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# An overview of the school and its approach to gender equality

* 1. **Letter of endorsement from the head of school**
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21 September 2023

I am delighted to submit the School of Chemical Engineering’s Athena SWAN Silver Award Application. The principles of Athena SWAN are firmly embedded in the management of the School and applied across the breadth of our activities.

I personally champion our AS action plan by ensuring that EDI is front and centre in the School’s strategic planning and decision-making. At our recent Staff Away Day an EDI roundtable discussion was the first activity of the day, and I have repositioned EDI and AS standing items higher up the agendas of Senior Management Team (SMT) meeting, School Committee and Education Committee to give them more prominence. The School’s Dr Claudia Favero won a Higher Education Futures institute (HEFi) Inclusive Education Award in 2022 for the short EDI ‘bite size’ she introduced to our weekly staff meetings all aimed at enhancing the student experience by making improvements in teaching and learning.

In addition to the financial support the School gives to carry out the positive initiatives arising from the AS action plan (including the EDI newsletter, staff coffee mornings, Staff Network themed events etc), I have assigned a budget of £15k to the EDI committee for the first time. Despite the School’s Operational budget being significantly reduced this year, I felt it was important that efficiency savings didn’t impact upon the efforts to address gender inequalities. The committee is planning to use a proportion of these funds to refresh the visuals in our School atrium to reflect our School’s diversity, and highlight graduate pathways.

Established in 2022, the Carole D. Ingram Memorial Prize provides financial support (£3k) to recognise and encourage women in the field of Chemical Engineering. It is awarded to a female student each year who fulfils the eligibility criteria. A high-profile ceremony and celebration are held within the School with the aim of inspiring other women to follow in Carole’s footsteps and have shining careers, champion causes important to them and live well-rounded fulfilling lives. Students have the opportunity to network with invited female alumni following careers in Engineering.

Since our last AS application, we have appointed a full-time Outreach and School’s Liaison officer, a female member of Professional Services’ staff whose job role is primarily focused on delivering outreach activities to encourage more female students into Chemical Engineering. I am proud to state that our targeted efforts in this space have contributed towards an increase in the female undergraduate population which has seen a steady increase from 30% to 37% since our last application, and is a couple of percent higher than the UK sector average (Table 6).

We have successfully narrowed the gender gap and gender pay gap at Associate Professor level largely through an increased focus on EDI in the recruitment process and I am striving towards achieving the same balance at more senior academic levels as much as possible during my tenure as Head of School, commensurate with Key Priority 6) of our future action plan.

The six Key Priorities identified for our future Action Plan concern 1) EDI culture, 2) consideration of EDI across all School structures, 3) increased mental health and wellbeing support, 4) an improved School Culture survey question set to better understand intersectional culture, 5) closing the gender attainment gap for Black, Asian and other minority Ethnic (B.A.M.E.) students and 6) improving the senior academic gender balance.

Chairing the School’s Women in Chemical Engineering staff group has been an invaluable opportunity to hear the opportunities and challenges of the School’s female population directly, and I am committed to using my position of influence as Head of School to amplify the voices of this group through increased advocacy and allyship.

I am personally invested in supporting all future recommendations from the AS SAT and thank them for their enthusiastic engagement with AS and the hard work that has gone into making significant efforts in improving gender equality.

Yours sincerely



Professor Gary Leeke AMIChemE FHEA

Head of the School of Chemical Engineering

## Description of the school

The School of Chemical Engineering is one of seven schools in the College of Engineering and Physical Sciences (EPS). It regularly ranks in the top 5 Chemical Engineering departments in the Complete University Guide and The Times league tables, and we are 66th in the World QS Rankings[[1]](#footnote-2).

The School’s staff and student cohort is predominantly male. In the 2021/22 academic year (latest data available) there were:

* 570 Undergraduate students (37% female)
* 210 Postgraduate taught students (48% female)
* 165 Postgraduate research students (34% female)
* 138 Academic staff (28% female)
* 29 Professional, Technical and Operational (PTO) staff (66% female)

We deliver modern industry-relevant educational programmes in Chemical Engineering (including industrial, international experience and year in computer science options) and Food Safety & Hygiene. Our laboratory-based teaching and open day activities have been strengthened by the opening of the University’s Collaborative Teaching Laboratory (2018). We offer taught Masters/MSc programmes in Advanced Chemical Engineering and specialists subjects, with focus on one of the research areas within the School, including Food Safety (with Continuing Professional Development (CPD) modules), Energy, Healthcare and Industrial Project Management (with CPD modules, distance learning). We also offer combined taught/research programmes including Master by Research, Engineering Doctorate and PhD with Integrated Study in the subjects of Chemical Engineering, Formulation Engineering, and Hydrogen, Fuel Cells and their applications. Doctoral/PhD research projects associated with either of our research pillars, which are Formulation, Energy and Healthcare, are also offered. Except for our EngD programmes, our Postgraduate programmes are also offered part time.

Many of our research projects involve collaboration with industrial and government organisations and the quality of our research is reflected by our Research Excellent Framework (REF) rating, with 96% of our research rated as world-leading or internationally excellent in the latest assessment (2021). Our REF submission was supported by a formal REF reading group, contributing to the selection of the School’s scientific publication outputs, and an informal REF reading group whose purpose is outlined in the action plan. A new formal reading group is already in place for the next round of REF. All three School research pillars (Formulation Engineering, Healthcare and Energy) have grown since 2018. As a key consequence, staff, postgraduate research students and laboratories/pilot facilities are now spread across 7 locations (Figure 1) and most of our meetings are offered as hybrid.
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Figure 1: School locations

## Governance and recognition of equality, diversity and inclusion work

The School’s management structure (including reporting structure and committee meeting frequency) is outlined in Figure 2. SMT discusses strategic and operational matters, space, staff, education, admissions, research and EDI/AS, and its gender ratio is representative of the School. The promotions committee considers all promotions applications. The composition of the panel is reviewed yearly to improve the gender equality of the panel, with increasing female membership where senior appointments in the previous year have made this possible. HoS pre-reviews applications and gives constructive feedback in advance of submission to the committee. Industrial Advisory Board (IAB) provides feedback to the taught curriculum, industry readiness of our graduates, and strategic developments of the School.

Chart showing the School Management structure

Figure 2: School management structure

The School of Chemical Engineering is fully committed to supporting, promoting, and implementing the three themes of the University’s Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) strategy: Dismantling Barriers; Integrating Equality, Diversity and Inclusion; and Inclusive Environments, and the ten key principles of the Athena Swan Charter. The School’s EDI committee and EPS EDI reporting structure are depicted in Figure 3 and Figure 4.
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Figure 3: School of Chemical Engineering EDI Committee
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Figure 4: EPS EDI reporting structure

The School’s EDI Committee (15F, 8M) ensures fair representation of the School of Chemical Engineering’s community through its membership of Staff and Students, although with an over-representation of female colleagues (65% cf. 36% female staff, Table 18), possibly as a result of how we have recruited Committee members by inviting expressions of interest for membership. Response rates have permitted that anybody wanting to join the committee being invited to do so. Going forward, we are readdressing the gender balance of the committee’s membership. The Committee meets formally once a term, with additional smaller focused action groups in-between. SAT also meets termly to critically evaluate progress against the Action Plan which reports into the EDI Committee.

Related action:

**2.1** Improve EDI committee and SAT profile, with gender as the primary criterion and other protective characteristics as secondary criterion, to be reflective of School.

All School of Chemical Engineering staff and students are actively encouraged to propose new initiatives to promote gender equality; committees representing UG, PGR, PGT, Centres for Doctoral Training (CDTs), or PTO can also voice suggestions, which are reported to the School’s EDI committee or directly to SMT for implementation and showcased at College level through the EPS EDI Operational Committee for dissemination and transfer. The EPS EDI Project officer will inform the EPS EDI Strategic Committee of any relevant initiative/development, and from there it will escalate to the University’s Central Equality Team as part of the University’s Equality Change Programme workstreams.

The aims of the School of Chemical Engineering’s EDI Committee are to:

* ensure the implementation of the University's policy and procedures in relation to Equality and Diversity within the School, and, where appropriate, to recommend improvements at College level;
* act as a focal point for any Equality and Diversity issues that may arise across the School, and to take appropriate action or escalate to other University services as appropriate to achieve resolution;
* act as a focal point for the various Equality and Diversity initiatives across EPS and wider University and to receive reports from relevant interest or special purpose groups;
* quarterly report on progress to College Operations Committee and to refer issues to other relevant University committees and groups and make recommendations for action through EDI lead input into overall College strategy and associated Action plan;
* encourage and monitor activities supporting the embedding of Equality and Diversity in the School’s practices and processes, including promoting Athena Swan and other national initiatives;
* promote Inclusivity of all groups within the broad scope of Equality and Diversity and to maintain an ongoing review to ensure that all are given equal consideration.

The Promotions Criteria of the new Birmingham Academic Career Framework recognises EDI across the three workstreams of Education, Research and Enterprise, Engagement and Impact. Points available for each workstream are divided into four separate criteria with EDI recognition at every level. The University’s Workload Allocation Model (WAM) for Academics awards points to EDI/AS Leads, and the personal annual review processes for all staff recognises EDI activity through citizenship.

## Development, evaluation and effectiveness of policies

The University of Birmingham (UoB) Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Strategy sets institutional objectives for equality which includes targets for senior female academic staff and is managed locally by College Board EDI Leads.

At School level, the implementation of this area of policy and guidance is overseen by the School and regularly assessed in the following ways:

Qualitatively, through:

1. interaction and participation in School and College fora, such as EDI committees, School Education Committee, SAT, Student Voice, Professional Services Staff Forum and Town Halls, where both staff and student bodies are represented, as well as
2. through annual personal reviews, Personal Development Plan meetings and/or regular line management meetings. Line managers liaise with HR and/or Occupational Health Services to assist in the implementation of key institutional policies (e.g., maternity/paternity/partner/adoption/shared leaves, flexible/hybrid working, support for staff during menopause or who might be experiencing domestic abuse), following specific training and guidelines available through the Staff Intranet, which acts as hub for information, forms, and guidance. All information is linked from our School digital staff handbook.

Quantitively, through:

1. the implementation by the SAT team of an annual Staff Culture Survey (SCS). The SCS is focused on recruitment and promotion, reward and recognition, family and care initiatives, and harassment and bullying, all of which are cornerstones of university-level policies and guidance. Results, which reflect both academic and non-academic staff views and an understanding of how the School promotes gender equality, are collated and analysed by the SAT team and discussed at School level through SMT, and at College and University level via the EPS EDI Operations committee. The SCS is an effective tool to identify issues related to differences in work environment and/or conditions across academic and non-academic staff, as well as to evaluate gender equality polices. Policy evaluation outputs are then used to revise School practices. For example, feedback from the University led Staff survey and SCS led to the inclusion of additional points of discussion being added to the Staff Performance and Development Reviews under the headings of ‘Career Development Support’ and ‘Wellbeing’. ‘My performance development reviews (PDR) proved the opportunity to discuss my learning and development’ had the second highest response rate favourability in the recently published staff survey results (89%), and 5% above the University’s average. Additionally, an annual review meeting takes place between AS Lead, College EDI Project officer and Deputy Head of College, with actions and/or action delivery plans on policy development, implementation and assessment adjusted as necessary.

## Athena Swan self-assessment process

The makeup of the SAT is shown in Table 1. There were 10 female and 6 male team members. The team was convened by the School’s AS Lead by circulating an open invitation to all staff to express interest in contributing to the application, in January 2022. Following an initial meeting early February 2022, the SAT was established. Throughout, the team was supported the EPS EDI Project Officer.

Table 1: Self-assessment team

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Staff Type and Role** unless Research and Education | **Role on SAT** |
| 6 | PTO – Education Support Team Manager | Contributing to section 3.1 |
| PTO – Operations Officer | Contributing to sections 1.3 and 1.4 |
| PTO – Outreach and Schools Liaison Officer | Assessing progress against action plan |
| 7 | Academic – Teaching Fellow | Contributing to all sections via discussion at SAT meetings |
| PTO – Senior Operations Manager | Supporting data provision and section 1 |
| Academic – TF and Distance Learning Course Developer and EDI Education Champion | Culture survey; Contributing to sections 3.2 & 4 |
| PTO – OM for the Healthcare Technologies Institute | Contributing to section 1.4 |
| 8 | Academic | Drafting section 1.4 |
| Academic | Drafting section 3.1 |
| PTO – Head of Operations | Drafting section 1.3; contributing to sections 3.2 & 4; Researching data held at School |
| 9 | Academic | Contributing to all sections via discussion at SAT meetings |
| Academic – Education | Culture survey; Supporting assessment of progress against action plan; contributing to sections 3.2 & 4 |
| Academic | Data tables |
| Academic | Contributing to section 3.1 |
| Prof | Academic | Contributing to section 1.4 |
| Academic | **AS Lead**; drafting sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 2.2, 3.2, 4 & Glossary; bringing all sections together for review by college and university; submission |

Our approach to SAT recruitment, via open invitation, meant that it is not representative of School of Chemical Engineering’s gender, staff type, grade or role profile. Students were not recruited due to sensitivity of the data to be reviewed in preparing the application. The SAT gender profile is female-dominated (62.5%) while the School’s gender profile is male-dominated (Staff: 64% (Table 18), Students: 60% (Table 4)). Academic staff dominate (62.5%), in line with the School (83%, Table 18). 19% of the academic SAT members are education-focussed and none are research-only. This compares to a School profile of 6% for education-focussed staff, 61% for research-only and 33% for research and education. Grade 7 with the highest representation in the School has the lowest representation on SAT. This is because the majority of grade 7 are research-only postdoctoral staff (57) and we only managed to recruit grade 7 TFs at grade 7. Speaking to individual Research Fellows (RFs) revealed that pressures to deliver research outputs, confounded by delays during Covid, and the fixed-term nature of their contracts were the main reasons to not engage. 21% of all PTO staff were on the SAT.

Related action:

**2.1** Improve EDI committee and SAT profile, with gender as the primary criterion and other protective characteristics as secondary criterion, to be reflective of School.

Since May 2022, the SAT has met monthly during teaching months. Meetings were held largely online using Microsoft Teams in core hours to honour working from home arrangements and split site locations. Dates were convened using online polls. Meetings were chaired by the School’s AS Lead. Microsoft Teams was used to share data, information, and application drafts.

In the intervening years (2018-21), a SAT was not in place. Progress against Bronze actions was monitored by the previous Head of Operations and AS Lead (who then doubled up as EDI Chair), and the School’s EDI committee and “action group” meetings were the main forums of discussion. Action groups, with members from the EDI committee, were created to deliver against the Bronze action plan as well as to deal with newly identified EDI challenges within the School. The role of AS Lead and EDI Chair were separated at the beginning of the Silver application process, and will remain separate going forward. This was done for two reasons; (i) to manage workload of the two roles, but, more importantly, to separate responsibility for delivering the action plan (delegated by Head of School to the EDI Chair) from assessing the delivery of actions, which is the role of the AS Lead. The AS Lead and most of the SAT members are, and have expressed interest to remain, on the School EDI committee. During the application process, SAT members were not involved in delivering actions.

Statistics (Appendix 2) supporting our application were sourced from the University’s Strategic Planning Team. Additional statistics were sourced from the School’s Education Support Office. Staff culture was surveyed April 2020, April 2022 and December 2022. In 2022 we re-used the 2020 survey but added the seven questions mandated by the new AS charter. Answer options were amended to conform with the charter culture survey. Appendix 1a reports the full set of results for the December 2022 survey, selected data from April 2020 are shown in Appendix 1b when required to evidence statements. We had a good number of respondents April 2020 (51%, 85/166) but not April 2022 (22%, 37/167), which is why we re-ran the survey in December of the same year when we had an excellent response rate (72%, 121/167[[2]](#footnote-3)).

The School of Chemical Engineering’s gender equality work is supported by the following ongoing means:

* as a standing item at SMT meetings, reviewing, granting and implementing AS actions;
* as a standing item at all staff School away days to communicate new items on the EDI agenda, educate and foster discussion around AS actions;
* regular EDI nuggets at weekly staff meetings to enhance student experience such as accessibility of online education material and team working;
* a designated budget;
* SAT meetings and feeding up of concerns/new actions to EDI Committee;
* two full-time staff roles (one permanent, one fixed term) dedicated to supporting EDI through outreach work with activity aimed at engaging with groups traditionally underrepresented in the discipline of Chemical Engineering (e.g., those who identify as female or non-binary and people from low socioeconomic areas);
* delivery of actions by action groups with volunteer members recruited from the School via open invitation.

