the research expertise of female researchers nationally and internationally, with outcomes informing the recruitment materials for senior posts; <br> Improved communication of recruitment materials to target professional organisations that involve women; <br> Recruitment strategy | 4.12.1 Use the findings to ensure vacancy advertisements reach potential female candidates <br> 4.12.2 Support women in Reader and SL posts in Philosophy and Architecture in their career progression, referring to Action 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5 | A gender balanced visiting professor group in Architecture by Sep 2022; <br> At least one female professor in Architecture by Sep 2025 | Sep 2021; <br> Sep 2025 | HoDs of Architecture and Philosophy; EDI working groups; Dean | A | $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{R}}$ |


|  |  |  | for Architecture visiting professors in implementation with aim to recruit women VPs immediately. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.13 | Recruitment or promotion of women in professorial positions in Philosophy | There have been no female professors in Philosophy since at least 2014 |  | 4.13.1 Philosophy to complete a similar exercise to Architecture (4.12) in preparation for a new professorial post which will be released in Jan 2023 <br> 4.13.2 Use the findings to ensure vacancy advertisements reach potential female candidates <br> 4.13.3 Support women in Reader and SL posts in Philosophy and Architecture in their career progression, referring to Action 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 | At least $30 \%$ of professorship applications to be female (when vacancy available) <br> At least one female professor in Philosophy by Sep 2025 | Dependent on when professors hip is advertised | Philosophy <br> EDI group, <br> Philosophy HoD | A | $\stackrel{\bullet}{R}$ |
| 4.14 | Improve gender balance of Music academic staff at Grade 8 and above through recruitment and promotion | Female staff are clustered at Grade 7 with minority in higher grades in comparison to men (excluding HoD) |  | 4.14.1 Develop relationships with relevant organisations to help reach a diversity of candidates e.g. Women in Music or Soundgirls <br> 4.14.2 Ensure advertisements of roles encourage applications from underrepresented groups by including female figures, our AS agenda and EDI agenda in general <br> 4.14.3 Refer to support to promotion Action 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 | Female staff represent at least $40 \%$ of Grade 8 and above by 2025 | Dependent on when vacancies are available 2025 | Music HoD, <br> Music EDI <br> working <br> group | A | A |


| 4.15 | More women on Fixed Term RO pathways | Women represent 54\% of all staff on this contract pathway (Jan 2021) which is disproportionate to the overall SOTA F\% (38\%) | 4.15.1 Ensure all Fixed Term RO pathway staff are allocated a mentor, with relevant training given throughout their contract, and ensure they are made aware of HR's redeployment policies <br> 4.15.2 Annual review of succession pipeline of RO female staff on Fixed Term contracts | All staff on RO pathway are allocated a mentor (or given the opportunity) by Sept 2021 | Annual review, starting July 2021 | Dept HoD/ Mentor | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\text { G }}$ | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.16 | Gender imbalance of GTAs | Departments show gendered imbalance of GTAs: Music 25\% F, Philosophy 0\% F. | 4.16.1 Annual report, starting Oct 2021, to monitor GTA gender balance (in context of Departmental PGR population) <br> 4.16.2 Enhance transparency of GTAs recruitment by sending out open calls and recruiting by application and interview process <br> 4.16.3 Supervisors identify suitable female PGR students and encourage them to apply | In Music and Philosophy, GTAs' gender split represents their PGR population by 2024 | Start Oct <br> 21 <br> Ongoing | SOTA PGR <br> Director, <br> Dept PGR <br> Leads | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\text { G }}$ | A |
| 4.17 | Improve gender balance of instrumental tutors in Music | Women currently represent 14\% of Music's instrumental tutors. | 4.17.1 HoD ensures HR policies are incorporated into the recruitment process for instrumental tutors; <br> 4.17.2 All academic staff searching for instrumental tutors must have completed UB training, as well as the mandatory EDI training | Improve F\% of instrumental tutors to $30 \%$ by 2023 and 50\% (industry benchmark) by 2025 | Sep-2023 <br> Sep 2025 | HoD of Music | G | A |
| 4.18 | Ensure fractional contract tutors in Architecture studios represent UK industry benchmark (34\%) | Women currently represent $15 \%$ of Architecture's AFTs | 4.18.1 Formalise recruitment process for AFTs, so they undergo the same scrutiny from HR/equal opportunities that other vacancies are mandated <br> 4.18.2 Liaison with RIBA and local young architect's association to enhance reach and improve gender balance. | Reduce the gender gap to the RIBA benchmark (34\%) by at least $5 \%$ by 2023 | 2023 | HoD of Architecture | A | A |


