

Newcastle University

Athena Swan Self-Assessment Team

9 November 2021, 5.13 King's Gate and via Zoom

MINUTES

Present: Judith Rankin (Co-chair JR), Adrienne McFarland (Co-chair AMcF), Kate Chedgzoy (KC), Mel Leitch (ML), Freya Douglas Oloyede (FDO), Sharron Kuznesof (SK), Meenakshi Swamy (MS), Carolyn Laws (CL), Chris Stanley (CS), Amy Reeve (AR), Paul Britton (PB), Kelechi Dibia (KD).

Apologies: Julie Sanders (JS), Malasree Home (MH), Vi Parker (VP), Gareth Longstaff (GL), Stacy Gillis (SG), Sarah Anderson (SA).

Item	Notes/Actions	Action by/ Deadline
1	Welcome & apologies JR welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies: As noted above.	
2	Minutes of the Last Meeting 9 September 2021 Minutes were agreed. AMcF had met with Paul Tyack about our membership of the 30% Club and advised members to contact Paul for any information about this. Survey rationalisation - SA had not been able to attend the Stonewall WEI meeting to discuss the rationalised culture survey, but KC will follow-up on this. AMcF updated that Lisette Nicholson had attended People Matters Group to discuss the survey rationalisation and the costs involved, and that there may now be a slight delay to finalising it, but this will be known by the end of the year. JR has emailed Andrea Henderson to seek input to the USAT from the Social Justice Advisory Group. She updated that Professor Liz Todd is now Chair of the group and that the group plan to discuss representation on our SAT at their first meeting. JR will follow up in due course. FDO had not received further update on the Transformational Leadership Programme participants' 'Women into Leadership project' but will follow this up before the next USAT meeting, possibly inviting them to attend. JR updated that that a number of submissions were made to the Advance HE EDI conference and thanked all those who had worked on submissions. Following the meeting we learnt that all had been accepted.	 KC JR FDO
3	Family Friendly core hours discussion (AM)	

	<p>SG had raised this topic in relation to the scheduling of some of the USAT meetings, which had fallen outside of the 10am-4pm recommended family friendly meeting hours. She provided the following comment which was shared at the meeting: 'Studies have repeatedly demonstrated that more women than men doing the domestic labour of parenting, and ensuring that all meetings start at 10 o'clock and only run until 4 o'clock, would allow for many colleagues who are parents to plan their time accordingly. A commitment on Newcastle University's part to keeping meetings between 10 and 4 would demonstrate a substantial commitment to colleagues who are parents.'</p> <p>AMcF outlined that we should all aim to arrange meetings between 10 and 4 as far as is practically possible. The Blended Working group will consider working hours later. JR agreed and also noted that there will be instances where it is not possible but that where possible meetings should not be always held at a time outside of 10-4.</p> <p>FDO suggested that the Inclusive Meetings Guidance that had previously been produced and shared via NU Connections and our website is not well known about.</p> <p>CL suggested another article in NU Connections with case studies to show the benefits of planning meetings within these hours for colleagues who are parents. KC suggested we approach NU Parents for volunteers for this.</p> <p>ML suggested we cascade the guidance through managers via People Services forums/mechanisms.</p> <p>CL suggested the guidance could be included in induction and welcome sessions.</p> <p>JR noted that it is not always possible due to meetings with overseas campuses in different time zones. MS suggested we ensure that meetings alternate between who will stay late/come in early.</p> <p>KD asked if we have a process for colleagues to challenge meeting timings if not being scheduled within these times. AMcF suggested it would be a conversation with the line manager and visibility of the guidance will help people to challenge. JR suggested we could offer another route for people to raise issues, such as EDI team. JR and PB will consider this.</p> <p>AR noted the disparity between clinical and non-clinical academics regarding working hours and expectations of meeting times.</p> <p>KD noted that some PGRs and supervisors have childcare responsibilities and would benefit from this guidance being applied.</p> <p>ML suggested we add a reminder to the room booking system e.g. a pop-up box. FDO to speak to Andrew Roberts in timetabling team about this.</p> <p>SK noted that SAgE colleagues try to start meetings at 5 past the hour to allow people to get to meetings if on campus.</p>	<p>CL & FDO</p> <p>AMcF</p> <p>JR & PB</p> <p>FDO</p>
--	--	---