# 

# An evaluation of the school’s progress and success

## Evaluating progress against the previous action plan

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Previous Action Plan Number** | **Action Description** | **Measured by (Impact)** | **RAG rating** | **Progress updates**  Note that updates are given by main action with reference to sub-actions (A, B, …). |
| 1. **Improve gender balance on courses offered** | | | | |
| 1A | For undergraduate courses:  Solicit opportunities in university organised outreach to create greater awareness of Chemical Engineering as a career path. Aim for a particular emphasis on foundation year option for those who may not have thought of Chemical Engineering. Develop targeted materials for Pre-GCSE and GCSE outreach (Action 1C) making use of all the positives we have identified in the Athena SWAN analysis (high profile female appointments, rising female student numbers etc.)  Create video interviews with the 2 new female professors appointed 2018 for use in recruitment activity and display on School website as positive role models. | F/M ratio increases in line or better than our direct competitors. An undergraduate three percentage point rise in female population is our target. | Green | Gender balance improved from 32% to 38% female in 2020/21 (Table 4), which is double of our target of 3% by 2021. The trend continues with the 2021/22 data point stating 39% female.  In 2017/18 we were below the UK sector average (Table 6) but have overtaken the sector in 2019/20, 35% cf. 31%. We had similar success for our PGT offering (Table 8), increasing female students from 31% to 44%, overtaking the sector in 2018/19 (44% cf. 30% in 2020/21).  This was achieved by successfully developing targeted outreach material for UG courses, to cover all School age groups, led by the additional outreach-dedicated post in the School and supported by the UG Admission tutor (1A), working with graduates and current students to promote AS principles (1B), and utilising the material for staff and PGR student outreach activities (1C). We didn’t report on practices of other schools (1D) but focused our activity on 1A-C via the new post. Influencing EDI policies of industry partners was dismissed as unachievable (1E), although we assess EDI policies of potential new industry partners. |
| 1B | Produce and host new materials (on-going as described in progress) for all courses but in particular undergraduate work with current students and recent graduates.  Produce promotional material aimed at GCSE students advocating chemical engineering as a career with a particular focus on gender inclusion. Link to the promotional approach of the IChemE ‘Why not Chemical Engineering’ <http://www.whynotchemeng.com/>.  Promote Athena SWAN principles in our information and the roles women can take in Chemical Engineering. | Refreshed materials prepared to cover all School age groups. | Green |
| 1C | Use the materials developed in combination with the outreach activities of our post graduate students particularly the EngD cohort and alumni who are spread around the country at their companies to widen participation. | Material disseminated to the outreach active team for incorporation into their activities.  Outreach activities logged and presented at the annual conferences of our postgraduate students. | Green |
| 1D | Review the practices in University Schools/Departments who consistently have a high F/M ratio and use the data to inform our recruitment activities in terms of gender balance in materials the type of materials used nature of the environment. | Report provided. | Red |
| 1E | Encourage those industries who send students to undergraduate and Postgraduate courses to consider their gender policies on the candidates they put forward. | Improvements in gender balance of part time courses.  Given the supply chain demographic the aim here is an improvement of 5% more males on the UG (PT) courses and likewise a 5% increase in females on PGT (PT) by 2021. | Red |
| 1. **To ensure gender equality in performance** | | | | |
| 2A | Introduce a statistically valid analysis process which will evaluate the gender balance in terms of registration for elective modules and performance within each module with data to be used to inform module coordinators and the teaching team of areas of concern in the annual review process. [This action applies to all taught modules, UG and PGT.] | The measurement is a more uniform gender performance profile within modules which will be reflected in the overall degree attainment profile. | Red | Although data were compiled for overall performance including cross-referencing ethnicity (Table 13, Table 14, Table 15), only during writing this application an education-focused academic was appointed to analyse and disseminate at exam boards module enrolment and performance by gender. |
| 1. **Targeted career advice for PG students** | | | | |
| 3A | Prepare and deliver a seminar on career opportunities specifically for our postgraduate student body covering opportunities in industry and academia and the route to information. | Career tutorial for postgraduates delivered. | Amber | (3A) University Careers services provide information for PGT students. A school-based seminar series on career opportunities could not be resourced. Careers are instead discussed in Personal Academic Tutorials. CV clinics are offered. Students have an opportunity to talk to industry lecturers.  Seminars and career opportunities, including PhDs, are posted on the PGT year page (3B). There is now also a school calendar accessible to all staff and students containing all events taking place. However, the latest PGT cohort raised in StuVo that a more targeted school offering is still desired. |
| 3B | Ensure that postgraduate students receive notification of School career events and seminars. | Events posted on the postgraduate information system. | Green |
| 1. **To ensure the continued upward trend in female representation in staff at grade 8 and above** | | | | |
| 4A | Use the more stringent/comprehensive Mentoring Scheme introduced by the University in 2018 for probationary lecturers.  Extend the approach to all staff on lecturer grade until they are promoted to Senior Lecturer. With 6 senior female academic now in post we can align mentors more closely with the needs of junior females.  Mentor current female lecturers over the next few years to reaffirm that they are valued staff members, and that career progression is attainable. The result will be a greater number of female senior lecturers and eventually greater numbers in higher grades.  This action is closely linked to the PDR (Action 10) and promotion (Action 6), which are for all staff. | Staff feel supported (as measured by the staff survey) and are ready for promotion in a timely manner with a clear vision. Our intention is that all new academics should be promotable in less than 5 years. | Green | Mentoring is offered to all staff (4A), see also A9. Training courses directed at supporting career progression, e.g., Leadership programmes for females, are publicised by email and in the School’s EDI newsletter (4B). Links to the University’s Professional and Organization Development unit are in the new electronic staff handbook (Action 6). Upon call for promotion, HoS offers to meet anybody considering applying and seeks dialogue with staff who they judge ready to apply. (4B) See Action 6 and Action 7 for further discussion. In support of building a balanced gender (and diverse) staff profile; University job adverts welcome applications from diverse backgrounds and openness to discussion around flexible working (4C). Prospective candidates are invited to give a seminar. Seminar series statistics reveals that one speaker was recruited (senior male, 2022/23) (Table 30). |
| 4B | Identify useful training courses for progression and circulate to relevant staff members and mentors (linked to action 4A). Additionally, the information will be incorporated in the School Handbook (Action 7). | Course information available for staff and mentors.  Incorporated in Handbook when fully launched | Green |
| 4C | Recruitment of Lecturing Staff:  When posts are made available for lecturing staff, ensure that we have mechanisms in place to attract female staff. To this end we will highlight in our commitment to family and flexible working as well as highlighting our commitment to Athena SWAN.  Invite internal and external prospective candidates to give talks and be familiar with the School in order that they are encouraged to apply when the opportunity arises. | Ongoing within the School meeting programme | Green |
| 1. **Prepare fixed term contract staff for promotion and transfer to permanent positions as appropriate** | | | | |
| 5A | Raise awareness on progression, provide advice and recommend training (through the School Handbook and PDR process [see Actions 7 and 10 respectively]) | Measurement will be through observed promotion and through the staff survey comments being more positive. | Green | All staff eligible to be on an open contract, limited by funds, were transferred (5B). Head of Operations reviews annually. See A6 for awareness on promotion (5A, 5C - Sessions as proposed in 5C were not delivered). |
| 5B | Ensure all staff who are eligible to transfer to open contract (limited by funds) are transferred. | All staff eligible to be on open contract (limited by funds) shall be. | Green |
| 5C | HR Promotions team to give a session on the process of promotion | Sessions delivered and improved responses in staff survey. | Red |
| 1. **Enhanced understanding of the promotion process and requirements that it is fit for purpose to encourage women as well as men to apply** | | | | |
| 6A | Promotions seminars will be arranged through Professional and Organisational Development unit and will be advertised to all staff and delivered by a mixed gender team.  Routes to promotions will be more formally discussed during PDR process (Action 10).  Promotion training links will be in the School Handbook Action 7. The handbook will augment the information given by the University to enable people to form a view of what typically leads to promotion within the School. | Improvement in the satisfaction score on promotion support particularly among women. | Green | Since our Bronze application, the promotions process changed to a points system and is now very transparent. The University’s Professional and Organisational Development unit delivers promotion briefings, advertised to staff at each promotion round. All promotion training information is available in the new School Handbook (A7) and supported via staff email, mentioning at staff meetings, and invitation to discuss intention to apply with HoS (6B). Discussion of career progression at the annual personal development appraisals is now monitored (Action 10) (6A).  59.5% of staff (Nov 2022 culture survey) agreed or strongly agreed that they understand the promotions process and criteria (Table 2, Q4) – an improvement from the previous 51.8% (Apr 2020; Table 3, Q4), across gender and role. By gender, 52.8% (19/36) F, 65.1% (43/66) M respondents cf. 42.8% (9/21) and 58.6% (24/41) fell into this bracket – an improvement across gender. By role, it was 87.2% academics (more female (8/9, 89%) than male (25/29, 86%)), 48.8% Research/Teaching Fellows (RTF) (more female (6/10, 60%) than male (14/30, 47%) and 37.5% PTO (30% (5/17) F, 67% (4/6) M) cf. 60.7% academics (similar for female (2/3, 66.7%) and male (13/20, 65%)), 50% RTF (fewer female (2/8, 25%) than male (6/9, 66.7%) and 52.6% PTO staff (50% (4/8) F, 37.5% (3/8) M). We have clearly been most successful in “educating” academic and PTO. Most RF posts (not TF but staff numbers suggest that most respondents in this category were RF) are short-term and a steppingstone to permanent positions. Grant funding often does not allow promotion; therefore, the unchanged outcome is not surprising. For RTF and PTO now fewer female than male understand the promotion criteria, whereas previously it was fewer male. |
| 6B | Provide information to managers covering upcoming promotional seminars and workshops so they can encourage attendance. | Green |
| 1. **Produce electronic online interactive relevant School Handbook** | | | | |
| 7A | Develop an online interactive handbook available to all staff which contains links relevant to all relevant sections. The Medical School’s excellent system will form the basis of our handbook.  <https://intranet.birmingham.ac.uk/mds/welcomeinduction/staff-handbook/index.aspx>  The handbook will cover Induction, Mentoring, Development, Promotion, Training Opportunities, Grant Writing Support, Learning Support, Personal Development, HR policy education, School Structure and Advice Gurus etc.  It will not re-invent university web pages but point the way to them with helpful additional information where the School might have specific needs or practices. | An up-to-date user-friendly help system (Handbook) in place to easily allow staff to gain information about life in the School College and University. | Green | An electronic staff School Handbook was produced, through review and adaption from a draft of another EPS School, and is available on our VLE platform. Staff are enrolled as part of onboarding. Content is reviewed annually by up to three members of staff who are also contact points for suggestions for improvement. Student groups have specific year/cohort handbooks. |
| 1. **To improve induction making it accessible and relevant** | | | | |
| 8A | Post induction interviews will be held at 3-6 months (either part of the PDR process or a pre-PDR meeting depending on when the inductee joined) to ensure entrants integration.  This forms part of Action 10 where the induction review is evaluated by the inductees PDR reviewer. | Induction process checked and remedial action instigated where required for all starters. | Green | A basic School induction programme, augmented by formal university induction introducing the central functions, is in place. For PTO, monthly meetings and interim personal development appraisals (PDR) are held. For academics, monthly meetings and interim PDR are in place for grade 8 as requirement of the new Birmingham Academic Career Framework. There is evidence this is being done at other grades. PDRA induction process was reviewed and now includes opportunity to meet with School PDRA rep, which has received excellent feedback. |
| 1. **Refine School mentoring system** | | | | |
| 9A | A more robust university policy on mentoring probationary lecturers has been introduced this year. As a school we plan that this mentoring should continue beyond probation to help academics towards subsequent promotions and general career development. While it will not be compulsory it will be formally offered to all new staff. | Extension of mentoring is expected to lead to improvement in the PDR process (see Action 10). Success will be measured as improvement in staff satisfaction with the PDR process. | Green | 57% of staff judge that the School provides them with useful mentoring opportunities (Table 2, Q7), increased from 54.8% in 2020 (Table 3, Q7). The University has now a formal mentoring system for probationary lecturers, much enhanced from 2018. EPS introduced a mentoring scheme open to all PTO. The School offers mentoring to (9A), but not always adopted by, staff on other grades, and setting up has on occasion taken months. Staff-led mentoring of PDRAs was not taken up and feedback from the PDRA Rep is that more work is needed. Information on the University PDRA mentor scheme is included in the new Staff Handbook (9B). Career progression is now a formal topic in PDR (Action 10) (9C). |
| 9B | The mentoring model will be offered to all staff. Offers made where the mentor status of a staff member is not known or recorded. | All staff made offer and recorded by the School that the process is taking place or has been declined. | Amber |
| 9C | Managers to be encouraged by the HoS to encourage staff and discuss career progression. | Staff feel more comfortable in discussing openly promotion and this is reflected in improved scores in the survey. | Green |
| 1. **Improve Personal Development Review (PDR) process** | | | | |
| 10A | Introduce a tick sequence in the process paperwork for both reviewee and reviewer to ensure that key aspects relating to career development, promotion aspirations and wellbeing are discussed. This is ready to go and will be implemented when the next round of PDR commences in February 2019.  Staff will be encouraged to meet with their mentors in the period leading up to the PDR to discuss aspects of the PDR less formally and help the mentee/reviewee focus on career development and help identify training needs/opportunities. | Increased satisfaction with the PDR process as measured by the staff survey. | Green | In 2022 cf. 2020 more staff found PDR helpful (59.5% (Table 2, Q7) cf. 55.9% (Table 3, Q7)). Mandatory discussion of long-term ambitions, career development and wellbeing during PDR was introduced (Figure 5). 10 academics (22.2% (2/9) female, 27.6% (8/29) male) and 6 PDRAs (20% (2/10) female, 13.3% (4/30) male) didn’t feel they could say PDR is helpful (responding neither disagree nor agree). 8 PDRAs (2F, 6M) actively said it isn’t helpful (disagreed or strongly disagreed) and 5 respondents (1F, 1M, 3 no gender reveal) didn’t know. In 2020 fewer academics (4/28, 1/3 female, 3/20 male) and fewer RTFs (5/22, 3/8 female, 1/9 male) responded neutral but only 3 respondents did not know (1M, 2 no gender reveal).  We haven’t consistently monitored reviewer and reviewee training (10B), and the above analysis shows that the PDR process or its perception still need improving. It has been difficult to get accurate data from the centre on who is up-to-date with training. Going forward we are looking to use a new University tool to track training in this area. |
| 10B | Refresher course for all staff involved in the PDR process. Reviewers will be offered retraining every 2 years to ensure consistency.  Reminders sent to interviewers emphasising the need to discuss career progression and wellbeing during the interview. | 100% trained staff undertaking review process. | Amber |
| 1. **Improve support for Grant writing** | | | | |
| 11A | Make the grant review scheme clear and formal. All grants to external bodies will pass through an internal review process. The reviewers will be selected on the basis of experience and gender. Review will include follow up to help understand reasons for success or failure that will be shared via the Handbook (Action 7). | All grants applications reviewed.  Improved submission and success rates measured. | Amber | Grant applications review before submission is in place, not formalised but rigorous for new staff up to first grant application (11A). Once per month the weekly staff meeting is research-focused for sharing information, key dates and best practice, with information archived on the School’s Research Teams channel. We decided against sharing reasons for grant success or failure widely as they may be very complex and grant specific (11B). RS and Director of Research advise individual applicants instead.  An additional Research Support Officer joined October 2021, and regular grant writing clinics are now in place. Feedback from Schools across EPS triggered major restructuring of Research Support in 2023. Grant applications and value show a dip due to Covid but are on an upward trajectory (Table 29). |
| 11B | The Handbook (Action 7) will contain all the contact information required to construct a grant and access the help available within the University and School. This will include an organisational map of the finance and grant support team processes. | Handbook operating see action 7. | Green |
| 1. **Clear communication and support for maternity, paternity and adoption leave.** | | | | |
| 12A | Provide clear literature for staff on entitlement and give examples of how it works with personal statements of those who have had leave associated with family matters. These will be available in the Handbook and incorporated into the induction materials, Actions 7 and 8. | Materials and examples available to all staff via the Handbook. | Amber | Communication is improved with information very clearly in the School Handbook, but all policies are University, not School. The School now is being informed by their HR advisor of upcoming leave so we can check in with individuals to see if any additional support is needed. Same for those returning from leave.  While we are yet to produce personal statements of those who had leave associated with family matters, we link up affected staff with those who have been through this. There is a new EPS initiative, get togethers of staff who have taken maternity, adoption, parental, shared parental, or paternity leave in the last 5 years to meet others, and to share experiences to help shape future experiences and support within EPS. |
| 1. **Be accommodating of flexible working** | | | | |
| 13A | Notify staff about flexible working procedures and options in the Staff Handbook (Action 7). | Handbook operating (see action 7). | Green | (13A) 85.8% of staff (little gender difference) agreed that the School enables flexible working (from home, hours of working; Table 2, Q9). This question wasn’t asked in 2020. 69.4% of all staff, and 63.9% F, felt that the School’s policies on gender equality (discrimination, parental leave, carer's leave, flexible working) are visible enough (Table 2, Q19). The all-staff figure in 2020 was 50% (Table 3, Q16) demonstrating improvement but the present figure should be close to 100%. Flexible working options and procedures are outlined in the School Handbook. A seminar (13B) wasn’t delivered, it is reiterated in staff meetings, PDRs, 1:1s, and mandatory PDR discussion topic (13C, see also Action 10). |
| 13B | Seminar on flexible working. | Flexible working seminar given. | Red |
| 13C | Flexible working added to tick list in PDR (Action 10). | Action 10 implemented. | Green |
| 1. **Make organisation and culture female friendly and inclusive** | | | | |
| 14A | Introduce more whole-School events to increase the sense of community within the School to increase the percentage of staff who believe that UoB is a great place to work. For example, weekly staff meetings with coffee and biscuits. Bimonthly social gatherings in the atrium with ‘Bake off’ cake contests. | The School Event Calendar presented. | Green | Several new initiatives were put in place (in addition to existing celebrations during the festive period, at graduation, summer BBQ, PGR Chinese New Year, REF and promotion celebrations) to enhance culture and feeling of belonging for all staff, though some target females:   * Bi-weekly whole School coffee mornings during teaching terms, changing days to accommodate part-time and flexible working staff (14A); * LGBTQ+ coffee morning; * New School seminar series with a gender balanced agenda (Table 30); * Support and training for female staff (Menopause Café, Aurora) is communicated clearly (14B); * Team meetings are held between 10:00-16:00 to fit around child-care/school run. Doodle poll is often used to find appropriate meeting times, which then maybe outside these hours; * PGR and staff common room implemented; * Women in Chemical Engineering group, chaired by HoS, set up; * PDRA and PGR ‘Bake off’ contest (14A); * CDT Formulation Engineering EDI seminar series with internal and external female speakers.   We have no data of specific support and training for females, but we have data on gender equality training. In 2022 77.7% of staff confirmed they completed gender equality training (Table 2, Q18), significantly improved from 53.6% in 2020 (Table 3, Q15). The REF reading group comprises 2F:10M grade 9/10 all of whom have completed unconscious bias training. |
| 14B | Increase the availability of support and training for female staff in order to help them feel more secure in their job through the mechanisms actioned. | Support to be offered through HoS PA, E & D members and workshops organised by them. | Amber |
| 1. **Improve staff student communication and welfare** | | | | |
| 15A | Introduce a weekly student voice meeting, which discusses all aspects of the student experience including diversity, with an emphasis on wellbeing. The process emphasises improved communication and immediate action where possible.  All years elect representatives that represent the diversity of their group, gender ethnicity etc.  A female 4th year student representative jointly chairs SSCC with HoS. The chair of the student voice and Head of Operations, are also present.  This replaces previous system of bi-termly meetings with student reps (one per study year) and a junior chair of SSCC. | Students and the staff have much closer relationship and understanding.  Quantified by improvements in student responses to wellbeing questions in the student survey. | Green | The following measures were put in place:   * StuVo with reps from all year groups, weekly during teaching weeks, to voice any concerns about student experience; * First year UG timetabled optional (but encouraged) workshops as extra staff-student touch point; * Peer-to-peer support scheme for students re-introduced following Covid; * VLE used more rigorously for student announcements; * Student representatives sit on School Committee; * ESO weekly digest; * Mentoring provided to PGR committee, and help with PGR culture survey (setting up, distribution, analysis).   In 2022 59.5% (52.8% (19/36) female, 66.7% (44/66) male) of staff confirmed they were kept informed about gender equality matters that affect them (Table 2, Q27), compared to 50.2% (38.1% (8/21) female, 56.1% (23/41 male) in 2020 (Table 3, Q22). There was improvement, especially for female staff. |
| 1. **More gender balanced committee structures** | | | | |
| 16A | The increased number of female staff in senior positions from September 2018 will allow the restructuring of our committees with women being carefully considered for the chair positions. For some committees it is a requirement for the Head of School to be Chair in these instances a female Co-Chair will be embedded and junior female staff encouraged to be active on committees to ensure they are familiar with the processes, ready for leadership in the future. Where appropriate a female appointment to senior committee positions will be made. | Committee chair review completed this year and changes made.  The committee Chair and co-chairs to be reviewed each year. | Amber | More female staff were appointed to lead roles, such as Bettina Wolf as EDI Chair and AS Lead, later dropping the EDI Chair as explained before. In her role, Bettina joined Senior Management Team. SMT is gender balanced. The promotions committee (4M:2F plus one external appointed each year alternating between M and F), Health & Safety (11M:5F) and Research Committee (5M:1F) reflecting the male-dominated staff profile of the school. We have embedded some co-chair positions, e.g., for the staff-student forum (male B.A.M.E. student presently). |
| 1. **Ensure the workload for staff has no gender bias** | | | | |
| 17A | Continue to develop a transparent workload model incorporating our existing model into the new university approach and give a seminar on its mechanism and use. | Operating work load model with a description available in the Handbook (Action 7) of it function and operation  Seminar given | Green | The University has developed a transparent WAM (17A) for lecturing staff, i.e., school action was not needed. Staff sign off their allocation, and it is discussed at PDR (17B). The development of a statistical element to assess fairness in allocation wasn’t practical (17C). The staff survey shows an increase in the perception of fair allocation of work: 2022 76% of all respondents and 77.7% F (Table 2, Q2) judged work allocation fair regardless of gender compared to 66.7% of all respondents in 2020 and 71.5% F (Table 3, Q2). 2022 47% of all respondents and 48.7% F (Table 2, Q12) agreed or strongly agreed that equal work was rewarded with equal value. Compared to 2020, these values are up from 42.2% and 38%, respectively (Table 3, Q10). We believe that the positive trend is due to a general increase in EDI activity in the School of Chemical Engineering as no particular action was taken to change the perception of workload allocation. |
| 17B | Individual staff to be given a load statement email each year for discussion at PDR and with HoS (if requested). Information will comprise administration and teaching load plus number of students and grant profile. | Staff informed of their recorded work load and discuss issues. | Green |
| 17C | Introduce into the model a statistical element to be able to assess gender fairness in workload allocation. | Forced review of gender fairness of WAM. | Red |
| 1. **Address gendered differences in satisfaction with School culture and working practices** | | | | |
| 18A | Establish a ‘Women in Chemical Engineering’ working group, led by HoS and invite all female staff to join, to explore the issues raised by the staff satisfaction survey.  Working group develops an action plan identifying the changes the School will make (considering both policy-driven and behavioural issues) to create a more positive working environment for women.  Action plan implementation is led by HoS.  Monitoring of the action plan implementation is integrated into the Athena action plan. | Group established.  60% of female staff joining the group.  Staff satisfaction survey gender gap is closed. | Amber | The success measure of “Staff satisfaction survey gender gap is closed” in our Bronze action plan is too broad to make a reasonable statement on whether it has been achieved. Therefore, the RAG rating provided for action 18 relates to whether we have delivered the action as outlined.  The inaugural meeting of the Women in Chemical Engineering group was early 2023, chaired by HoS. Staff survey outcomes and gender pay gap were discussed. The development of actions was postponed until after our AS Silver application submission (18A). A reverse mentoring scheme was trialled but not implemented since one is being developed for EPS (18B). EDI training, including an element of unconscious bias is compulsory for all staff, but compliance is not at 100% (18C) (see Action 14). |
| 18B | As part of the above area of activity, explore with female staff support for and, as appropriate, set up a reverse-mentoring scheme, pairing a senior male member of staff with a female member of staff. | Staff satisfaction survey gender gap is closed. | Red |
| 18C | Commission and deliver unconscious bias training for all staff at grade 9 and above via People and Organisational Development. | Staff satisfaction survey gender gap is closed. | Green |
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Figure 5: New mandatory discussion sections for on School PDR form (Action 10A)