| 4.19 | Gender balance of Architectural guest critics | In 19/20 women represented $37 \%$ of guest critics in UG programmes | Architecture staff proactively addressed gender inequality for the 19/20 guest critics | 4.19.1 Ensure all staff who recruit guest critics have undertaken EDI and UB training <br> 4.19.2 Annual report of women engaged as guest critics, starting Sept 2021 | Women to represent 50\% of guest critics by 2023 to match student gender demographic (53\% F, 2021) | Sep 21 | Architecture UG Programme Leads | G | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.20 | Improve reporting of reasons for leaving job post | Identified gap in current data collection practices | University-level project reviewed and updated the generic exit interview to capture more data on reasons for leaving | 4.20.1 Analyse exit interview answers to understand if there is a gendered trend or impact <br> 4.20.2 Annual report that identifies trends for leaving staff with meaningful action resulting from analysis | Produce a report on investigation with action plan-including specific targets and measuresto be developed by the EDI Committee | July 2022 Ongoing | SOTA <br> HR/EDI committee | G | A |
| 5.1 | Reduce unconscious bias of all members of interview panels, not just the key recruiter | We have no record on the number of interview panel members completing UB training | All shortlisting and interview panels are required to have a gender balance and use structured interview questions and presentation topics consistently for all candidates. | 5.1.1 Interview panel members must complete the Recruitment and Selection, UB and EDI training before being confirmed to sit on an interview panel <br> 5.1.2 Key recruiter to liaise with SOTA HR to check that panel members have completed all training | $100 \%$ of all staff involved in recruitment panels have completed the stated training with immediate effect | May 2021 | Key <br> Recruiter/SO <br> TA HR/ <br> HoSO | G | G |
| 5.2 | Improve understanding of promotion process, particularly for T\&S staff | Since 2015, 21 T\&S applications for promotion (11M, 10F), and some T\&S staff expressing concern about how 'scholarship' is defined and assessed in promotion (Research survey 2020) |  | 5.2.1 Creation of a T\&S staff network within the School and across the Faculty to promote peer support and communication of career trajectory, including networking events (crossreference to Action 5.4) <br> 5.2.2 Induction and PDR to include discussions with T\&S staff about participating in existing research groups | Improved T\&S staff satisfaction on support for promotion in staff survey 2023: average over 3.0 on promotion related questions by T\&S respondents | Annual, beginning July 2021 | School EDI committee | A | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\mathrm{R}}$ |

In the Research Survey 2020, staff asked for guidance on activities that would improve their chance for promotion

SOTA staff's attendance to the 'Insight to Promotion' workshop has increased in 2019. But Philosophy and Music only had 3 ( $2 \mathrm{~F}, 1 \mathrm{M}$ ) and 5 (2F, 3M) staff attended since 2016.

Improve understanding of promotion process and encourage women to apply
5.3.1 Promote and encourage staff to engage with UoL's 'Insights to Promotion' events via SOTA EDI newsletter and email address
5.3.3 Annual report detailing number of staff engaged with UoL 'Insights into Promotion' events
5.3.2 Provide promotion case studies, particularly from women and T\&S staff on School website. 2 initially, 1 from T\&S.
5.4 The Dean to create a gender balanced CV/Career Review Committee, open between July and Sept annually for staff who are considering promotion to get advice
5.5 The Dean to host a 'What's Next?' roadshow, with presentations from senior women detailing their career stories

