

## School of Computer Science Athena SWAN Meeting Notes

27<sup>th</sup> January 2016 11am Room C1

Attendees	Apologies
Amy Dickens (Notes) -AD Jon Garibaldi -JG Boriana Koleva -BK Sarah Martindale Rong Qu Milena Radenkovic (Chair - MR Hannah Robinson -HR Pepita Stringer	Fiona Cotteril Holger Schnädelbach Daniel Serotsky Samantha Stapleford-Allen

Milena gave an update on ongoing Athena SWAN activities within the School as well as good practice summaries related to the preparation for our submission of the new form. The presentation slides will be circulated to the committee.

Key information included:

1. **Application dates:** CS application due in November, applying as Bronze award as a new application – so that can apply under post-May 2015 format, this is looking at a greater inclusivity not just gender based and valid for longer (potentially benefiting from a new process).
2. **Timeline:** Highlighted that currently at 9-12 month prior to application period, stats have been gathered and analysis has been completed on these, 6 meetings in previous year and well documented – all is publishable.
3. **Infrastructure:** Noted that university has more support in terms of infrastructure now in HR via the People in Culture team. There has been a review of the infrastructure as a whole in the Athena Swan structures, including new Faculty Equality, Diversity and Inclusion steering groups and People Strategy Board (includes new allocation of Associate PVC). We also have the 2020 goals, the people strategy, highlighted key words of diverse, motivated and empowered, developmental, inclusive, collaborative and supportive – these need to be evidence as important factors of our focus for Athena Swan.
4. **New Action taken under recent Athena Swan:** two women in CS events, one staff survey and one student survey since 2015 (surveys last completed 2013). Sharing good practice – Mentoring, Outreach, Women in CS events, Committees (breakdown of membership, new evaluation looks at roles also i.e. chair positions)
5. **Activities since last review:** Attendance of regular WinSET meetings. Joined parental leave working group. Athena Swan mailing list. Suggested amendments to website. Events for women in CS and tech events. Regular meetings inclusive of HR and School meetings, liaison regarding progress and transparency.
6. **Website:** high presence of Athena Swan, Minutes for all meetings are present, members are shown with bios. Noted are missing links to interviews with women in CS – noted that other videos can be repurposed, computer-phile, WIT, Horizon equality. AD noted new material to be filmed for Women in Tech.
7. **Benchmarking:** MR noted that we can review our progress against other universities.
8. **Stats:** HR stats for attendance of L4 researchers to HR courses discussed as of 31<sup>st</sup> May 2015 – broken down by school, noted that these were numerical not relative to size of school. Noted that in terms of statistics physics and chemistry are potentially most relative to CS. Noted that there is requirement to open discussion into these in focus groups amongst staff and students regarding training, to better analyse data and other imbalanced attendance (communication course as an example). Discussed RED

AMBER GREEN analysis for reports in focus groups regarding services delivered in schools (careers, mentoring etc.)

9. **Ideas to improve Stats:** Induction processes, need to highlight training opportunities. JG noted staff development as an area that has already been highlighted and steps taken towards this. CS stats – for staff and students have been analysed regarding this.
10. **Visit:** Happening in 4 weeks. HR and JG will be at UNMC during visit, discussed between MR and SM what will need to be done regarding statistics. SM highlighted that as Qualitative researcher not best person to be managing Quantitative data. Noted one of the new guidelines related to maternity leave query experience before during and after leave (should be included in student survey). Student survey to be formally pushed from University on 6<sup>th</sup> Feb 2016.
11. **New Guidelines for attention:** Career development, staff selection etc. HR noted that positive examples are required for policies. SM noted particularly for maternity for students, this should be pointed toward University policy. HR confirmed that flexibility is highlighted as a positive and setting regimented policies (which was requested) works against this. Policy reflecting the key points is crucial, at least to be noted as working on. (HR & M Action) HR noted that showing visible changes in actions is more difficult than reporting on the policies.
12. JG questioned **format of the form** to report to Athena Swan, MR noted that there is specific questions given and sub-questions.
13. **External Committes:** noted that we need to collate data on involvement of staff in external committees.
14. **Culture:** demonstration – key word, as detailed as possible, Consultations, past, current and future activities. Noted that visiting speakers are inclusive here – BK & JG noted this refers to institutions who have a high proportion of visiting or similar contracted staff (Not applicable in the case of CS)
15. **Progress Reports:** discussion of reports on female participation in CS overall for UK and US. Noted reports on graduate employment. Comments on the CS employability – HR and JG noted to talk about Nottingham specific as graduate employment is good and new degree streams have been introduced to focus on the future development (5-10 years in advance). Workforce profiles are an issue (data up to 2014 shown and the ratio on permanent and levels are not positive – JG confirmed needs addressing). Comparisons would be required to understand how negative this is reflecting on CS or just demonstrating the known issue in CS and STEM roles.
16. **Immediate Actions:** HR to look over document and note policies to be updated, draft not required in 4 weeks (hard deadline 2 months prior to submission), noted to use the visit in 4 weeks from internal professors as a demo of list of activities and data, asking for advice not review. Lift information from the ref statement – and ask for confirmation. JG confirmed to not put a full draft but sections for feedback. MR to prepare data for review and potential areas CS needs feedback on.