## Evaluating success against the school’s key priorities

Two key areas outlined in our Bronze application are discussed in the following:

1. Promoting greater female representation in academic grades 8 and above; and
2. Staff information provision through an interactive portal.

While not previously labelled as a key area, the following was also an important part of our previous application and is discussed in this application section:

1. Enhancing our outreach and recruitment of female students.

### 2.2.1 Promoting greater female representation in academic grades 8 and above

Figure 6 shows the academic staff data reported in our previous application as evidence for a key area of improvement.
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Figure 6: Academic staff by grade and contract type (copy of Figure 11 in our Bronze application)

Our success in this key area is due to delivering against actions 4A, 4C, 7 and 10A, evidenced by the data reported for Assistant Professor/Lecturer (grade 8), Associate Professor/Senior Lecturer/ Reader (grade 9) and Professor in Table 20. Female representation overall increased from 17% to 24%, at grade 8 from 14% to 42% and at Prof level from 9% to 20%. At grade 9 it dropped in 2020 but recovered later. At grade 8, into which staff are recruited rather than promoted, we are close to a balanced gender profile providing us with a foundation for a balanced gender profile at higher grades through promotion, in addition to recruitment. The F/M ratio for applications to grade 8 posts increased and is reflected in the gender profile of the shortlists and appointees (Table 26). Only the last reporting year saw recruitment at grade 9 (Table 26). While applications and shortlist were male dominated (74% and 75%), 2 out of 5 appointees were female. Appointment at Prof level was dominated by targeted appointments, not captured in Table 26. In 2017/18 3 male and 1 female Professors, and in 2018/19 1 female Professor were appointed.

Related action:

**6.1** Increase number of promotion applications by female grade 8 academic staff.

There was a higher percentage of female than male applicants for promotion to Prof (Table 28) with 2/5 male and 2/3 female applications approved. We are clearly on a positive journey that we seek to continue. Free text comments (Table 2, Q13a) in support of our success are:

* “The School are open and inclusive and do a lot to support staff with their careers and opportunities.”
* “The School of Chemical Engineering encourages everyone to apply for posts in multiple working areas based on their qualifications, and irrespective of gender or gender identity. It is a friendly and highly inclusive environment.”

One respondent concerningly noted “Positive discrimination”, another one noted “From promotion to other rights, I do not feel that women are appreciated” (Table 2, Q28a).

Related action:

**1.2** Eradicate claims of bullying, harassment and discrimination.

Success against this key priority was facilitated by the Head of School, the Head of Operations and the PA to Head of School. What we have learnt from assessing progress against this key area is that we still need to improve support for female staff to apply for promotion. In our future action plan, we will target grade 8 female academics and learn what support they would find useful, adopting a “bottom-up” approach as we have exhausted the “top-down” approach.

Related action:

**6.1** Increase number of promotion applications by female grade 8 academic staff.

### 2.2.2 Staff information provision through an interactive portal

The Bronze SAT concluded that staff could be better informed/aware of several matters including dignity at work, sickness absence, grievance processes, progression, parental and adoption leave, and flexible working. Action 7 “Produce electronic online interactive relevant School Handbook” was put in place. A team comprising of the Head of Operations, AS Lead and a Teaching Fellow delivered our current Electronic School Handbook as detailed in section 2.1.

The handbook had 5826 page views (for 91 total users) since it was created in April 2021. Asked about visibility of policies on gender equality, including parental leave, in the staff survey **in 2022** (Table 2, Q19) **69.4%** (84/121, 23/36 (63.9%) F, 50/66 (75.8%) M) agreed or strongly agreed and 8 (6.4%, 7 academics) disagreed. **In 2020** (Table 3, Q16) **50%** agreed or strongly agreed (6/21 (33.3%) female, 24/41 (58.5%) male. 11 (13.1%) disagreed (3F, 3M; 5 academics; 2 disagreed strongly (1F, 1 no gender reveal)).

As alluded to in the first paragraph of this section, the purpose of the staff handbook was not only to improve EDI policy, but also to provide clear information on performance and progression mechanisms (4 users, 6 views), flexible working policy (18 users, 31 views), research development (10 users, 14 views) and grant set-up (8 users, 12 views). We will continue to develop the staff handbook including regular checks of intranet links and review of content, as well as promoting its use as clearly the page view numbers are modest. Going forward operational staff will link to the staff handbook in their email signature to enhance visibility.

Related action:

**1.1** Strengthen the visibility of EDI policies.

### 2.2.3 Enhancing our outreach and recruitment of female students

Action 1 of our previous application concerned the overall improvement of the gender balance on our courses. As discussed in section 2.1, we focused activity on UG courses noting success in enhancing our outreach and recruitment of female students facilitated by the Outreach and Schools Liaison Officer. Going forward, we continue to build upon the activities below:

* Hosting prospective female applicants and arranging 1:1 meetings on careers as a female chemical engineer with female staff;
* Female staff delivering online taster lectures;
* Ensuring the gender profile of student helpers at open days is balanced where possible. Occasionally the gender balance of academic staff at open days does not meet the School profile due to smaller number of F academics and not wanting to unfairly overburden them;
* Advertising our female specific prize at open days;
* Hosting an annual outreach event for year 9 students who are female/identify as female.

Female students overall increased from 32% to 39% (see Action 1 in 2.1), 29% to 37% for our main UG offering. In 2017/18 we were below the UK sector average (Table 6) but have overtaken the sector in 2019/20, 35% cf. 31%. We had similar success for our PGT offering (Table 8), increasing female students from 31% to 44%, overtaking the sector in 2018/19 (44% cf. 30% in 2020/21).

# An assessment of the school’s gender equality context

## Culture, inclusion and belonging

Following the award of Athena SWAN Bronze in 2019, the School has strived to continue its development in EDI, particularly in terms of gender, which has historically had a strong male presence. The School is proud of its progress which has actively sought to break unconscious traditions that may have perpetuated historical inequality, promoting a new culture that its staff/students can identify with, to building an environment of inclusion, and, important within an educational setting, inspiration. Encouragingly, a sign of active success in this is demonstrated by the overwhelming majority of staff (87.6%) in the School being understanding towards engaging with equality (Table 2, Q21), making it a school ethos.An in-depth evaluation of the School’s overarching culture has been broken down and is discussed for a) Social Culture, b) Professional and Hierarchal Cultures, c) Physical Space and Working Environment, and d) Partnerships, and e) Intersectionality, reflecting on how the School actively considers gender equality and highlighting how negative practises are addressed.

### A) Social culture

As a result of its diverse research strength, the School is split across multiple sites (see 1.2) making the creation of a unified social culture a challenge. With this in mind, it highlights the achievements that the EDI committee have accomplished, via working towards the delivery of our Bronze actions, bringing a culture of togetherness into the School, initially driven via conscious efforts, that have embedded into the School’s psyche with time:

* Raised awareness of Athena Swan and its importance in a positive, welcoming and inclusive environment;
* Wellbeing and support for staff and students;
* Personal academic tutorials, mentoring, Wellbeing, Diversity and Staff Network champions;
* Regular staff social meetings/activities, Communal celebrations of achievements such as REF rating, Coffee mornings, Staff colloquia, and EDI newsletters.

As a School built around improving the future, the importance of inspiring the next generation of chemical engineers, from all backgrounds and genders is key. In recognition of this, the School facilitates outreach projects for local schools, aimed at reaching out to poorly represented groups. These projects have been well received, resulting in an array of positive feedback:

* “seeing such a volume of female engineers really inspired the students.” – *Year 11 teacher (2023)*

Moreover, this has had a positive impact on female student applications, showing a steady increase over the reporting period (see 1). External perception of the school, from a staffing point of view, however, is more challenging to assess. Consistent with discipline norms, our staff is predominantly male. Across all staff roles, throughout the reporting period, we have not seen much change maintaining splits around 35% female and 65% male (Table 18). However, when focusing on academic positions, a recognisable increase in female staff is observed, likely propagated by a cycle of active inclusion, with female academics in senior positions inevitably demonstrating a more balanced a perception of gender within the School.

Related action:

**6.2** Attract more highly qualified female applications to advertised grade 9 positions.

The overall feeling, internally, is that the School is a great place to work. Citing from the 2022 staff survey:

* “Friendly, laidback, professional, and highly inclusive environment. 100% satisfied.*” – male PDRA*

In the staff survey, this question was proposed in two forms “a great place to work for either … women, or … men”. Interestingly, female responses to the question “I feel that the School of Chemical Engineering is a great place to work for women” were more positive than male responses to “…men” (83.4% cf. 77.3%; Table 2, Q28). Social events were perceived as welcoming and tended to avoid degrading venues, non-inclusive activities and are accessible for part-time staff or those with caring responsibilities (negative outcomes accounting for only 0.8% of the total response – 0% for female; Table 2, Q17).

Although the school is overarchingly perceived as a great place to work, there appears to be an air of despondency when questioned in relation to feelings of belonging, value and importance; scores (positive responses including agree and strongly agree) typically lower than those relating to “being a great workplace”:

* “My mental Health and Wellbeing are supported” – 55.6% female and 56% male (Table 2, Q29);
* “My contributions are valued in the School of Chemical Engineering” – 71% female and 66.6% male (Table 2, Q8);
* ”The School of Chemical Engineering’s leadership actively supports gender equality.” – 77.7% female and 86.4% male (Table 2, Q20).

This potentially suggests that, although staff are responding positively to current EDI current actions, greater attention to creating a warmer work environment is required. Survey data does not allow differentiating between the support staff feel is offered by the School versus the University, which also applies to the communication of policies. One free-text comment made in the survey suggests that the situation at School level is more satisfactory than at University level:

* “…I think the School cares a lot about my mental health and wellbeing, but nothing I’ve seen indicates that the University cares*” – male academic*

However, negative perceptions, some by obviously very frustrated staff, were also left indicating that this is an area needing close attention:

* “There is a lot of gender bias and the School and University as a whole fail to provide support or empathy to those bullied or discriminated against.”;
* “The PI may try, but given my gender and the University policies, positive discrimination will ensure I will have to move into another institution for any promotion.*” – male PDRA*;
* “The University wellbeing and HR team are not at all supportive of harassment, bullying or offensive behaviour. They are both unempathetic and cold even at the highest level, which is a shame in this day and age. I am not hopeful if things will ever improve at this organisation.*”*

Our assessment suggests that social culture within Chemical Engineering represents a potential area for continued improvement, especially in light of the gender gap (8.7%) when it comes to recognising active support of EDI by School’s leadership team (last bullet above). The importance of support, not only in terms of wellbeing, but harassment, and our commitment to addressing this area is clearly identified through the future action plan which spans multiple key priorities.

Related actions:

**1.2** Eradicate claims of bullying, harassment and discrimination.

**3.1** Increase the awareness of mental health and wellbeing support.

### B) Professional and hierarchical culture

As previously alluded to, Chemical Engineering has historically been a predominantly male-dominated field, an aspect identified in the Bronze application, highlighting the gender imbalance in senior staff roles. Our staff balance has started to shift through recruitment at Assistant Professor level (grade 8) into new posts and to backfill vacancies, evidenced by a sustained increase in female appointments from 14% in 2017/18 to more even female:male at 42% in 2020/21 and 2021/22 (Table 20). In order to ascertain a more resilient gender balance, the School has continued to implement a more comprehensive mentoring scheme, aimed at fostering staff development and encouraging internal promotion into more senior roles. To aid staff development, more structured probation periods (for new staff, Birmingham Academic Career Framework) and annual personal development appraisals (for established staff, university policy) are undertaken with all staff including senior members in mentoring roles. This provides a forum to personally address areas of training staff may require aiding career progression. As part of the School’s commitment to career development it has supported three members of staff on the Aurora programme: an Advance HE’s leadership development initiative for women, run as a unique partnership between leadership experts, higher education providers and research institutes. This has facilitated positive action towards addressing under-representation in leadership positions in the sector[[3]](#footnote-4). This positive action has been well received by staff, obtaining feedback in the culture survey such as:

* “The School is open and inclusive and do a lot to support staff with their careers and opportunities.” *– female PTO staff*

Notably, 41.7% of female staff strongly identify with being “encouraged to take up career development opportunities” (Table 2, Q5). However, the response to mentoring opportunities (Table 2, Q7) has not yet received its fully intended outcome. Although 57% of the staff surveyed provided positive feedback to the process:

* “I feel supported and encouraged to go for development opportunities and to apply for promotion.” *– female PTO staff*;
* “The School of Chemical Engineering encourages everyone to apply for posts in multiple working areas based on their qualifications, and irrespective of gender or gender identity. It is a friendly and highly inclusive environment.” *– male PDRA*.