| Increase participation in 'Insights to Promotion' events by 20\% overall in SOTA by Dec 2023. <br> Increase the number of participants from Music and Philosophy by 30\% by Dec 2023 | Annual report starting Sept 2021 <br> Case studies uploaded by July 2021 <br> Dec 2023 | EDI <br> Committee | $\stackrel{\bullet}{G}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feedback received via Faculty and University surveys to show improved satisfaction with career support: average over 3.0 by respondents by 2023 | By July 2023 (as promotion is not open in 2021) | Dean | A |
| Feedback received via Faculty and University surveys to show improved satisfaction with career support: average over 3.0 by respondents by 2023 | Annually (Jan) $2023$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dean/SOTA } \\ & \text { HR } \end{aligned}$ | A |



|  |  |  |  |  | the next round of REF |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 5.9.1 Impact Leads at |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.9 | Improve support given to women in developing research impact in Architecture | $22 \%$ of authors of ICS were women in Architecture; The Research Survey 2020 suggests women felt less supported in developing impact case studies than men |  | level strategically identify and encourage women to lead impact case studies, particularly in Architecture <br> 5.9.2 Support women in developing research impact through the RDIF fund and other funding opportunities in the University. | By next round of internal review of impact case studies, the F percentage reaches at least $30 \%$ in Architecture. | Next REF cycle | SOTA Impact lead; Faculty Impact Lead; REF coordinator | A | A |
| 5.10 | Track and improve completion rates of obligatory training | The completion rates of obligatory training were $65 \% \mathrm{~F}$ and $58 \% \mathrm{M}$; Less than $40 \%$ in both genders in Music | All PT staff contacted directly by HoD about outstanding GDPR and EDI training. All FT SOTA staff contacted by Dean. | 5.10 Regularly review completion rates of obligatory training, particularly Music and male staff in general, working via HoDs to increase completion rates | Regular reporting should see \% for completion rates increase, with the aim to increase the completion rate to $80 \%$ by end of 2021 in all Departments | Quarterly | SMT/HoD | $\stackrel{\bullet}{G}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\text { G }}$ |


| 5.11 | Improve visibility of non-obligatory training | Staff Survey 2019 suggests that $51 \%$ of women agreed that they had received the training they need to assist with their career development, in comparison to $72 \%$ of men |  | 5.11.1 HoDs to identify nonobligatory training, especially that are relevant for career progression, and brief the PDR reviewers about them; encourage discussion about them in PDR process <br> 5.11.2 University-wide training opportunities to be included in Induction materials, particularly those opportunities focusing on women. <br> 5.11.3 SOTA EDI newsletter, email address and School Forum will be used to disseminate training opportunities and enhance visibility of them <br> 5.11.4 PDR guidance reminds staff to record all training completed in the past year | Updated induction pack by Sep 2021 including university training opportunities for women; <br> 2023 staff survey sees improved rating by both genders re 'training I need to assist with career development', average rating over 3.0 on this question | Sep 2021 <br> Sep 2023 | HoDs; <br> School <br> Operation support team | A | $\bullet$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.12 | Ensure gender balance when recommending candidates for external training courses. | Research Survey 2020 suggested that women are less likely to be recommended for external training than men | Supported at least one female member of staff each year for Aurora since 2015 <br> Provide match funding to support women participating in these programmes | 5.12.1 Monitor the gender balance in recommended people for external training <br> 5.12.2 Continue to provide match funding to support women participating in these programmes | Ensure F\% attending external training matches the gender split of SOTA staff during 5-year audit period | Starting July 2021for every 4 years | HoD, Deans and HoSO, EDI leads | G | $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { G }}$ |


| 5.13 | Improve gender balance of PDR reviewers in Architecture and Philosophy | No female PDR reviewers in Architecture and only 2 in Philosophy |  | 5.13.1 Include female staff at Grade 9 in Architecture as PDR reviewers and provide training for them by July 2021 <br> 5.13.2 Increase the number of senior women in Philosophy via recruitment or promotion by Sep 2024 | Two Grade 9 women in Architecture become PDR reviewers, complete training and conduct reviews in July 2021 <br> Increase by at least 1 female reviewer by Sep 2024 | July 2021 <br> Sep 2024 | HoDs, Dean, EDI leads | G | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.14 | Include promotion criteria and School roles in PDR discussion | Staff not always clear how PDR supports their career progression and what would be useful for their promotion |  | 5.14.1 HoDs brief all PDR reviewers about promotion criteria and School roles coming available <br> 5.14.2 PDR reviewers meet postPDR with HoDs to share best practice and feedback on the stages individuals are at on their promotion journey while respecting confidentiality of PDR discussion | By July 2021 (in time for PDR review period) <br> 2022 staff survey: respondents average over 3.5 for 'My PDR is helpful for developing my career' | July 2021 $2022$ | HoDs, Dean | $\stackrel{\bullet}{G}$ | A |