	JR suggested the guidance be checked again to reflect the suggestions made and updated if needed.	FDO
4	<p>Update on Professional, Technical & Operational Athena Swan applications (FDO)</p> <p>Following discussion in HaSS and a question from KC about whether we could do a whole-institution PTO submission, FDO had obtained some further guidance from Advance HE on how the new process is expected to be used. This was presented in a few slides, which will be circulated to the group. Key messages include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University applications: all staff and sub-units included • Academic dept (Faculties & Schools): all staff based in their structure, including relevant PTO staff • PTO directorate: new route available for directorates to apply, e.g. Estates, People Services, library, Student Services, Finance) <p>Key is where PTO colleagues report to, who recruited by, whose policies bound by. Only those reporting to the Unit should be in the application for that unit (but option to include them in faculty/school applications).</p> <p>Advance HE would not expect a university-wide PTO application or a whole faculty PTO application.</p> <p>ML asked what data is required in PTO applications. The requirements are: PTO staff by job family, contract type, applications, shortlist and appointments made in recruitment, applications and success rates for PTO progression, all broken down by gender.</p> <p>KD noted that Faculty Offices are not engaged in Athena Swan in HaSS currently and would it be a way to engage them. KC noted that the numbers are small and would be smaller when you take out those that report into central services.</p> <p>AMcF suggested she and FDO could attend a Senior Officers Group meeting to find out if there would be appetite, once we have found out more about this.</p> <p>JR suggested we find out more from Advance HE and learn from those in the pilot.</p> <p>FDO and LW will ask for more detail from colleagues in the Russell Group Athena Swan group about how they are planning to use the new process.</p> <p>ML suggested we need to map out where people sit within PTO. AMcF noted the new People Dashboard, launched on 9 November, may help with data for that purpose. PB suggested we also engage Craig Armstrong on data requirements for Athena Swan going forward.</p>	<p>AMcF & FDO</p> <p>FDO & LW</p> <p>PB</p>
5	<p>Overseas campuses and Athena Swan applications</p> <p>We have approached Advance HE for guidance or examples of good practice from other Universities with international campuses and had received a response, as follows:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of the overseas campus staff and students in faculty or school submission is not a requirement but is possible (and NU wishes to do so) • Advance HE has not routinely kept a record of submissions which include overseas campuses, but are now doing so. • Advance HE is in the process of developing some FAQs around Athena Swan awards for overseas campuses and the inclusion of overseas/collaborative provision staff and students in institutional and departmental applications. • In the meantime, they provided advice on extra information institutions should provide (2000 words) in order to enable their international campuses to formally participate (as departments in their own right, or within departmental submissions, for ratification by Advance HE (with the document appended to the application, to provide the panel with context): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information on the international campus' governance structures and the degree of autonomy ○ Information on legal aspects of the host country (e.g. differences in terms and conditions from the UK and the reasons for difference; and information on how enhancements to provision for staff in the UK are also provided to staff at the international campus); ○ Information on cultural aspects of the host country, with particular regard to what contextual factors contribute to the current EDI baseline at the campus (e.g. what attention is given to EDI in the higher education sector of host country); ○ Information on what good practice is being rolled out from the main UK site (and vice versa); ○ Information on how the international campus is represented in the institutional self-assessment process; ○ Information on what the institution takes into account when making arrangements for UK staff to work at an international campus (if applicable) ○ Information on any student exchanges that take place. <p>FDO updated that we have heard from Heriot Watt University, which has campuses in Malaysia and Dubai. She will do some more research to find others. JR suggested Warwick and Birmingham. SK suggested Nottingham had a campus in China that was successful in its own right.</p>	FDO
6	<p>Update on progress with the workstreams</p> <p>Two of the workstreams were discussed this time, and the others will be covered at the next meeting.</p> <p>Communications and engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PB asked for ideas regarding the action to collate good practice in EDI statements for funding bids to produce a repository of good practice. The group agreed this would be beneficial. • SK updated that Sarah Warner, Research Development Training Manager, is collecting these and EDI is in her remit. PB to follow up with her. 	PB