Quite high numbers of staff showed indifference; with 19.4% of the female and 16.7% of the male respondents failing to see its worth (Table 2, Q7). Related survey questions provoked similar levels of positive responses:

* “The School of Chemical Engineering takes positive action to encourage women to apply for posts in areas where they are under-represented” – 51.2% (overall; Table 2, Q13);
* “The School of Chemical Engineering values and rewards the full range of skills and experience including pastoral work, outreach work, teaching and administration in considering promotions” – 55.5% female and 58.4% male (Table 2, Q3).

Again, this suggests a potential barrier in communication, linking the support and training offered to the promotion process itself. Although the School has taken active measures to make the promotion process more transparent, providing access via mentoring and links via the staff handbook (see discussion to A4 and A6 in 2.1), limited understanding remains across both female (52.8%) and male colleagues (65.1%) (Table 2, Q4). Encouragingly, however, when applying for promotion, 77.7% of female respondents and 87.9% of male respondents feel that the School would not discriminate on their application based on their gender identity (Table 2, Q1).

Related actions:

**6.1** Increase number of promotion applications by female grade 8 academic staff.

**6.2** Attract more highly qualified female applications to advertised grade 9 positions.

In addition to the bottom-up approach of addressing gender equality through internal cultivation, a top-down attitude, through hierarchical structure and leadership, has also been adopted. The make-up of School Committees is designed to reflect the relevant male:female ratio although, while SMT is gender balanced, this is yet to be fully implemented. This is particularly notable in the Promotions Committee (Figure 2). It is hoped that improving the gender balance in this committee will have the knock-on effect of further reducing effects of how different groups experience promotion, and thus, in the long-term helping to ensure a balance in power, pay, and recognition. Following our Bronze application, the School has specifically encouraged female staff at grade 8, such as through discussion at annual personal development appraisals, to participate in committees (an area strongly recognised by 73.2% of female respondents (Table 2, Q6) in the most recent culture survey compared to 55.3% in 2020 (Table 3, Q6)), with the dual goals of a) ensuring their voices are better heard, and b) making them more familiar with key processes, preparing them for future leadership roles.

Related action:

**2.2** Improve gender balance on Promotions, Health & Safety and Research Committees.

To comply with University initiatives, the School had to adopt a WAM, designed to ensure equitable spread of opportunity and workloads, and to provide a transparent approach to working practises. The model allows academic staff members to assess their workload on a yearly basis and compare against anonymised charts relative to others undertaking similar activities. Reports can be linked to personal development reviews and probationary personal development plans, which has generated an overarching positive reaction (76% of all staff agreeing or strongly agreeing, Table 2, Q2) resulting in a general feeling of open and fair work allocation, irrespective of gender or gender identity.

The link between workload and monetary recognition is less defined. In 2020, 38.6% of respondents “didn’t know” whether equal pay was being given for equal value of work, with a similar percentage found in 2022 (37.8%). Worryingly, in 2022 1 out of the 35 female respondents (PTO member of staff) disagreed with the statement.

* *“*My personal experience is that the school does pay an equal amount for doing work of equal value, however I genuinely don’t know people’s salaries*.” – female PTO staff*

In reality, the gender disparity in terms of pay gap for academic staff has been closed at grade 8 (internal HR data), in line with the School’s bottom-up approach to hierarchal equality. As a result, follow-through improvements at higher levels, likely coming from legacy salaries, remain an area for continued improvement. In January 2023 the pay gap was 6% at grade 9 and 15% at Prof level (information provided by HR).

Other aspects to maintaining a healthy professional culture include providing opportunities for staff work-life balance. Examples of which include enabling those with external responsibilities (e.g., carers or childcare) to maintain their careers. Although partially enforced by the recent pandemic, responses from the 2022 survey highlight that our School has maintained its flexible working policies, establishing meetings throughout core hours, and maintaining hybrid sessions where possible:

85.8% of staff agree with “The School of Chemical Engineering enables flexible working” equally viewed by both female and male respondents (Table 2, Q9). “Meetings in the School of Chemical Engineering are completed in core hours…” is, interestingly, perceived more highly by male than female respondents (84.9% cf. 77.8%; Table 2, Q11).

Importantly, staff who work part-time or flexibly do not feel that this working style is detrimental to their development and/or career opportunities, with 33.6% of staff responding as agree or strongly agree to “Staff who work part-time or flexibly in the School of Chemical Engineering are offered the same career development opportunities as those who work full time” (Table 2, Q10). Although the percentage appears low, this could be due to 49.6% of participants responding “don’t know”, suggesting that those who agreed may be staff who work flexibly. Unfortunately, this data cannot be analysed for part-time versus full-time contracted staff as this demographic was not collected in the staff survey.

Related action:

**4.1** Critically assess type of data missing in culture survey and edit culture survey accordingly.

### C) Physical space and Working Environment

The physical space and working environment play an important part in the perceived workplace culture, even in situations where flexible, remote and hybrid working are commonplace. Often the surroundings supply situational cues that provoke a sense of inclusion and comfort. Although not highlighted as an area of primary focus in our Bronze application, an increased awareness of the importance in this area has grown in recent years. An evaluation of the School’s current status has been broken down into the following three areas: physical infrastructure, visuals and activities.

One of the focal points to the Chemical Engineering building is the open plan atrium. The function of this space is to promote a sense of openness and equality, being frequently used by both staff and students as a multi-functional breakout, group work and meeting area. By creating the feeling of a “mess hall”, where staff and student alike can be seen, feelings of social and workplace barriers are broken down, promoting inclusivity across a broad range of diversities. Moreover, recently (2022) a common room for staff and post-graduate researchers was established, again to provide an area of wellbeing and community (Action 14, section 2.1). In addition to communal areas, the School’s ablution facilities, in the various locations, to accommodate commuter/active lifestyles, allowing staff to feel refreshed and less self-conscious within the workplace. To this end, where building infrastructures allow, facilities such as toilets are gender-neutral.

In addition to the physical infrastructure, the School continues to successfully (around 85% of staff agree/strongly agreed in 2022 (Table 2, Q16) and 2020 (Table 3, Q13) that this is the case) promote a gender-balanced visual presence. This includes images that would stereotype people’s gender or identity, making sure to minimise their presence within communal areas, school newsletters, information sheets, etc. We are yet to realise our longstanding plan to refresh the representation of research outputs and Birmingham hero posters in the atrium. The pandemic has held us back, but most recently we have come to a decision on the refresh; research images with concise explanations, interspersed with career pathway posters of graduates representing our student diversity. The latter is expected to support our student recruitment since we host prospective applicants and students in the atrium for much of their visiting day.

Lastly, the School has actively assessed the use of role models, e.g., as speakers on seminar programmes, staff inductions, and outreach activities to better reflect the diversity of gender and gender identity within the School (Table 2, Q26).

### D) Partnerships

We interact with suppliers, industries, and other universities, in the UK and abroad. Suppliers are scrutinised for financial stability and registration with net-positive futures but not yet for their gender inclusive practices. Students returning from placements are asked for feedback to include gender equality and offered support should concerns be raised during or after the placement through referral to wellbeing services. We operate a register of companies who have hosted students, in particular students of diverse backgrounds, and companies with alarming gender equality feedback are removed from this register.

For outreach activity in support of student recruitment, we use female speakers to share their journey into STEM. In light of LGBTQ+, teachers agree with their students who can come along to any event. Any events with individual students signing up (such as taster day for year 12) are kept mixed gender to avoid any students thinking they are excluded.

### E) Intersectionality

Culture, although often categorised into discrete areas, is a multi-factorial ideology; overlap between various aspects often have a knock-on effect that can manifest in barriers towards inclusion. The School’s attitude toward understanding and addressing disparity within this area is relatively new, with strides to adopt better practices and promote awareness mostly driven within the past few years. Indeed, assessing historical data (2017-2020) relating to student attainment (of 1st class classifications) between white and Black, Asian and other minority ethnic (B.A.M.E.) cohorts highlighted a clear discrepancy, which was exaggerated when viewed through an intersectional lens, with the difference between B.A.M.E. and white females obtaining a 1st on average 9% lower than for males(calculated from Table 14 and Table 15). HEFi Award winning colleague Claudia Favero has been a leader of change within this area, stimulating a School-wide view of decolonisation through a range of directed talks, workshops and conferences both within UoB and the wider HE arena. Her work in this area has grown, fostered through the School, to incorporate specific projects aimed at “decolonisation in engineering”, and related papers, which investigate the links between curriculum and psychology in addressing belonging. This push has put the School of Chemical Engineering as leader in the College in this area, and the fruits of this hard work can be observed when looking at attainment data recorded following this shift in culture. Indeed, the school has seen a reduction in the attainment gap down to just 6% for male cohorts. Unfortunately, this has yet to be translated through to female B.A.M.E. students where a disparity close to 34% remains (Table 14, 2-year average from 2020-2022 showing the difference between B.A.M.E. and white female in 1st class attainment). Almost certainly, future success would benefit from working closer with E-connect, a student-led School of Chemical Engineering initiative focusing on addressing the challenges faced by B.A.M.E. students. Although it would be nice to report greater quantitative changes, it is key to remember that such a view is relatively new to the School. Indeed, the strength of the evidence sits within the level to which intersectionality has been embraced across all taxonomies: support for driving new policy from the top down, and inclusion of better practices at the teaching level. Indeed, this provides a solid foundation for continual growth.

Related actions:

**5.1** Develop and implement a decolonising the curriculum action plan.

**5.2** Provide staff training.

**5.3** Gather student feedback.

## Key priorities for future action

Based on the evaluation of the School’s progress and success (Section 2) and the School’s overarching EDI culture, the following **6 Key Priorities** (KPs) for future action were identified:

### KP1) Embed a successful EDI culture

In a successful EDI culture, female (and male) staff can feel safe, and have a sense of belonging and empowerment to achieve their full potential. As a foundation of a successful EDI culture, EDI policies need to be clearly visible.

However, staff survey responses indicate that this area needs strengthening (Table 2, Q19). We need to ensure rigorous promotion and discussion of EDI polices at weekly staff meeting, coffee mornings, in the EDI newsletter and at an open EDI School forum we have already discussed to introduce with a female B.A.M.E. academic keen to lead on this. Going forward, we will develop and implement a plan to encourage and support line managers in the application of EDI policies.

Furthermore, in a successful EDI culture we would not expect the following sort of free comments in the staff survey (Table 2):

Q13a: “…female PS staff acting as support for male academics, positive discrimination.”;

Q18a: “lots of gender bias no support or empathy for bullying and discrimination, more on bullying and harassment.”;

Q25a: “more on bullying and harassment (people dealing with it not policy), more on positive discrimination, workloads.”

We need to understand the reason for these comments which may be outside the control of our School:

Q25a: “The university wellbeing and HR team are not at all supportive of harassment, bullying or offensive behaviour….”;

Q25a: “... given my gender and the university policies positive discrimination will ensure I will have to move into another institution for any promotion.”

Analysing the University staff survey data set for our School and targeted focus groups are expected to provide us with good insights as basis for targeted actions.

### KP2) Embed EDI considerations across all School structures

Not all of our School structures were implemented considering gender balance, specifically the SAT and REF reading group. Recruitment of SAT and our overall approach going forward was described in section 1.5. The REF reading group (see section 1.2) was recruited without EDI considerations in mind. We are at an early stage of the REF cycle and Deputy Head of Research recruited from the pool of academics involved in the previous REF round, with some female academics no longer available. Going forward we will ensure the gender profile of this group is improved. For the yet-to establish informal reading group (see Action 2.2.3), we will as a minimum implement a gender profile representative of the research active staff in the School. Ethnicity and staff grade will also be considered where possible.

### KP3) Improve mental health and wellbeing support

There is a multitude of mental health and wellbeing support, including a broad range of staff and student networks, offered that staff seem to be unaware off. In the staff survey 36.1% of staff either strongly disagreed, disagree or neither disagreed nor agreed that their mental health and wellbeing are supported (Q29, Table 2). We will analyse this observation through focus groups and work with the new College People & Culture Group for Professional Services staff and use our findings as basis for new actions. There are also new courses such as “Supporting Mental Health in the Workplace for University staff” offered by the People and Organisation Development department.

### KP4) Acquire appropriate School culture survey data to assess success against actions

We identified that we were lacking certain demographic data in our last two culture surveys to analyse Bronze actions, such as type of staff contract (full time, part time) and staff grade. More was included in the previous survey, but afterwards we omitted asking for these data as staff voiced concern about respondents being identifiable. Furthermore, our approach to intersectionality needs improving by collecting additional demographic characteristics. We will critically assess the type of data missing, network with other EPS schools for their approach to and experience with demographic data collection, and revise the culture survey accordingly whilst maintaining anonymity of respondents.

### KP5) Narrow the attainment gap of female B.A.M.E. students

As discussed in section 3.1E), we identified a discrepancy between Black, Asian and other minority ethnic (B.A.M.E.) and white cohort’s graduating with a 1st which is exaggerated when analysed for gender. Between 2017-2020 the difference between B.A.M.E. and white females obtaining a 1st was on average 9% lower than for males. To help address this we are committed as a School to decolonising the curriculum and to providing bespoke EDI training on attainment for all staff working with students. We will also gather feedback from students as to our decolonisation plans and what they would like to see happening. Speaking to students will also help us understand whether any particular ethnic groups are particularly affected (the currently available university data do not allow us to drill into this by gender).

Decolonising the curriculum and teaching and learning practices promotes belonging, self-concept and self-efficacy among students and staff (Bhambra et al., 2018). This, in turn, has been shown to support improved outcomes and attainment (Pedler, et al, 2022). We will establish a working group on decolonising the curriculum and teaching and learning practice to improve current practices in the school based on a plan of action. We will monitor our progress against closing this gap and respond against sliding progress by reviewing and amending our actions.

### KP6) Improve academic gender balance at grade 9

Building on our success of improving the academic gender balance at grade 8 we now focus on addressing the gender balance at the next grade (Table 20). Several actions to encourage promotion applications are already in place, i.e., ensuring promotion/ career aspirations are addressed in PDR meetings and Head of School offering 1-2-1 appointment to discuss promotion. It appears thought that additional action is needed to improve the situation. We will address this by putting additional support mechanisms for female grade 8 academics in place, based on focus groups and liaison with other STEM schools in the University. In terms of the recruitment route into the grade, we identified that we need to attract more highly qualified females. Based on fraction of applications, fewer females were shortlisted for interview than male. However, a higher fraction of shortlisted females was appointed, compared to male interviewees Table 26). We will review our EDI approach on advertising positions, building on experience shared by other STEM schools in the University.