| 5.15 | Improve SOTA ECAs usage of mentoring network and improve the perception of the value of the mentoring network | Research Survey 2020 suggests that $53 \%$ ECAs and Lecturers were either not aware of mentoring support or did not sufficiently utilise such support |  | 5.15.1 Encourage ECAs to utilise mentoring network via induction processes within Departments and SOTA's EDI newsletter <br> 5.15.2 Use PDRs to record usage of the mentoring network <br> 5.15.3 Mentors ensure at least one meeting with mentees per semester and report to HoDs about the general progress of mentoring each year <br> 5.15.4 Share best practice from mentor and mentee about the benefits of mentoring in School ECA networking events | Increase the positive feedback in Faculty and University surveys regarding mentoring support to 60\% among ECAs and Lecturers by Sep 2022 <br> Use mentors' report to track the number of active mentorships in SOTA and monitor the number annually | Sep-22 <br> Annually | HoD/EDI Leads; mentors | A | $\stackrel{\bullet}{R}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.16 | Improve postdoc engagement with PROSPER programme in the coming round | Only 1 SOTA post-doc was involved in this round of Prosper programme |  | 5.16.1 Raise awareness and encourage applications via supervisors, in addition to circulating case studies of past participants in EDI newsletter, websites and social media channels; <br> 5.16.2 Monitor the numbers of participants from SOTA. | Increased participation in SOTA by 100\% by 2022 | Sep 2022 | PGR Lead | $\stackrel{\bullet}{G}$ | A |
| 5.17 | Improve UG student awareness of placement opportunities and improve male participation in placement opportunities | Since 2015/16, 194F, 39M participated SOTA300 placement module | Introduction of SOTA300 in 2012/13, in addition to roll out of Year in Industry programmes in English, Music and Philosophy after success in C\&M | 5.17.1 Promote placement opportunities to UG students via their academic advisors, Employability Leads in each Department <br> 5.17.2 Annual review of data and monitor the gendered take-up | Increase male students' participation to $20 \%$ of all participants of placement opportunities by Sep 2022, to $30 \%$ by Sep 2024 | Sep 2022 <br> Sep 2024 <br> Annually | Dept <br> Employability <br> Leads/SOTA <br> Employability team; Academic advisors; | G | A |


| 5.18 | Improve visibility of career coaching for students | 2018 UG student focus group suggested that students are not aware of the Career Coaching in the University's Career Service | 5.18.1 Promote the service in Welcome Week activities and Freshers Week <br> 5.18.2 Cover employability discussion in academic advisory meetings with students | Focus group with UG students to be repeated in 2023 to understand impact of actions on visibility of Career Coaching | Sep 2023 | Associate Dean Education/De partmental Education leads/ PS student experience team/Employ ability Lead | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\text { G }}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{G}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.19 | Improve UG students' involvement in URS and GIRS, particularly in ARCH, C\&M, MUSI, and PHIL | Low participation of staff from ARCH, C\&M and Philosophy in these two programmes; <br> Since 2018/19, 50F and 15M students from SOTA participated in the programmes and 32F, 3M from English. | 5.19.1 Departmental Research Lead promote the programmes among academic staff prior to the call for project proposals; <br> 5. 19.2 Programme directors promote the opportunities among students <br> 5.19.3 Academic advisors to encourage student participation | Improved staff participation from Architecture, C\&M and Philosophy by 150\% by May 2022 (when the programmes release) <br> Improved student numbers from each Department, with the aim to increase male participation to 35\% by June 2022, and 50\% by June 2024. | June 2022; <br> June 2024 | Dept <br> Research <br> Lead/Employ <br> ability <br> Leads/SOTA <br> employability <br> team; <br> Education <br> Leads | $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { G }}$ | A |