# Future action plan

| **Key Priority** | **Action(s)** | **Rationale for action** | **Sub-actions** | **Start/end dates** | **Role responsible** | **Action success criteria** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** **Embed a successful EDI culture** | **1.1** Strengthen the visibility of EDI policies. | While on an upward trend, only 59.5% of staff replied positively that EDI policies are visible (Table 2, Q19). | **1.1.1** Communicate new or changed EDI policies at weekly staff meeting. | September 2023 onwards | EDI Lead | Continued increase in positive staff survey responses to visibility of EDI policies, target increase of 5% per annum. |
| **1.1.2** Operational staff to include link to staff handbook in their email signature. | September 2023 onwards | Head of Operations |
| **1.1.3** Encourage discussion of EDI policies at coffee mornings/introduce themed coffee mornings. | September 2023 onwards | EDI Lead |
| **1.1.4** Develop and implement a plan to encourage and support line managers in the application of EDI policies | September 2023 onwards | EDI Lead with Head of Operations |
| **1.1.5** Include EDI policy nuggets in School EDI newsletter (which is posted onto the EDI noticeboard). | September 2023 onwards | EDI Education Champion |
| **1.1.6** Implement an annual open EDI School forum. | 2024/25 academic year | Designated member of staff |  |
| **1.2** Eradicate claims of bullying, harassment and discrimination. | Free text comments in staff survey (Table 2):  Q13a: …female PS staff acting as support for male academics, positive discrimination.  Q18a: lots of gender bias no support or empathy for bullying and discrimination, more on bullying and harassment.  Q25a: more on bullying and harassment (people dealing with it not policy), more on positive discrimination, workloads.  Q25a: The university wellbeing and HR team are not at all supportive of harassment, bullying or offensive behaviour. They are both unempathetic and cold even at the highest level, which is a shame in this day and age. I am not hopeful if things will ever improve at this organisation.  Q25a: The PI may try, but given my gender and the university policies positive discrimination will ensure I will have to move into another institution for any promotion. | **1.2.1** Analyse School responses to University staff satisfaction survey to understand whether matters currently outside the control of the School played a role. | 2025/26 academic year | SAT | Eradicated claims of bullying and harassment in staff survey by 2027/28. |
| **1.2.2** Design and conduct focus groups to understand the reasons for the claims made. | 2025/26 academic year | EDI Lead |
| **1.2.3** Design and implement actions based on the outcomes of **1.2.1** and **1.2.2**. | 2026/27 academic year | AS and EDI Lead |
| **2 Embed EDI considerations across all School structures** | **2.1** Improve EDI committee and SAT profile, with gender as the primary criterion and other protective characteristics as secondary criterion, to be reflective of School. | SAT gender profile was not reflective of School, nor was it reflective of staff type/grade profile. Protected characteristics other than gender were not considered in recruiting the SAT. | **2.1.1** Review protective characteristics profile of School. | By end of 2023 | Senior Operations Manager | EDI committee and Silver SAT gender profile reflective of School gender profile. |
| **2.1.2** Develop new award EDI committee and SAT recruitment approach considering the outcomes of 2.2.1. | By April 2024 | EDI and AS Leads |
| **2.1.3** Recruit new award EDI committee and SAT based on approach developed. | By June 2024 | EDI and AS Leads |
| **2.2** Improve gender balance on Promotions, Health & Safety and Research Committees. | The gender balance on Promotions, Health & Safety and Research Committees reflects the male-dominated staff profile the School. | **2.2.1** Review gender profile on Promotions, Health & Safety and Research Committees and align to gender balance of academic staff, all staff and research-active staff respectively. | Annually | Head of School | Gender balance on Promotions, Health & Safety and Research Committees and representative of academic staff, all staff and research-active staff respectively. |
| **2.3** Improve REF reading group gender profile. | It is early stage in the next REF round. The initial senior academic output reading group comprises 2F:10M, due to individual female staff circumstances. It was recruited from the pool of staff involved in the same group at the previous REF round. | **2.3.1** Review REF reading group membership twice a year. | April 2023 onwards | Deputy Head of School Research | Gender balance on REF reading group representative of School research-active staff gender balance. |
| **2.3.2** Adjust gender balance on REF reading group. | By March 2024 | Head of School |
| **2.3.3** Ensure gender profile of informal REF reading group is representative of research-active staff in the School. The purpose of this group is not EDI related, thus the action success criteria are not linked to its purpose. Its purpose is to train staff for future call onto formal REF reading group and to enhance understanding of what excellent research outputs in view to nominating own REF outputs and enhancing quality of future research outputs. | By March 2025 | Head of School |
| **3 Improve mental health and wellbeing support** | **3.1** Increase the awareness of mental health and wellbeing support. | 36.1% of staff either strongly disagreed, disagree or neither disagreed nor agreed that their mental health and wellbeing are supported (Q29, Table 2). | **3.1.1** Focus groups to understand the reasons for this unsatisfactory level. | 2024/25 academic year | EDI Committee | Positive answers to Q29 culture survey question (Table 2; mandated question) at least 90%. |
| **3.1.2** Gather insight on this matter from the new College People & Culture Group for Professional Services staff. | 2025/26 academic year | School representative on College People & Culture Group for Professional Services staff |
| **3.1.3** Develop new actions based on **3.1.1** and **3.1.2**. | 2026/27 academic year | AS Lead |
|  | **3.2** Encourage line managers and team leaders to undertake courses addressing mental health offered by the Personal and Organisational Development unit. | Some staff indicated they did not know whether they were confident their line manager would deal effectively with any complaints about harassment, bullying or offensive behaviour (Q25, Table 2). | **3.2.1** Disseminate encouragement to undertake courses addressing mental health offered by the Personal and Organisational Development unit. | April every year as part of PDR round | Head of School | Eradication of “don’t know” answers to Q25 in Staff survey and at least 80% of line managers and team leaders completed the course by June 2028. |
| **4** **Acquire appropriate School culture survey data to assess success against actions** | **4.1** Critically assess type of data missing in culture survey and edit culture survey accordingly. | Identified lack of certain demographic data in our last two culture surveys to analyse Bronze actions, such as type of contract and grade. More was included in the previous survey, but these were limited due to staff concerns about respondents being identifiable. Furthermore, our approach to intersectionality needs improving by collecting additional demographic characteristics. | **4.1.1** Network with Culture Survey Leads of other EPS Schools for input and recommendations on demographic survey questions. | Before November 2024 | Culture Survey Leads | Culture Survey questions updated in alignment with other surveys in EPS where respondents can't be identified and run annually with a target of >50% response from total number of staff in School at that time. |
| **4.1.2** Agree demographic question section for forthcoming culture survey (Nov/Dec 2024, 2 years gap to most recent survey) and all future surveys checking against staff profile at the time. | Before November 2024 and then November every year | Culture Survey Leads |
| **5** **Narrow the attainment gap of female B.A.M.E. students** | **5.1** Develop and implement a decolonising the curriculum action plan. | Decolonising the curriculum and teaching and learning practices promotes belonging, self-concept and self-efficacy among students and staff and helps improve outcomes and retention (Bhambra et al., 2018, Pedler,et al, 2022). | **5.1.1** Establish a working group on decolonising the curriculum and teaching and learning practice. The working group will be dedicated to gathering evidence from the literature and experts in the field, analysing and evaluating current practices in the school, celebrating and promoting best practices and furthering debate. | April to June 2024 | Working group chair | Evidence of debate/discussions within the working group and an action plan produced and delivered and  evidence of at least 50% of the modules offered by the School having undergone reviews and having incorporated decolonising considerations and opportunities. |
| **5.1.2** Gather student views through targeted surveys and focus groups | From academic year 2024/25 onwards | Working group chair |
| **5.1.3** Implement plan of action with yearly review within the group and the EDI committee | From academic year 2024/25 onwards | Working group chair |
| **5.1.4** Disseminate outcomes and recommendations to the wider school community | From academic year 2024/25 onwards | Working group chair |
| **5.2** Provide staff training. | Provide bespoke training on EDI issues relevant to cross-sectional attainment gap for all staff working with students. | **5.4.1** Guest speaker series on EDI and decolonisation topics (especially from experts from the STEM field) | From academic year 2024/25 so that the work can be planned in synergy with the working group on decolonisation | EDI education champion | Improved staff participation in mandatory and non-mandatory training in EDI. |
| **5.4.2** Communicate training offered internally or by external organisations/ networks including HEFi adhoc sessions. | From academic year 2023/24 | EDI education champion |
| **5.3** Gather student feedback. | Gathering student feedback to guide our actions and anticipate their outcome is essential for the success of closing the attainment gap | **5.3.1** Conduct student focus groups and 1:1s | At least annually | Senior academic tutor | Evidence of focus groups and ten 1:1s having taken place each academic year and 80% of surveyed students agree that our actions supported their academic achievement. |
| **5.3.2** Survey B.A.M.E. student population for satisfaction with and impact of actions implemented. | Annually | Head of Student Experience |
| **5.4** Monitor the attainment gap. | Tracking effectiveness of Actions **5.1** and **5.2** and taking action if not effective. | **5.4.1** Collection and analysis attainment data focusing on intersectionality and tracking whether closing the gap is on target | Annually | Head of Undergraduate Studies | Eliminated gender discrepancy in the difference between B.A.M.E. and white students graduating with a 1st |
| **5.4.2** Review actions **5.1** and **5.2** if not on target | Ongoing |
| **6 Improve academic gender balance at grade 9** | **6.1** Increase number of promotion applications by female grade 8 academic staff. | While the ratio of female:male applications to grade 9 is better than the staff ratio at grade 9, it is below the staff ratio at grade 8. Head of School is already offering 1-2-1 for grade 8 seeking promotion or encouraged to apply for promotion. Additional action is needed to better the situation. | **6.1.1** Survey female staff at grade 8 in the School and liaise with and other STEM Schools within the University to identify high impact actions. | 2024/25 academic year | Women in Chemical Engineering Group Lead | Female academic staff at grade 9 is at least 42% (matching the ratio at grade 8 at time of action plan submission) at January 2028 data point. |
| **6.1.2** Complement this action plan based on the output of **6.2.2** | By January 2026 | AS Lead |
| **6.2** Attract more highly qualified female applicants to advertised grade 9 positions. | Based on fraction of applications, fewer females were shortlisted for interview than male. However, a higher fraction of shortlisted females was appointed, compared to male interviewees. | **6.2.1** Put School process in place for EDI review of job adverts. Review process annually. | By end of 2023 followed by annual review | Head of Operations |
| **6.2.2** Put School process in place to circumvent gender bias during the shortlisting process. Review process annually. | By June 2024 followed by annual review | Head of Operations |
| **6.2.3**. Understand what attracted female academic recruits to our School, other Schools within the sector and other STEM Schools within the University. | 2026/27 academic year | EDI Committee |
| **6.3.4** Review and edit accordingly school web pages in light of outcomes of **6.3.3**. | Upon completion of **6.3.3** onwards | Senior Operations Manager |
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# Appendix 1: Culture survey data

## Appendix 1a: Culture survey data November 2022

The results of our latest culture survey, undertaken in November 2022, including the new HE mandated core culture survey questions, are reported in Table 2. The mandated questions were Q8, 9, 15, 20, 24, 29 and 30, highlighted in green. Selected results of a previous culture survey, based on the same questions without the new mandated questions, are reported in Table 3. Selection was based on referencing data in this application.

Table 2: Results of November 2022 extended culture survey with 7 core culture survey questions incorporated, see highlighted rows. 121/163 members of staff responded. 36 respondents identify as female (including transgender women), 66 as male (including transgender male) and 11 preferred not to reveal their gender. 47 respondents were academic staff, 41 RTFs, 24 PTO staff, 8 preferred not to say and 1 other.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participation and promotion practices** | | | | | | |
| **Q1: In the School of Chemical Engineering, staff are treated on their merits irrespective of their gender or gender identity (e.g. everyone is actively encouraged to apply for promotion and take up training opportunities).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 3  (2.5%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 7  (5.8%) | 1  (2.8%) | 4  (6.1%) | 1  (2.1%) | 4  (9.8%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 4  (3.9%) | 3  (8.3%) | 0 | 1  (2.1%) | 0 | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Agree** | 48  (39.7%) | 16  (44.4%) | 25  (37.9%) | 20 (42.6%) | 18 (43.9%) | 9 (37.5%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 49  (40.5%) | 12  (33.3%) | 33  (50%) | 22 (46.8%) | 16  (39%) | 10 (41.7%) |
| **Not applicable** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 8  (6.6%) | 4  (11.1%) | 3  (4.5%) | 2  (4.3%) | 3  (7.3%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q2: In the School of Chemical Engineering, work is allocated on a clear and fair basis irrespective of gender or gender identity**. | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 3  (2.5%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 5  (4.1%) | 0 | 3  (4.5%) | 2  (4.3%) | 2  (4.9%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 13  (10.7%) | 6  (16.7%) | 4  (6.1%) | 5  (10.6%) | 1  (2.4%) | 4  (16.7%) |
| **Agree** | 49  (40.5%) | 16  (44.4%) | 27  (40.9%) | 21  (44.7%) | 19  (46.3%) | 9  (37.5%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 43  (35.5%) | 12  (33.2%) | 27  (40.9%) | 17  (36.2%) | 14  (34.1%) | 11  (45.8%) |
| **Not applicable** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 8  (6.6%) | 2  (5.6%) | 4  (6.1%) | 2  (4.3%) | 4  (9.8%) | 0 |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q3: The School of Chemical Engineering values and rewards the full range of skills and experience including pastoral work, outreach work, teaching and administration…**  **…in performance appraisals.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 4  (3.3%) | 0 | 2  (3.1%) | 2  (4.3%) | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 8  (6.7%) | 1  (2.8%) | 5  (7.7%) | 4  (8.5%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.3%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 11  (9.2%) | 2  (5.6%) | 5  (7.7%) | 5  (10.6%) | 2  (4.9%) | 1  (4.3%) |
| **Agree** | 57  (47.5%) | 16  (44.4%) | 32  (49.2%) | 26  (55.3%) | 20  (48.8%) | 10  (43.5%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 25  (20.8%) | 11  (30.6%) | 12  (18.5%) | 9  (19.1%) | 8  (19.5%) | 8  (34.8%) |
| **Not applicable** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 14  (11.7%) | 6  (16.7%) | 8  (12.3%) | 1  (2.1%) | 9  (22%) | 3  (13%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **…in considering promotions.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 6  (5%) | 0 | 3  (4.6%) | 3  (6.4%) | 1  (2.5%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 10  (8.3%) | 3  (8.3%) | 5  (7.7%) | 5  (10.6%) | 1  (2.5%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 11  (9.2%) | 2  (5.6%) | 5  (7.7%) | 4  (8.5%) | 1  (2.5%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Agree** | 45  (37.5%) | 13  (36.1%) | 27  (41.5%) | 19  (40.4%) | 19  (47.5%) | 7  (29.2%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 22  (18.3%) | 7  (19.4%) | 11  (16.9%) | 10  (21.3%) | 6  (15%) | 6  (25%) |
| **Not applicable** | 1  (0.8%) | 1  (2.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Don’t know** | 25  (20.8%) | 10  (27.8%) | 14  (21.5%) | 6  (12.8%) | 12  (30%) | 6  (25%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q4: I understand the promotion process and criteria in the School of Chemical Engineering.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 5  (4.1%) | 1  (2.8%) | 1  (1.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 0 | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Disagree** | 14  (11.6%) | 5  (13.9%) | 6  (9.1%) | 1  (2.1%) | 4  (9.8%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 17  (14%) | 5  (13.9%) | 9  (13.6%) | 3  (6.4%) | 0 | 5  (20.8%) |
| **Agree** | 50  (41.3%) | 15  (41.7%) | 29  (43.9%) | 27  (57.4%) | 18  (43.9%) | 6  (25%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 22  (18.2%) | 4  (11.1%) | 14  (21.2%) | 14  (29.8%) | 16  (39%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Not applicable** | 5  (4.1%) | 4  (11.1%) | 1  (1.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 0 | 4  (16.7%) |
| **Don’t know** | 7  (5.8%) | 2  (5.6%) | 5  (7.6%) | 0 | 3  (7.3%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q5: I am encouraged to take up career development opportunities.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 0 | 2  (2.1%) | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 11  (9.1%) | 2  (5.6%) | 7  (10.6%) | 4  (8.5%) | 4  (9.8%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 23  (19%) | 8  (22.2%) | 10  (15.2%) | 9  (19.1%) | 6  (14.6%) | 5  (20.8%) |
| **Agree** | 40  (33.1%) | 10  (27.8%) | 25  (37.9%) | 16  (34%) | 18  (43.9%) | 5  (20.8%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 39  (32.2%) | 15  (41.7%) | 19  (28.8%) | 13  (27.7%) | 11  (26.8%) | 13  (54.2%) |
| **Not applicable** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 2  (3%) | 2  (4.3%) | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 2  (1.7%) | 1  (2.8%) | 1  (1.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Prefer not to say** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 2  (3%) | 1  (2.1%) | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Q6: I am encouraged and given opportunities to represent the School of Chemical Engineering externally and/or internally (e.g. on committees or boards, in nominations for prizes, as chair or speaker at conferences).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 11  (9.1%) | 4  (11.1%) | 4  (6.1%) | 4  (8.5%) | 4  (9.8%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 21  (17.4%) | 4  (11.1%) | 11  (16.7%) | 7  (14.9%) | 7  (17.1%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Agree** | 44  (36.4%) | 12  (33.3%) | 28  (42.2%) | 19  (40.4%) | 16  (39%) | 9  (37.5%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 35  (28.9%) | 14  (38.9%) | 18  (27.3%) | 16  (34%) | 10  (24.4%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| **Not applicable** | 5  (4.1%) | 1  (2.8%) | 3  (4.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 2  (4.9%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Don’t know** | 2  (1.7%) | 1  (2.8%) | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Q7: The School of Chemical Engineering provides me with**  **….useful mentoring opportunities.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 4  (3.3%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 14  (11.6%) | 2  (5.6%) | 10  (15.2%) | 7  (14.9%) | 6  (14.6%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 24  (19.8%) | 7  (19.4%) | 11  (16.7%) | 8  (17%) | 7  (17.1%) | 5  (20.8%) |
| **Agree** | 53  (43.8%) | 17  (47.2%) | 30  (45.5%) | 21  (44.7%) | 19  (46.3%) | 11  (45.8%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 16  (13.2%) | 6  (16.7%) | 8  (12.1%) | 7  (14.9%) | 4  (9.8%) | 5  (20.8%) |
| **Not applicable** | 7  (5.8%) | 3  (8.3%) | 4  (6.1%) | 3  (6.4%) | 2  (4.9%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Don’t know** | 3  (2.5%) | 1  (2.8%) | 2  (3%) | 1  (2.1%) | 2  (4.9%) | 0 |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **…useful networking opportunities.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 4  (3.3%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 12  (9.9%) | 2  (5.6%) | 6  (9.1%) | 7  (14.9%) | 3  (7.3%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 23  (19%) | 10  (27.8%) | 9  (13.6%) | 11  (23.4%) | 5  (12.2%) | 5  (20.8%) |
| **Agree** | 58  (47.9%) | 16  (44.4%) | 36  (54.5%) | 20  (42.6%) | 25  (61%) | 10  (41.7%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 22  (18.2%) | 8  (22.2%) | 12  (18.2%) | 8  (17%) | 6  (14.6%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| **Not applicable** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **…helpful annual appraisal.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 7  (5.8%) | 2  (5.6%) | 2  (3%) | 0 | 3  (7.3%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Disagree** | 9  (7.4%) | 2  (5.6%) | 6  (9.1%) | 3  (6.4%) | 5  (12.2%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 22  (18.2%) | 5  (13.9%) | 14  (21.1%) | 10  (21.3%) | 7  (17.1%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Agree** | 54  (44.6%) | 15  (41.7%) | 29  (43.9%) | 21  (44.7%) | 19  (46.3%) | 11  (45.8%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 18  (14.9%) | 7  (19.4%) | 9  (13.6%) | 10  (21.3%) | 1  (2.4%) | 7  (29.2%) |
| **Not applicable** | 3  (2.5%) | 1  (2.8%) | 2  (3%) | 1  (2.1%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Don’t know** | 8  (6.6%) | 4  (11.1%) | 4  (6.1%) | 2  (4.3%) | 5  (12.2%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q8: My contributions are valued in the School of Chemical Engineering.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 3  (2.5%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 12  (%9.9) | 3  (8.3%) | 8  (12.1%) | 5  (10.6%) | 5  (12.2%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 16  (13.2%) | 3  (8.3%) | 10  (15.2%) | 3  (6.4%) | 9  (22%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Agree** | 52  (43%) | 16  (44.4%) | 29  (43.9%) | 23  (48.9%) | 15  (36.6%) | 13  (54.2%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 29  (24%) | 11  (30.6%) | 15  (22.7%) | 12  (25.5%) | 8  (19.5%) | 9  (37.5%) |
| **Not applicable** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 8  (6.6%) | 3  (8.3%) | 2  (3%) | 2  (4.3%) | 3  (7.3%) | 0 |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q9: The School of Chemical Engineering enables flexible working.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 2  (7.1%) | 0 | 2  (3%) | 1  (2.2%) | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 4  (3.3%) | 1  (2.9%) | 2  (3%) | 2  (4.3%) | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 3  (2.5%) | 1  (2.9%) | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 2  (4.9%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Agree** | 51  (42.5%) | 17  (48.6%) | 25  (37.9%) | 16  (34.8%) | 17  (41.5%) | 13  (54.2%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 52  (43.3%) | 13  (37.1%) | 32  (48.5%) | 24  (52.2%) | 18  (43.9%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| **Not applicable** | 4  (3.3%) | 2  (5.7%) | 1  (1.5%) | 1  (2.2%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Don’t know** | 4  (3.3%) | 1  (2.9%) | 3  (4.5%) | 2  (4.3%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q10: Staff who work part-time or flexibly in the School of Chemical Engineering are offered the same career development opportunities as those who work full time.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 3  (2.5%) | 1  (2.8%) | 2  (3.1%) | 2  (4.4%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (2.4%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 9  (7.6%) | 5  (13.9%) | 3  (4.6%) | 2  (4.4%) | 2  (4.9%) | 2  (4.9%) |
| **Agree** | 26  (21.8%) | 9  (25%) | 15  (23.1%) | 9  (20%) | 11  (26.8%) | 11  (26.8%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 14  (11.8%) | 3  (8.3%) | 8  (12.3%) | 8  (17.8%) | 3  (7.3%) | 3  (7.3%) |
| **Not applicable** | 8  (6.7%) | 3  (8.3%) | 2  (3.1%) | 2  (4.4%) | 2  (4.9%) | 2  (4.9%) |
| **Don’t know** | 59  (49.6%) | 15  (41.7%) | 35  (53.8%) | 22  (48.9%) | 22  (53.7%) | 22  (53.7%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q11: Meetings in the School of Chemical Engineering are completed in core hours\* to enable those with caring responsibilities to attend (\*Core hours are 10am to 4pm, during which flextime workers must be engaged in work).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 2  (3%) | 1  (2.1%) | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 3  (2.5%) | 1  (2.8%) | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 2  (4.9%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 7  (5.8%) | 5  (13.9%) | 1  (1.5%) | 2  (4.3%) | 1  (2.4%) | 4  (16.7%) |
| **Agree** | 70  (57.9%) | 20  (55.6%) | 39  (59.1%) | 25  (53.2%) | 23  (56.1%) | 16  (66.7%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 29  (24%) | 8  (22.2%) | 17  (25.8%) | 17  (36.2%) | 8  (19.5%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Not applicable** | 3  (2.5%) | 1  (2.8%) | 1  (1.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Don’t know** | 7  (5.8%) | 1  (2.8%) | 5  (7.6%) | 1  (2.1%) | 5  (12.2%) | 0 |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q12: In the School of Chemical Engineering, everyone, irrespective of gender or gender identity, is paid an equal amount for doing the same work or work of equal value.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 3  (2.5%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 4  (3.4%) | 1  (2.9%) | 0 | 1  (2.2%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 11  (9.2%) | 5  (14.3%) | 4  (6.1%) | 3  (6.7%) | 4  (9.8%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Agree** | 38  (31.9%) | 14  (40%) | 20  (30.3%) | 13  (28.9%) | 12  (29.3%) | 13  (54.2%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 18  (15.1%) | 3  (8.6%) | 15  (22.7%) | 5  (11.1%) | 10  (24.4%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Not applicable** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 45  (37.8%) | 12  (34.3%) | 26  (39.4%) | 23  (51.1%) | 13  (31.7%) | 6  (25%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q13: The School of Chemical Engineering takes positive action to encourage women to apply for posts in areas where they are under-represented (e.g. encouraging appropriately qualified female colleagues to apply for posts; including images of women in senior positions on recruitment materials; including family-friendly policies on job adverts).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 3  (2.5%) | 1  (2.8%) | 0 | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 7  (5.8%) | 2  (5.6%) | 1  (1.5%) | 2  (4.3%) | 2  (4.9%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 15  (12.4%) | 9  (25%) | 5  (7.6%) | 6  (12.8%) | 6  (14.6%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Agree** | 47  (38.8%) | 12  (33.3%) | 31  (47%) | 17  (36.2%) | 18  (43.9%) | 10  (41.7%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 15  (12.4%) | 3  8.3(%) | 9  (13.6%) | 7  (14.9%) | 4  (9.8%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Not applicable** | 3  (2.5%) | 0 | 3  (4.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 2  (4.9%) | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 31  (25.6%) | 9  (25%) | 17  (25.8%) | 14  (29.8%) | 8  (19.5%) | 7  (29.2%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q13a: Please include any additional comments on this section (optional).** | | | | | | |
| * Q12 my personal experience is that the school does pay an equal amount for doing work of equal value, however I genuinely don't know people's salaries. * I have not read any job descriptions lately so feel unable to comment. * I feel supported and encouraged to go for development opportunities and to apply for promotion. The University's teaching day is not inclusive for those with caring responsibilities. Sometimes as professional services it feels like the females acting as support for the male academics. * Some answers may seem a little odd but my post reports to the College so not all are applicable. * The School are open and inclusive and do a lot to support staff with their careers and opportunities. * The School of Chemical Engineering encourages everyone to apply for posts in multiple working areas based on their qualifications, and irrespective of gender or gender identity. It is a friendly and highly inclusive environment. * Positive discrimination | | | | | | |
| **Workplace culture** | | | | | | |
| **Q14: The School of Chemical Engineering makes it clear that unsupportive language and behaviour are not acceptable (e.g. condescending or intimidating language, ridicule, overly familiar behaviour, jokes/banter that stereotype people on the basis of their gender or gender identity or focus on their appearance).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 5  (4.1%) | 1  (2.8%) | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Disagree** | 5  (4.1%) | 2  (5.6%) | 0 | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 11  (9.1%) | 3  (8.3%) | 8  (12.1%) | 5  (10.6%) | 4  (9.8%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Agree** | 62  (51.2%) | 20  (55.6%) | 33  (50%) | 27  (57.4%) | 20  (48.8%) | 12  (50%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 32  (26.4%) | 8  (22.2%) | 20  (30.3%) | 14  (29.8%) | 11  (26.8%) | 6  (25%) |
| **Not applicable** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 6  (5%) | 2  (5.6%) | 4  (6.1%) | 1  (2.1%) | 4  (9.8%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q15: I am satisfied with how bullying and harassment are addressed in the School.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 3  (2.5%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 4  (3.3%) | 1  (2.8%) | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 17  (14%) | 6  (16.7%) | 7  (10.6%) | 7  (14.9%) | 4  (9.8%) | 4  (16.7%) |
| **Agree** | 43  (35.5%) | 9  (25%) | 29  (43.9%) | 16  (34%) | 20  (48.8%) | 7  (29.2%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 6  (5%) | 6  (16.7%) | 7  (10.6%) | 7  (14.9%) | 3  (7.3%) | 4  (16.7%) |
| **Not applicable** | 6  (5%) | 3  (8.3%) | 3  (4.5%) | 4  (8.5%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Don’t know** | 33  (27.3%) | 11  (30.6%) | 19  (28.8%) | 13  (27.7%) | 12  (29.3%) | 7  (29.2%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q16: Inappropriate images that stereotype people's gender or gender identity are not visible in the School of Chemical Engineering (e.g. in calendars, newspapers and magazines; on computer and mobiles; on supplier packaging).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 2  (1.7%) | 1  (2.8%) | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Disagree** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 4  (3.3%) | 1  (2.8%) | 3  (4.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 2  (4.9%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Agree** | 64  (52.9%) | 19  (52.8%) | 35  (53%) | 23  (48.9%) | 22  (53.7%) | 16  (66.7%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 39  (32.2%) | 13  (36.1%) | 22  (33.3%) | 21  (44.7%) | 11  (26.8%) | 5  (20.8%) |
| **Not applicable** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 2  (3%) | 0 | 2  (4.9%) | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 10  (8.3%) | 2  (5.6%) | 3  (4.5%) | 2  (4.3%) | 3  (7.3%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q17: Work related social activities in the School of Chemical Engineering, such as staff parties, team building or networking events, are likely to be welcoming to people of all genders or gender identities (e.g. avoid venues that may be degrading anyone; avoid sporting activities that some staff may not be able to, or wish to, watch or take part in; avoid times that frequently exclude part-time staff or those with caring responsibilities).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 7  (5.8%) | 2  (5.6%) | 3  (4.6%) | 2  (4.3%) | 2  (4.9%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Agree** | 53  (44.2%) | 16  (44.4%) | 28  (43.1%) | 22  (47.8%) | 19  (46.3%) | 9  (37.5%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 51  (42.5%) | 17  (47.2%) | 31  (47.7%) | 21  (45.7%) | 17  (41.5%) | 12  (50%) |
| **Not applicable** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 7  (5.8%) | 1  (2.8%) | 2  (3.1%) | 1  (2.2%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q18: I have undertaken training in …gender equality.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Yes – online** | 91  (72.5%) | 28  (77.8%) | 50  (75.8%) | 38  (80.9%) | 30  (73.2%) | 17  (70.8%) |
| **Yes – Course or workshop attendance** | 3  (2.5%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 3  (6.4%) | 0 | 0 |
| **No** | 18  (14.9%) | 6  (16.7%) | 11  (16.7%) | 3  (6.4%) | 9  (22%) | 4  (16.7%) |
| **Don’t know** | 9  (7.4%) | 2  (5.6%) | 4  (6.1%) | 3  (6.4%) | 2  (4.9%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **…unconscious bias.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Yes - online** | 83  (68.8%) | 25  (69.4%) | 45  (68.2%) | 35  (74.5%) | 25  (61%) | 16  (66.7%) |
| **Yes – Course or workshop attendance** | 12  (9.9%) | 3  (8.3%) | 4  (6.1%) | 8  (17%) | 1  (2.4%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **No** | 17  (14%) | 6  (16.7%) | 11  (16.7%) | 2  (4.3%) | 11  (26.8%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Don’t know** | 9  (7.4%) | 2  (%5.6) | 6  (9.1%) | 2  (4.3%) | 4  (9.8%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Q18a: Please include any additional comments on this section (optional).** | | | | | | |
| * I have not been paying attention to images in calendars or websites either but if something did offend me I would probably notice. * There is a lot of gender bias and the School and University as a whole fail to provide support or empathy to those bullied or discriminated against. * training to be re-taken * The school could/should do a lot more to address bullying and harassment. | | | | | | |
| **Leadership and management commitment** | | | | | | |
| **Q19: The School of Chemical Engineering has made visible its policies in relation to gender equality (e.g. on discrimination, parental leave, carer's leave, flexible working).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 7  (5.8%) | 0 | 5  (7.6%) | 3  (6.4%) | 3  (7.3%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 16  (13.2%) | 9  (25%) | 6  (9.1%) | 6  (12.8%) | 5  (12.2%) | 4  (16.7%) |
| **Agree** | 68  (56.2%) | 18  (50%) | 39  (59.1%) | 28  (59.6%) | 23  (56.1%) | 13  (54.2%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 16  (13.2%) | 5  (13.9%) | 11  (16.7%) | 5  (10.6%) | 8  (19.5%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Not applicable** | 1  (0.8%) | 1  (2.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Don’t know** | 12  (9.9%) | 3  (8.3%) | 5  (7.6%) | 5  (10.6%) | 2  (4.9%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q20: The School of Chemical Engineering's leadership actively supports gender equality.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 5  (4.1%) | 2  (5.6%) | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 4  (9.8%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 9  (7.4%) | 4  (11.1%) | 4  (6.1%) | 4  (8.5%) | 2  (4.9%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Agree** | 68  (56.2%) | 21  (58.3%) | 39  (59.1%) | 29  (61.7%) | 24  (58.5%) | 12  (50%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 29  (24%) | 7  (19.4%) | 18  (27.3%) | 12  (25.5%) | 8  (19.5%) | 9  (37.5%) |
| **Not applicable** | 1  (0.8%) | 1  (2.8%) | 0 | 1  (2.1%) | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 8  (6.6%) | 1  (2.8%) | 4  (6.1%) | 1  (2.1%) | 3  (7.3%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q21: I understand the School of Chemical Engineering's reasons for engaging with gender equality.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 9  (7.4%) | 2  (5.6%) | 6  (9.1%) | 2  (4.3%) | 6  (14.6%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Agree** | 63  (52.1%) | 17  (47.2%) | 37  (56.1%) | 27  (57.4%) | 20  (48.8%) | 12  (50%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 43  (35.5%) | 15  (41.7%) | 22  (33.3%) | 18  (38.3%) | 13  (31.7%) | 10  (41.7%) |
| **Not applicable** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 4  (3.3%) | 2  (5.6%) | 0 | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q22: I understand why positive action may be carried out to promote gender equality.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.6%) | 0 | 1  (2.6%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 2  (3.1%) | 1  (2.1%) | 1  (2.6%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 12  (10.1%) | 3  (8.3%) | 7  (10.9%) | 6  (12.8%) | 4  (10.3%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Agree** | 70  (58.8%) | 20  (55.6%) | 38  (59.4%) | 27  (57.4%) | 25  (59%) | 14  (58.3%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 32  (26.9%) | 13  (36.1%) | 15  (23.4%) | 12  (25.5%) | 10  (25.6%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| **Don’t know** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 1  (1.6%) | 1  (2.1%) | 0 | 0 |
| **Q23: My line manager is supportive of requests for flexible working (e.g. requests for part-time working, job share, compressed hours).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 4  (3.3%) | 2  (5.6%) | 2  (3%) | 1  (2.1%) | 1  (2.4%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 7  (5.8%) | 1  (2.8%) | 4  (6.1%) | 1  (2.1%) | 3  (7.3%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Agree** | 55  (45.5%) | 16  (44.4%) | 30  (45.5%) | 23  (48.9%) | 18  (43.9%) | 10  (41.7%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 46  (38%) | 15  (41.7%) | 25  (37.9%) | 17  (36.2%) | 17  (41.5%) | 10  (41.7%) |
| **Don’t know** | 9  (7.4%) | 2  (5.6%) | 5  (7.6%) | 5  (10.6%) | 2  (4.9%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Q24: My line manager supports my career development.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 3  (2.5%) | 0 | 3  (4.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 2  (4.9%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 9  (7.4%) | 3  (8.3%) | 4  (6.1%) | 5  (10.6%) | 0 | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Agree** | 51  (42.1%) | 13  (36.1%) | 29  (43.9%) | 18  (38.3%) | 20  (48.8%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 55  (45.5%) | 20  (55.6%) | 29  (43.9%) | 22  (46.8%) | 19  (46.3%) | 13  (54.2%) |
| **Not applicable** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Prefer not to say** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q25: I am confident that my line manager/supervisor would deal effectively with any complaints about harassment, bullying or offensive behaviour.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.5%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 8  (6.7%) | 1  (2.8%) | 5  (7.7%) | 3  (6.4%) | 3  (7.5%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Agree** | 50  (41.7%) | 14  (38.9%) | 28  (43.1%) | 26  (55.3%) | 14  (35%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 52  (43.3%) | 20  (55.6%) | 27  (41.5%) | 17  (36.2%) | 19  (47.5%) | 15  (62.5%) |
| **Not applicable** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 7  (5.8%) | 1  (2.8%) | 4  (6.2%) | 1  (2.1%) | 3  (7.5%) | 0 |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q25a: Please include any additional comments on this section (optional):** | | | | | | |
| * I have an excellent line manager who is supportive in every way * I feel that actually it would be my PIs personal assistant that would be sorting complaints out, but yes it would be done with the PIs support * Line Manager is in professional services, outside of the School staffing structure. * I feel more confident with my new manager * Policies tend to be University policies rather than Chem Eng specific * The university wellbeing and HR team are not at all supportive of harassment, bullying or offensive behaviour. They are both unempathetic and cold even at the highest level, which is a shame in this day and age. I am not hopeful if things will ever improve at this organisation. * The PI may try, but given my gender and the university policies positive discrimination will ensure I will have to move into another institution for any promotion. * Many ECRs are overworked to dangerous levels and work extraordinarily long hours with unsustainable demands. Expectations are higher every year, yet the senior staff managing them do not achieve/maintain these standards themselves | | | | | | |
| **Reputation and social responsibility** | | | | | | |
| **Q26: The use of visible role models in the School of Chemical Engineering, e.g. as speakers on seminar programmes, on staff inductions, at recruitment events, in school visits, reflects the diversity of gender and gender identity in the School.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 2  (1.7%) | 1  (2.8%) | (%) | 0 | 2  (4.9%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 4  (3.3%) | 1  (2.8%) | 0 | 1  (2.1%) | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 17  (14%) | 4  (11.1%) | 1  (1.5%) | 6  (12.8%) | 4  (9.8%) | 5  (20.8%) |
| **Agree** | 68  (56.2%) | 21  (58.3%) | 11  (16.7%) | 29  (61.7%) | 24  (58.5%) | 12  (50%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 15  (12.4%) | 3  (8.3%) | 38  (57.6%) | 6  (12.8%) | 6  (14.6%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Not applicable** | 3  (2.5%) | 2  (5.6%) | 1  (1.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Don’t know** | 12  (9.9%) | 4  (11.1%) | 4  (6.1%) | 4  (8.5%) | 3  (7.3%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q27: I am kept informed by the School of Chemical Engineering about gender equality matters that affect me (e.g. changes to maternity/paternity leave entitlements, gender legislation and institutional policies).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 5  (4.1%) | 2  (5.6%) | 2  (3%) | 0 | 4  (9.8%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 23  (%19) | 8  (22.2%) | 12  (18.2%) | 6  (12.8%) | 8  (19.5%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| **Agree** | 55  (45.5%) | 17  (47.2%) | 31  (47%) | 27  (57.4%) | 17  (41.5%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 17  (14%) | 2  (5.6%) | 13  (19.7%) | 7  (14.9%) | 6  (14.6%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| **Not applicable** | 2  (1.7%) | 1  (2.8%) | 0 | 1  (2.1%) | 0 | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Don’t know** | 16  (13.2%) | 5  (13.9%) | 8  (12.1%) | 6  (12.8%) | 5  (12.2%) | 4  (16.7%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 2  (1.7%) | 1  (2.8%) | 0 | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Q28: I feel that the School of Chemical Engineering is a great place to work …for women.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 4  (3.4%) | 2  (5.6%) | 2  (3.1%) | 0 | 2  (5%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Disagree** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 14  (11.8%) | 4  (11.1%) | 5  (7.8%) | 4  (8.7%) | 4  (10%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Agree** | 40  (33.6%) | 15  (41.7%) | 18  (28.1%) | 17  (37%) | 13  (32.5%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 44  (37%) | 15  (41.7%) | 23  (35.9%) | 18  (39.1%) | 13  (32.5%) | 11  (45.8%) |
| **Not applicable** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 2  (3.1%) | 2  (4.3%) | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 14  (11.8%) | 0 | 14  (21.9%) | 5  (10.9%) | 8  (20%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **… for men.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 3  (2.5%) | 1  (2.9%) | 2  (3%) | (%) | 2  (4.9%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Disagree** | 4  (3.3%) | 0 | 4  (6.1%) | 0 | 4  (9.8%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 11  (9.2%) | 2  (5.7%) | 7  (10.6%) | 0 | 4  (9.8%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Agree** | 37  (30.8%) | 12  (34.3%) | 19  (28.8%) | 4  (8.7%) | 11  (26.8%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 57  (47.5%) | 16  (45.7%) | 32  (48.5%) | 17  (37%) | 18  (43.9%) | 11  (45.8%) |
| **Not applicable** | 3  (2.5%) | 2  (5.7%) | 1  (1.5%) | 23  (50%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Don’t know** | 3  (2.5%) | 2  (5.7%) | 0 | 1  (2.2%) | 0 | 1  (4.2%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Q28a: Please include any additional comments on this section (optional).** | | | | | | |
| * Very supportive Department * From promotion to other rights, I do not feel that women are appreciated * Friendly, laidback, professional, and highly inclusive environment. 100% satisfied. * Great place to work for both genders, however the school should do more to 1. improve the conditions for ECRs, which can affect women more than men (talented/enthusiastic researchers are leaving in great numbers as a result); and 2. the school should also do more to prevent unacceptable behavior from female staff, not necessarily/just from male staff. This includes bullying, condescending and intimidating behavior. The school should keep track of formal complaints and take appropriate action irrespective of the seniority level or gender of the bullying member of staff, whether they are male or female. | | | | | | |
| **Q29: My mental health and wellbeing are supported.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 4  (3.2%) | 0 | 2  (3%) | 1  (2.1%) | 2  (4.9%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 9  (7.4%) | 5  (13.9%) | 3  (4.5%) | 3  (6.4%) | 4  (9.8%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 31  (25.6%) | 9  (25%) | 17  (25.8%) | 12  (25.5%) | 11  (26.8%) | 5  (20.8%) |
| **Agree** | 47  (38.8%) | 10  (27.8%) | 28  (42.2%) | 19  (40.4%) | 15  (36.6%) | 9  (37.5%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 20  (16.5%) | 10  (27.8%) | 9  (13.6%) | 7  (14.9%) | 5  (12.2%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| **Not applicable** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 2  (3%) | 2  (4.3%) | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 8  (6.6%) | 2  (5.6%) | 5  (7.6%) | 3  (6.4%) | 4  (9.8%) | 0 |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Q30: The School of Chemical Engineering has taken action to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on staff.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 2  (1.7%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 3  (2.5%) | 0 | 2  (3%) | 1  (2.1%) | 1  (2.4%) | 0 |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 12  (9.9%) | 5  (13.9%) | 4  (6.1%) | 3  (6.4%) | 5  (12.2%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| **Agree** | 35  (28.9%) | 9  (25%) | 23  (34.8%) | 11  (23.4%) | 15  (36.6%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 16  (13.2%) | 6  (16.7%) | 7  (10.6%) | 7  (14.9%) | 4  (9.8%) | 4  (16.7%) |
| **Not applicable** | 1  (0.8%) | 0 | 1  (1.5%) | 1  (2.1%) | 0 | 0 |
| **Don’t know** | 52  (43%) | 16  (44.4%) | 28  (42.2%) | 24  (51.1%) | 15  (36.6%) | 10  (41.7%) |
| **Prefer not to say** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Montioring information – all of the following charts are based on all responses** | | | | | | |
| **Q31: How would you describe your gender?** | | | | | | |
| **Female (including transgender women)** | | 36 (31.9%) | | | | |
| **Male (including transgender men)** | | 66 (58.4%) | | | | |
| **Prefer not to say** | | 11 (9.7%) | | | | |
| **Other (self description)** | | 0 | | | | |
| **Q31a: If you selected Other, please specify:** | | | | | | |
| no answer | | | | | | |
| **Q32: What is your current role?** | | | | | | |
| **Professional services (teaching support, research support, technical staff)** | | 24 (19.8%) | | | | |
| **Academic staff** | | 47 (38.8%) | | | | |
| **Postdoctoral position (Teaching Fellow or Research Fellow)** | | 41 (33.9%) | | | | |
| **Prefer not to say** | | 8 (6.6%) | | | | |
| **Other** | | 1 (0.8%) | | | | |
| **Q32a: If you selected Other, please specify:** | | | | | | |
| no answers | | | | | | |
| **Q33: What sort of contract do you have?** | | | | | | |
| **Open ended** | | 54 (45%) | | | | |
| **Fixed term** | | 55 (45.8%) | | | | |
| **Prefer not to say** | | 11 (9.2%) | | | | |
| **Q34: Please add any further comments about this survey and/or the topics covered here (optional).** | | | | | | |
| * I do not see why you combined born-as and transgender male/female in the above choice. Do you not want to know if there are differences of perception between these groups? * Not sure if anything useful come out of these surveys, I fill them in a hope that someone will take actions and improve things one day. * The School of Chemical Engineering is a great opportunity for everyone, irrespective of their gender or gender identity, to grow professionally and personally based on their skills and qualifications. The School of Chemical Engineering also values meritocracy. I would suggest to highilight this aspect as well. * Will be nice to have some support tailored to other genders and more positive support rather than you need to look for yourself * Would make a contrast between the School caring about my wellbeing and the University. I think the School cares a lot about my mental health and wellbeing, but nothing I've seen indicates that the University cares. * The school could address inequalities through better monitoring of the working conditions and making students/staff sufficiently comfortable to report any pressures or unfair behaviors from colleagues/managers. | | | | | | |