| 5.22 | Improve the utilisation of research support | The research Survey 2020 shows 19 out of 22 women felt they were not well supported. 15 out of 25 men felt the same. |  | 5.22.1 R\&I team disseminates more targeted communication of funding calls to relevant staff by creating mailing lists according to staff areas of expertise by Dec 2021 <br> 5.22.2 Deliver focused training for less experienced applicants/ECAs at least twice a year <br> 5.22.3 Encourage mentors to be Co-I on funding bids. <br> 5.22.4 Audit the utilisation of research support in SOTA through a checklist of support for all funding applications | Record grant writing workshops for ECAs and open for all at least twice every year <br> The F\% of grant applications matches the gender split of SOTA staff <br> Close gender gap on the score of how well staff feel supported in research in staff survey by 2023 | Dec 2021 <br> Annually <br> 2023 | Research <br> Support <br> Team; <br> Associate <br> Dean for <br> R\&I; <br> Departmental <br> Research <br> Lead; <br> Mentors/Res earch group leaders | A | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.23 | Add in milk expression/breastf eeding rooms in SOTA buildings | No milk expression/breastfeeding rooms in SOTA |  | 5.23.1 Room survey by the Facility Manager to identify rooms for milk expression/breastfeeding after return to campus in Sep 2021 <br> 5.23.2 Raise awareness of the portable mini fridges that are available via UoL for staff who need to store expressed milk | Allocate one room in the Abercromby Square building, and another room in 80-82 Bedford St South by Sep 2022 | Sep 2021 <br> Sep 2022 | Facility Management team; HoSO | A | G |
| 5.24 | Improve awareness of the University Family Friendly mentors and policies | Staff Survey 2018 showed that 33 (40\%) 15M (45\%), 18F (55\%) were not well informed with the FF policies | Feb 2021 EDI Newsletter featured Family Friendly mentors and policies <br> Feb 21 School Forum 'Did You Know' section highlighted | 5.24.1 Production of a Family Friendly guide by Sep 2021 that will be circulated to all staff and given to all new starters as part of induction process | Increase in staff awareness identified through improved scoring on University staff survey: reaching 80\% staff informed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sep-2021 } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | EDI <br> Leads/SOTA HR | G | A |


|  |  |  | availability of University-level Family Friendly mentors and policies | 5.24.2 SOTA EDI newsletter promote family friendly policies every two years <br> 5.24.3 Continue allocating 15 mins ‘Did you know' sessions in the SOTA staff forum to raise awareness of the Family Friendly Policies, Returner Fund, Children's Centre and carer car park. | with FF policies by 2022 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.25 | Improve SOTA local support for parents/care givers | Research Survey 2020 identified that among 22 women who reported their parental responsibilities, 10 are main/sole carer, while only 2 out of 25 men are main/sole carer. <br> Research Survey 2020 showed that $46 \%$ women strongly agree it is difficult to balance worklife while 58\% men somewhat agree | Open call for peersupport volunteers raised at School Forum in February 2021 by EDI Leads <br> The School Parent and Carer network was created on Teams and regular meetings was arranged | 5.25 Recruit Family friendly peersupport members within the School, listed on SOTA intranet by Sep 2021 | Improved staff satisfaction in staff survey 2023 to achieve average score over 3.0 on support given to their carer responsibilities | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sep } 2021 \\ & 2023 \end{aligned}$ | EDI <br> Leads/Dean | A | A |
| 5.26 | Normalise hybrid working for academic staff and allow flexible working locations | Research Survey 2020 showed that $46 \%$ women strongly agree it is difficult to balance worklife while $58 \%$ men somewhat agree <br> The staff focus group identified the preference for flexible working locations |  | 5.26 HoDs hold conversation with individuals to identify preference on hybrid working patterns after return to campus in Sep 2021 | Increased staff satisfaction (10\% strongly agree the difficulty) on achieving worklife balance in University and Faculty staff survey in 2024 | 2024 | HoDs/Dean | A | $\stackrel{\bullet}{R}$ |