## Appendix 1b: Culture survey data April 2020 – selected data

Table 3: Selected results of April 2020 culture survey, as reference for data cited in the main application section. 85/151 members of staff responded. 21 respondents identified as female (including transgender women), 41 as male (including transgender male) and 9 chose not to reveal their gender. 28 respondents were academic staff, 22 RTFs, 19 PTO staff, 14 preferred not to say and 1 other. There were fewer answer options in this survey, compared to the data presented in Table 2. There were more role categories to choose, which for the sake of presentation in this table were combined to the same roles as in Table 2.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q2: In the School of Chemical Engineering, work is allocated on a clear and fair basis irrespective of gender or gender identity.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 2  (2.4%) | 1  (4.8%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (3.6%) | 1  (4.5%) | 0  (0%) |
| **Disagree** | 5  (5.9%) | 1  (4.8%) | 1  (2.4%) | 3  (10.7%) | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 14  (16.5%) | 4  (19.1%) | 7  (17.1%) | 4  (14.3%) | 4  (18.2%) | 3  (15.8%) |
| **Agree** | 35  (41.2%) | 9  (42.9%) | 15  (36.6%) | 11  (39.3%) | 9  (40.9%) | 10  (52.6%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 21  (24.7%) | 6  (28.6%) | 11  (26.8%) | 6  (21.4%) | 7  (31.8%) | 5  (26.3%) |
| **Don’t know** | 7  (8.2%) | 0  (0%) | 6  (14.6%) | 4  (14.3%) | 1  (4.54%) | 1  (5.3%) |
| **Q4: I understand the promotions process and criteria in the School of Chemical Engineering.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 5  (5.9%) | 2  (9.5%) | 2  (4.9%) | 1  (3.6%) | 3  (13.6%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 14  (16.5%) | 2  (9.5%) | 7  (17.1%) | 5  (17.9%) | 2  (9.1%) | 4  (21.1%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 19  (22.4%) | 8  (38.1%) | 7  (17.1%) | 4  (14.3%) | 5  (22.7%) | 5  (26.3%) |
| **Agree** | 30  (35.3%) | 7  (33.3%) | 15  (36.6%) | 9  (32.1%) | 11  (50%) | 7  (36.8%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 14  (16.5%) | 2  (9.5%) | 9  (22%) | 8  (28.6%) | 0 | 3  (15.8%) |
| **Don’t know** | 3  (3.5%) | 0 | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (3.6%) | 1  (4.5%) | 0 |
| **Q6: I am encouraged and given opportunities to represent the School of Chemical Engineering externally and/or internally (e.g. on committees or boards, in nominations for prizes, as chair or speaker at conferences).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1  (1.2%) | 0 | 0 | 0  (%) | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) |
| **Disagree** | 5  (6%) | 3  (14.3%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (3.6%) | 3  (13.6%) | 0  (0%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 22  (26.5%) | 6  (28.6%) | 10  (24.3%) | 6  (21.4%) | 5  (22.7%) | 7  (36.8%) |
| **Agree** | 34  (41%) | 7  (33.3%) | 17  (41.5%) | 12  (42.9%) | 9  (40.9%) | 7  (36.8%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 15  (18.1%) | 4  (19%) | 8  (19.5%) | 7  (25%) | 2  (9.1%) | 3  (15.8%) |
| **Don’t know** | 6  (7.2%) | 1  (4.8%) | 3  (7.3%) | 1  (3.6%) | 3  (13.6%) | 1  (5.3%) |
| **Q7: The School of Chemical Engineering provides me with… useful mentoring opportunities.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 3  (3.6%) | 1  (4.8%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (3.6%) | 1  (4.5%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 13  (15.5%) | 4  (19%) | 6  (14.6%) | 3  (10.7%) | 4  (18.2%) | 2  (10.5%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 22  (26.2%) | 9  (42.9%) | 9  (22%) | 9  (32.1%) | 3  (13.6%) | 7  (36.8%) |
| **Agree** | 36  (42.9%) | 5  (23.8%) | 20  (48.8%) | 12  (42.9%) | 11  (50%) | 7  (36.8%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 10  (11.9%) | 2  (9.5%) | 5  (12.2%) | 3  (10.7%) | 3  (13.6%) | 3  (15.8%) |
| **Don’t know** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **…helpful annual appraisal.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1  (1.2%) | 1  (4.8%) | 0 | 0 | 1  (4.5%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 6  (7.1%) | 2  (9.5%) | 1  (2.4%) | 1  (3.6%) | 2  (9.1%) | 1  (5.3%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 25  (29.8%) | 6  (28.6%) | 13  (31.7%) | 8  (28.6%) | 6  (27.3%) | 6  (31.6%) |
| **Agree** | 30  (35.7%) | 4  (19%) | 18  (43.9%) | 11  (39.3%) | 7  (31.8%) | 5  (26.3%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 17  (20.2%) | 8  (38.1%) | 6  (14.6%) | 7  (25%) | 3  (13.6%) | 6  (31.6%) |
| **Don’t know** | 5  (6%) | 0 | 3  (7.3%) | 1  (3.6%) | 3  (13.6%) | 1  (5.3%) |
| **Q10: In the School of Chemical Engineering, everyone, irrespective of gender or gender identity, is paid an equal amount for doing the same work or work of equal value.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1  (1.2%) | 1  (4.8%) | 0 | 0  (0%) | 1  (4.5%) | 0  (0%) |
| **Disagree** | 7  (8.4%) | 1  (4.8%) | 2  (4.9%) | 2  (7.1%) | 1  (4.5%) | 1  (5.3%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 8  (9.6%) | 3  (14.3%) | 3  (7.3%) | 1  (3.57%) | 3  (13.6%) | 3  (15.8%) |
| **Agree** | 24  (28.9%) | 4  (19%) | 16  (39%) | 6  (21.4%) | 11  (50%) | 6  (31.6%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 11  (13.3%) | 4  (19%) | 6  (14.6%) | 5  (17.9%) | 1  (4.5%) | 4  (21.1%) |
| **Don’t know** | 32  (38.6%) | 8  (38.1%) | 14  (34.1%) | 14  (50%) | 5  (22.7%) | 5  (26.3%) |
| **Q13: Inappropriate images that stereotype people's gender or gender identity are not visible in the School of Chemical Engineering (e.g. in calendars, newspapers and magazines; on computer and mobiles; on supplier packaging).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1  (1.2%) | 1  (4.8%) | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 1  (4.5%) | 0  (0%) |
| **Disagree** | 0 | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 6  (7.1%) | 2  (9.5%) | 3  (7.3%) | 1  (3.6%) | 2  (9.1%) | 1  (5.3%) |
| **Agree** | 36  (42.9%) | 9  (42.9%) | 18  (43.9%) | 9  (32.1%) | 14  (63.6%) | 8  (42.1%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 35  (41.7%) | 9  (42.9%) | 18  (43.9%) | 18  (64.3%) | 4  (18.2%) | 8  (42.1%) |
| **Don’t know** | 6  (7.1%) | 0  (0%) | 2  (4.9%) | 0  (0%) | 1  (4.5%) | 2  (10.5%) |
| **Q15: I have undertaken training in gender equality.** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Yes-online** | 35  (41.7%) | 8  (38.1%) | 17  (41.5) | 13  (46.4%) | 8  (36.4%) | 8  (42.1%) |
| **Yes-Course or workshop attendance** | 10  (11.9%) | 4  (19.1%) | 3  (7.32%) | 2  (7.1%) | 5  (22.7%) | 0  (0%) |
| **No** | 30  (35.7%) | 7  (33.3%) | 16  (39.0%) | 9  (32.1%) | 7  (31.8%) | 8  (42.1%) |
| **Don’t know** | 9  (10.7%) | 2  (9.5%) | 5  (12.2%) | 4  (14.3%) | 2  (9.1%) | 3  (15.8%) |
| **Q16: The School of Chemical Engineering has made visible its policies in relation to gender equality (e.g. on discrimination, parental leave, carer's leave, flexible working).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 2  (2.4%) | 1  (4.8%) | 0 | 0 | 1  (4.5%) | 0 |
| **Disagree** | 9  (10.7%) | 2  (9.5%) | 3  (7.3%) | 5  (17.9%) | 0 | 3  (15.8%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 14  (16.7%) | 5  (23.8%) | 8  (19.5%) | 4  (14.3%) | 7  (31.8%) | 2  (10.5%) |
| **Agree** | 34  (40.5%) | 6  (28.6%) | 19  (46.3%) | 12  (42.9%) | 9  (40.9%) | 7  (36.6%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 8  (9.5%) | 1  (4.8%) | 5  (12.2%) | 5  (17.9%) | 1  (4.5%) | 2  (10.5%) |
| **Don’t know** | 17  (20.2%) | 6  (28.6%) | 6  (14.6%) | 2  (7.1%) | 4  (18.2%) | 5  (26.3%) |
| **Q22: I am kept informed by the School of Chemical Engineering about gender equality matters that affect me (e.g., changes to maternity/paternity leave entitlements, gender legislation and institutional policies).** | | | | | | |
|  | **All respondents** | **Female** | **Male** | **Academic** | **R/TF** | **PTO** |
| **Strongly disagree** | 1  (1.2%) | 1  (4.8%) | 0 | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 1  (5.3%) |
| **Disagree** | 10  (11.9%) | 5  (23.8%) | 3  (7.3%) | 2  (7.1%) | 3  (13.6%) | 3  (15.8%) |
| **Neither disagree nor agree** | 24  (28.6%) | 6  (28.6%) | 13  (31.7%) | 9  (32.1%) | 5  (22.7%) | 5  (26.3%) |
| **Agree** | 35  (41.7%) | 6  (28.6%) | 20  (48.8%) | 13  (46.4%) | 10  (45.5%) | 7  (36.6%) |
| **Strongly agree** | 8  (9.5%) | 2  (9.5%) | 3  (7.3%) | 3  (10.7%) | 2  (9.1%) | 3  (15.8%) |
| **Don’t know** | 6  (7.1%) | 1  (4.8%) | 2  (4.9%) | 1  (3.6%) | 2  (9.1%) | 0  (0%) |

# Appendix 2: Data tables[[4]](#footnote-5)

Table 4: All students by gender registered on a degree course offered by the School of Chemical Engineering

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 340  (32%) | 370  (35%) | 370  (35%) | 365  (38%) | 365  (39%) |
| **Male** | 730  (68%) | 680  (65%) | 670  (65%) | 605  (62%) | 575  (61%) |
| **TOTAL** | 1070 | 1050 | 1040 | 970 | 940 |

Table 5: UG by gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 195  (29%) | 210  (31%) | 215  (33%) | 215  (35%) | 210  (37%) |
| **Male** | 485  (71%) | 460  (69%) | 430  (67%) | 400  (65%) | 360  (63%) |
| **TOTAL** | 680 | 670 | 645 | 615 | 570 |

Table 6: UG by gender UoB versus UK sector (Sec)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **2017/18** | | **2018/19** | | **2019/20** | | **2020/21** | | **2021/22** | |
| **UoB** | **Sec** | **UoB** | **Sec** | **UoB** | **Sec** | **UoB** | **Sec** | **UoB** | **Sec** |
| **Female** | 29% | 33% | 31% | 34% | 33% | 30% | 35% | 31% | 37% | NA\* |
| **Male** | 71% | 67% | 69% | 66% | 67% | 70% | 65% | 69% | 63% | NA\* |
| **Other** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.04% | 0% | 0.1% | 0% | NA\* |

\*Sector data not available for 2021/22 at time of writing.

Table 7: PGT by gender – including MRes but excluding Certificate and Diploma degrees

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 50  (31%) | 75  (45%) | 70  (40%) | 60  (44%) | 70  (44%) |
| **Male** | 120  (69%) | 90  (55%) | 110  (60%) | 75  (56%) | 90  (56%) |
| **TOTAL** | 170 | 165 | 180 | 135 | 160 |

Table 8: PGT by gender UoB versus UK sector (Sect) – including MRes but excluding Certificate and Diploma degrees

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **2017/18** | | **2018/19** | | **2019/20** | | **2020/21** | | **2021/22** | |
| **UoB** | **Sect** | **UoB** | **Sect** | **UoB** | **Sect** | **UoB** | **Sect** | **UoB** | **Sect** |
| **Female** | 31% | 37% | 45% | 38% | 40% | 30% | 44% | 30% | 44% | NA\* |
| **Male** | 69% | 63% | 55% | 62% | 60% | 70% | 56% | 70% | 56% | NA\* |
| **Other** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.3% | 0% | NA\* |

\*Sector data not available for 2021/22 at time of writing.

Table 9: PGT by gender – Certificate and Diploma degrees

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 20  (61%) | 20  (61%) | 25  (68%) | 25  (71%) | 30  (59%) |
| **Male** | 15  (39%) | 15  (39%) | 10  (32%) | 10  (29%) | 20  (41%) |
| **TOTAL** | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 50 |

Table 10: PGR by gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 75  (39%) | 65  (36%) | 60  (33%) | 65  (35%) | 55  (34%) |
| **Male** | 115  (61%) | 120  (64%) | 120  (67%) | 120  (65%) | 110  (66%) |
| **TOTAL** | 190 | 185 | 180 | 185 | 165 |

Table 11: Attainment UG by gender as fraction of total cohort within classification (BEng/MEng)[[5]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Degree class** | **2017/18** | | **2018/19** | | **2019/20** | | **2020/21** | | **2021/22** | |
| **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** |
| **1st** | 10  (29%) | 25  (71%) | 15  (31%) | 35  (70%) | 25  (34%) | 50  (66%) | 20  (36%) | 35  (64%) | 15  (25%) | 40  (75%) |
| **2:1** | 20  (27%) | 55  (73%) | 20  (25%) | 55  (75%) | 15  (28%) | 40  (72%) | 25  (38%) | 35  (62%) | 20  (27%) | 60  (73%) |
| **2:2** | 10  (32%) | 20  (68%) | 20  (25%) | 55  (75%) | 15  (28%) | 40  (72%) | 25  (38%) | 35  (62%) | 20  (27%) | 60  (73%) |
| **3rd/ Pass** | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 12: Attainment UG by gender as fraction of gender cohort (BEng/MEng)5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Degree class** | **2017/18** | | **2018/19** | | **2019/20** | | **2020/21** | | **2021/22** | |
| **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** |
| **1st** | 24% | 23% | 36% | 31% | 35% | 38% | 62% | 52% | 43% | 43% |
| **2:1** | 50% | 52% | 43% | 48% | 58% | 56% | 38% | 41% | 49% | 46% |
| **2:2** | 24% | 20% | 17% | 17% | 8% | 6% | 0% | 5% | 4% | 11% |
| **3rd/Pass** | 2% | 5% | 5% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 4% | 0% |

Table 13: Attainment UG by ethnicity as fraction of ethnic cohort (BEng/MEng)5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Degree class** | **2017/18** | | **2018/19** | | **2019/20** | | **2020/21** | | **2021/22** | |
| **B.A.M.E.** | **White** | **B.A.M.E.** | **White** | **B.A.M.E.** | **White** | **B.A.M.E.** | **White** | **B.A.M.E.** | **White** |
| **1st** | 18% | 38% | 19% | 54% | 27% | 56% | 48% | 62% | 37% | 53% |
| **2:1** | 61% | 52% | 57% | 39% | 64% | 44% | 44% | 36% | 46% | 43% |
| **2:2** | 18% | 11% | 20% | 4% | 10% | 0% | 5% | 2% | 14% | 4% |
| **3rd/Pass** | 3% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 0% | 3% | 0% |

Table 14: Attainment UG by gender and ethnicity as fraction of specific cohort (BEng/MEng) FEMALE5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Degree class** | **2017/18** | | **2018/19** | | **2019/20** | | **2020/21** | | **2021/22** | |
| **B.A.M.E.** | **White** | **B.A.M.E.** | **White** | **B.A.M.E.** | **White** | **B.A.M.E.** | **White** | **B.A.M.E.** | **White** |
| **1st** | 25% | 50% | 20% | 71% | 26% | 58% | 46% | 82% | 31% | 63% |
| **2:1** | 54% | 38% | 61% | 24% | 63% | 42% | 54% | 18% | 54% | 38% |
| **2:2** | 20% | 13% | 19% | 0% | 11% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 8% | 0% |
| **3rd/Pass** | 0% | 0% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 8% | 0% |

Table 15: Attainment UG by gender and ethnicity as fraction of specific cohort (BEng/MEng) MALE5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Degree class** | **2017/18** | | **2018/19** | | **2019/20** | | **2020/21** | | **2021/22** | |
| **B.A.M.E.** | **White** | **B.A.M.E.** | **White** | **B.A.M.E.** | **White** | **B.A.M.E.** | **White** | **B.A.M.E.** | **White** |
| **1st** | 14% | 36% | 19% | 48% | 27% | 56% | 49% | 53% | 41% | 49% |
| **2:1** | 64% | 54% | 56% | 45% | 64% | 45% | 40% | 44% | 41% | 46% |
| **2:2** | 17% | 11% | 21% | 5% | 9% | 0% | 7% | 3% | 18% | 5% |
| **3rd/Pass** | 6% | 0% | 4% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

Table 16: Attainment PGT by gender (MSc)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Degree class** | **2017/18** | | **2018/19** | | **2019/20** | | **2020/21** | | **2021/22** | |
| **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** |
| **Distinction** | 10  (60%) | 10  (40%) | 10  (63%) | 5  (37%) | 15  (63%) | 10  (37%) | 10  (56%) | 5  (44%) | 15  (55%) | 15  (45%) |
| **Merit** | 20  (33%) | 40  (67%) | 25  (51%) | 25  (49%) | 25  (46%) | 30  (54%) | 25  (48%) | 25  (52%) | 20  (43%) | 30  (57%) |
| **Pass** | 10  (41%) | 15  (59%) | 25  (62%) | 15  (38%) | 10  (38%) | 15  (62%) | 10  (50%) | 10  (50%) | 20  (49%) | 20  (51%) |

Table 17: Completions PGR by gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2017/18** | | **2018/19** | | **2019/20** | | **2020/21** | | **2021/22** | |
| **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** |
| **Completed** | 10  (27%) | 25  (73%) | 20  (48%) | 20  (52%) | 10  (32%) | 25  (68%) | 15  (32%) | 25  (68%) | 15  (54%) | 10  (46%) |

Table 18: All staff by type and by gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Staff type** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Academic[[6]](#footnote-7)** | 126  (81%) | 124  (77%) | 136  (82%) | 122  (81%) | 138  (83%) |
| **PTO** | 29  (19%) | 38  (23%) | 30  (18%) | 29  (19%) | 29  (17%) |
| **TOTAL** | 155 | 162 | 166 | 151 | 167 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 53  (34%) | 63  (39%) | 60  (36%) | 47  (31%) | 58  (35%) |
| **Male** | 102  (64%) | 99  (61%) | 106  (64%) | 104  (69%) | 109  (65%) |
| TOTAL | 155 | 162 | 166 | 151 | 167 |

Table 19: Academic staff by function[[7]](#footnote-8)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Education focussed** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 1  (33%) | 2  (40%) | 3  (38%) | 2  (29%) | 3  (38%) |
| **Male** | 2  (67%) | 3  (60%) | 5  (38%) | 5  (71%) | 5  (38%) |
| **TOTAL** | 3 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 8 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Research only** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 28  (35%) | 31  (42%) | 29  (35%) | 20  (28%) | 26  (32%) |
| **Male** | 51  (65%) | 43  (58%) | 55  (65%) | 52  (72%) | 56  (68%) |
| **TOTAL** | 79 | 74 | 84 | 72 | 82 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Research and Education** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 7  (16%) | 7  (16%) | 9  (21%) | 9  (22%) | 10  (23%) |
| **Male** | 37  (84%) | 36  (84%) | 33  (79%) | 32  (78%) | 34  (77%) |
| **TOTAL** | 44 | 43 | 42 | 41 | 44 |

Table 20: Academic staff by grade

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Research (6-8)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 0  (0%) | 1  (20%) | 1  (14%) | 0  (0%) | 2  (29%) |
| **Male** | 0  (0%) | 4  (20%) | 6  (86%) | 4  (100%) | 5  (71%) |
| **TOTAL** | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 7 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Research Fellow (7)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 26  (37%) | 28  (44%) | 23  (34%) | 16  (28%) | 17  (27%) |
| **Male** | 45  (63%) | 36  (56%) | 45  (66%) | 41  (72%) | 46  (73%) |
| **TOTAL** | 71 | 64 | 68 | 57 | 63 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Research Fellow (8)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 2  (29%) | 2  (33%) | 5  (45%) | 4  (40%) | 7  (54%) |
| **Male** | 5  (71%) | 4  (67%) | 6  (55%) | 6  (60%) | 6  (46%) |
| **TOTAL** | 7 | 6 | 11 | 10 | 13 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Assistant Professor/ Lecturer (8)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 2  (14%) | 3  (23%) | 4  (31%) | 5  (42%) | 5  (42%) |
| **Male** | 12  (86%) | 10  (77%) | 9  (69%) | 7  (58%) | 7  (58%) |
| **TOTAL** | 14 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Senior Research Fellow (9)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) |
| **Male** | 0 | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 1  (100%) | 1  (100%) |
| **TOTAL** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Associate Professor/ Reader/ Senior Lecturer (9)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 4  (33%) | 4  (27%) | 5  (29%) | 2  (13%) | 3  (18%) |
| **Male** | 8  (67%) | 11  (74%) | 12  (71%) | 13  (87%) | 14  (82%) |
| **TOTAL** | 12 | 15 | 17 | 15 | 17 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Professor (10)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 2  (9%) | 2  (10%) | 3  (15%) | 4  (19%) | 5  (20%) |
| **Male** | 20  (91%) | 19  (90%) | 17  (85%) | 17  (81%) | 20  (80%) |
| **TOTAL** | 22 | 21 | 20 | 21 | 25 |

Table 21: Academic staff by grade fixed term. Note: Table has been redacted in this version.

Table 22: Academic staff by grade permanent. Note: Table has been redacted in this version.

Table 23: All PTO staff by gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 17  (59%) | 23  (61%) | 19  (63%) | 16  (55%) | 19  (66%) |
| **Male** | 12  (41%) | 15  (39%) | 11  (37%) | 13  (45%) | 10  (34%) |
| **TOTAL** | 29 | 38 | 30 | 29 | 29 |

Table 24: PTO staff by grade (job family)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Support (3)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 2  (100%) | 2  (100%) | 1  (100%) | 0  (-%) | 0  (-%) |
| **Male** | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 0  (-%) | 0  (-%) |
| **TOTAL** | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Support (4)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 3  (100%) | 4  (100%) | 3  (100%) | 2  (67%) | 4  (67%) |
| **Male** | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 0  (0%) | 1  (33%) | 2  (33%) |
| **TOTAL** | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 6 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Support (5)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 6  (60%) | 7  (64%) | 5  (63%) | 2  (33%) | 2  (33%) |
| **Male** | 4  (40%) | 4  (36%) | 3  (37%) | 4  (67%) | 4  (67%) |
| **TOTAL** | 10 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 6 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Admin & Other academic related (6)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 5  (56%) | 7  (54%) | 6  (75%) | 6  (75%) | 8  (89%) |
| **Male** | 4  (44%) | 6  (46%) | 2  (25%) | 2  (25%) | 1  (11%) |
| **TOTAL** | 9 | 13 | 8 | 8 | 9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Admin & Other academic related (7)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 1  (33%) | 1  (33%) | 2  (50%) | 4  (57%) | 3  (60%) |
| **Male** | 2  (67%) | 2  (67%) | 2  (50%) | 3  (43%) | 2  (40%) |
| **TOTAL** | 3 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Admin & Other academic related (8)** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 0  (0%) | 2  (40%) | 2  (33%) | 2  (40%) | 2  (67%) |
| **Male** | 2  (100%) | 3  (60%) | 4  (67%) | 3  (60%) | 1  (33%) |
| **TOTAL** | 2 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3 |

Table 25: PTO staff by contract type overall, and contract type by gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contract type** | **Fixed term** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Fixed term** | 7  (24%) | 12  (32%) | 14  (47%) | 13  (45%) | 13  (%) |
| **Permanent** | 22  (76%) | 25  (68%) | 16  (53%) | 16  (55%) | 16  (%) |
| **TOTAL** | 29 | 37 | 30 | 29 | 29 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Fixed term** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 2  (29%) | 4  (33%) | 6  (43%) | 5  (38%) | 10  (77%) |
| **Male** | 5  (71%) | 8  (67%) | 8  (57%) | 8  (62%) | 3  (23%) |
| **TOTAL** | 7 | 12 | 14 | 13 | 13 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Permanent** | | | | |
| **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Female** | 15  (68%) | 18  (72%) | 13  (81%) | 11  (69%) | 9  (56%) |
| **Male** | 7  (32%) | 7  (28%) | 3  (19%) | 5  (31%) | 7  (44%) |
| **TOTAL** | 22 | 25 | 16 | 16 | 16 |

Table 26: Academic recruitment. Note: Sub tables showing data by grade have been redacted in this version.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ALL** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **2017/18** | | **2018/19** | | **2019/20** | | **2020/21** | | **2021/22** | |
| **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** |
| **Appli-cations** | 130  (23%) | 430  (77%) | 157  (23%) | 514  (77%) | 107  (20%) | 416  (80%) | 134  (21%) | 518  (79%) | 102  (19%) | 435  (81%) |
| **Short-listed** | 29  (33%) | 58  (67%) | 23  (22%) | 80  (78%) | 26  (38%) | 43  (62%) | 36  (23%) | 119  (77%) | 23  (22%) | 81  (78%) |
| **Appoin-tments** | 11  (28%) | 28  (72%) | 8  (20%) | 32  (80%) | 12  (48%) | 13  (52%) | 14  (27%) | 38  (73%) | 13  (28%) | 34  (72%) |

Table 27: PTO recruitment. Percent shortlisted data are based on percent application data and percent appointments are based on percent shortlisted, by gender. Note: Sub tables showing data by grade have been redacted in this version.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ALL** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **2017/18** | | **2018/19** | | **2019/20** | | **2020/21** | | **2021/22** | |
| **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** | **F** | **M** |
| **Applica-tions** | 148  (62%) | 92  (38%) | 55  (46%) | 62  (53%) | 67  (53%) | 60  (47%) | 40  (74%) | 44  (26%) | 107  (59%) | 74  (31%) |
| **Short-listed** | 24  (16%) | 12  (13%) | 14  (25%) | 18  (29%) | 11  (16%) | 9  (15%) | 14  (35%) | 11  (25%) | 50  (47%) | 18  (24%) |
| **Appoint-ments** | 7  (29%) | 2  (17%) | 6  (43%) | 3  (17%) | 3  (27%) | 1  (11%) | 5  (36%) | 6  (55%) | 18  (36%) | 2  (11%) |

Table 28: Academic promotions including percentages of promotions approved. PTO progression is not included as counted through application data. Note: Table has been redacted in this version.

Table 29: Research grant applications

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Number** | 96 | 115 | 152 | 118 | 124 |
| **Approx. Total value** | £36,034k | £31,538k | £43,230k | £32,883k | £37,820k |

Table 30: New School seminar speaker statistics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** |
| **Number of seminars** | - | 3 | 4 | 1 | 6 |
| **Academic speakers**  **(Assistant Profs, Associate Profs, Profs)** | - | 2 | 3  (0, 0, 3) | 1  (0, 0, 1) | 5  (0, 4, 1) |
| **Industry/Consultancy based speakers** | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| **Female speakers** | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| **Attracted to School as member of staff** | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1M (at Prof level) |

# Appendix 3: Glossary

AS – Athena Swan

Asc – Associate

Ast – Assistant

B.A.M.E. – Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic

CPD – Continuing Professional Development

CDT – Centre for Doctoral Training

Dep – Deputy

dPVC – Deputy Pro Vice-Chancellor

EDI – Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

EngD

EPS – College of Engineering and Physical Sciences

HEFi – Higher Education Futures institute

HoC – Head of College

HoO – Head of Operations

HoS – Head of School

IAB – Industrial Advisory Board

IChemE – Institution of Chemical Engineers

KP – Key Priority

LGBTQ+ – lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer (or sometimes questioning) and other identities

M – male

PDR – Personal Development Reviews

PDRA – Postdoctoral Research Associate

PGR – Postgraduate Research

PGT – Postgraduate Taught

Prof – Professor

PTO – Professional, Technical and Operational

Q - Question

RAG – Red-Amber-Green

REF – Research Excellence Framework

Rep, Reps – Representative, Representatives

RF – Research Fellow

RTF – Research/Teaching Fellows

SAT – Self Assessment Team

SCS – Staff Culture Survey

SMT – Senior Management Team

SOM – Senior Operations Manager

SRF – Senior Research Fellow

SSCC – staff student consultative committee

STEM – Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics

StuVo – Student Voice

TF – Teaching Fellow

UG – Undergraduate

UoB – University of Birmingham

WAM – Workload Allocation Model

1. <https://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/university-subject-rankings/2023/chemical-engineering?&search=birmingham> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Staff number is a snapshot of January that year, the actual number at the time point of the survey may have been slightly higher or lower. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. <https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/assets.creode.advancehe-document-manager/documents/advance-he/AdvHE_Onwards%20and%20Upwards_Year%205_Aurorans%20report_1612372926.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. For student data, numbers are rounded to the nearest 5 whereas percentages are based on actual numbers. Staff data are a snapshot taken at the end of the calendar year (31st December). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Columns may not add up to 100% due to the data handling procedures at source and rounding. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Academic as in HE notation, elsewhere we refer to academic staff including Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, and Research/Teaching Fellow [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Sum of data per year in this table shows slight discrepancies to data in Table 20 as research support (2 per year except for 2018/19) and enterprise engagement and impact (2 in 2021/22) are not accounted for in Table 19. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)