| 5.30 | Carry out analysis on each tariff in PPF by gender | Staff Survey suggested that women concerned that they are in supportive roles |  | 5.30 PS EDI Lead to carry out analysis of the tariff in PPF by gender and communicate the result to the EDI committee by Oct 2021 | Understand any gendered impact resulting from tariffs, particularly related to recognised Administration and Leadership roles; <br> Produce action plans if there is a gendered gap in these roles by Mar 2022 | First review Oct 2021, <br> Action plan by Mar 2022 | Dean/HoSO/ PS EDI Lead | G | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.31 | Carry out feedback from staff on PPF after the first year of implementation PPF | No feedback has been received on PPF as this is the first year of its implementation | PPF presentation delivered in Nov 20 School Forum by the Dean and PS EDI Lead, detailing methodology behind the project and framework <br> PPF went through extensive consultation period with SOTA staff, in addition to PPF being reviewed by EDI Committee in June 20 before formal release of document | 5.31.1 Circulate a survey to staff after the first year of implementation to understand any gendered concern among staff <br> 5.31.2 Produce an action pan according to the result of the survey | Feedback and analysis gained from survey will determine required actions | Summer 2022 <br> March <br> 2023 | Dean/HoSO/ PS EDI Lead | G | $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { R }}$ |
| 5.32 | Improve opportunities for informal gathering in SOTA; Investigate the benefit of hybrid meeting arrangements | Staff Survey 2018 showed that $65 \%$ F believed not be able to attend out-of-core-hour activities negatively impacted their progression. Only 26\% men felt the same. | Fortnightly coffee morning was arranged in SOTA before the pandemic | 5.32.1 Continue offline fortnightly coffee mornings and monitor the attendance <br> 5.32.2 Carry out staff focus group to explore the benefit and preferences of hybrid meeting arrangement in Oct 2021 | Monitor the attendance of coffee morning and ensure at least $20 \%$ staff attend once every semester <br> Implement hybrid meeting | Oct 2021 <br> Dec 2021 | EDI leads /Operation Team/ Committee chairs | A | $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{R}}$ |


|  |  |  |  | 5.32.3 Implement hybrid meeting arrangement in the School from Dec 2021 to enhance inclusion | arrangement in all Department by Dec 2021 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.33 | Include active and inspiring pictures of women in SOTA promotional materials | Insufficient visibility of female role models |  | 5.33.1 Audit the gendered images presented in all communication channels of the School including website, handbooks, social media <br> 5.33.2 Highlight women's achievement in promotional materials when they occur <br> 5.33.3 HoDs identify women staff success and report to the School Marketing team on the ongoing basis | Achieve gender balance in promotional materials and all communication channels by Dec 2021 | Dec 2021 <br> Ongoing | EDI Leads/ HoDs/ MRE | G | $\stackrel{\ominus}{\circ}$ |
| 5.34 | Monitor and ensure gender balance in School events and activities | Insufficient visibility of female role models | EDI Leads <br> coordinated successful application to Faculty Beacon fund which funded the following activity: <br> PS Champion, working group, C\&M Champion and student reps organised event series 'Making a Change in the Real World' which was launched in March 21 featuring 5 female speakers talking | 5.34 Monitor and ensure gender balance is achieved in all activities organised by SOTA, including Departmental level | Gender balance reached in all SOTA and Departmental activities immediately | Immediate | Dean/HoDs/ <br> Departmental Champions | $\stackrel{\bullet}{G}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{R}}$ |


|  |  |  | about their research and issues related to EDI, available for both staff and students to attend; <br> English Champion/working group funded 3 alumni in February 21 to share career stories with current students as part of Skills Week |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.35 | Music signs up for Key Change Initiative | Insufficient visibility of female role models | Music department signed up to Key Change in principle in 2019 which require all events to have equal gender split, as evidenced in lunchtime concert series | 5.35 Formally sign up the Key Change initiative by Sep 2021 | Formal membership of Music in the initiative by Sep 2021 | Sep 2021 | HoD of Music/ Music EDI champion | G | A |