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JR explained the background to the action and need for it, including the accountability aspect and need for evaluation and measurement of commitments made in statements. • SK suggested EDI needs to have a constant conversation with research to keep them in the loop with initiatives and ensure join-up. • PB suggested we build this action into the Research Culture Road Map and will discuss with Candy Rowe. • JR suggested we pick this up through the REC research workstream too. • PB explained the need to capture the work we do to support others to improve regarding EDI and gender in particular for the action plan, and to support gold level application in future. • JR suggested we could alter the existing impact form designed by MH. FDO to explore this with MH. • SK shared that Eleanor Farrington has created an action plan where SAgE can capture where they support others, but there will always be things we don't know about. • PB suggested we could have someone from external engagement on the workstream, or USAT. PB to follow up with Louella Holdcraft. • SK shared that she had been a critical friend for a University of Edinburgh submission recently, which was successful. SK to share details. It is important to capture this type of work as evidence for our next application. <p>Wider accreditation and governance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FDO outlined actions in the workstream designed to prepare us for a future gold submission. • JR reminded the SAT that we had included in our action plan that EB members would act as champions and undertake beaconing activity. JR to discuss with AMcF. • PB noted we will need a way to capture this activity. • The group agreed to the benefit of the action to reinstate internal review panels. JR, PB and FDO to consider further. • The group agreed that a document setting out the USAT role and responsibilities would be useful, especially for new members. FDO will draft this for feedback from members. 	<p>PB</p> <p>JR</p> <p>FDO</p> <p>PB</p> <p>SK</p> <p>JR & AMcF</p> <p>JR, PB & FDO</p> <p>FDO</p>
7	<p>Updates from EDI networks</p> <p>SG shared NU Women's annual report for circulation to the group and noted the following from it:</p> <p>"This past year has seen a substantial change in the Steering Group: several individuals have left the institution, an experienced Deputy Chair became Chair of NU Parents, and other members are stepping down after over six years of service. Recognition for the labour of sitting on the Steering Group needs to be formalised across the institution (academic colleagues: workload and promotions; PS colleagues: complexities of 'volunteer' labour). The University needs a strong and diverse Steering Group constituency for the EDI networks in order to support members</p>	

	<p>across the institution. There are currently barriers to some participating in the governance of EDI networks, and the labour rests upon the shoulders of a few. As NU Women goes from strength to strength, as member numbers grow, and as the remit within the institution develops, there are challenges in terms of how to meet the needs for all members. EDI work is visible at Newcastle, but what is not always recognised is the labour behind this work. This is a significant challenge for the institution in the coming years in terms of achieving its equality and diversity goals.”</p> <p>JR shared that a paper to recognise workload of PS colleagues was approved by the People Matters Group and will next go back to UEDIC. This paper recognised the issues.</p> <p>ML updated on new training opportunities to support female Technicians into management, which has received lots of interest from NU Technicians. PB suggested we think about embedding this type of initiative into in-house development programmes for this future through Lisette Nicholson and Angela Wren.</p> <p>NU Carers is running a joint event with Northumbria Carers’ Group, Newcastle Carers and Gateshead Carers to promote Carers’ Rights Day (on 25th November). This is being hosted by NU in the Lindisfarne Room and will be open to the public along with online accessibility.</p>	PB & ML
8	<p>EDI annual report update</p> <p>PB updated that the annual EDI report for 2021 is almost complete and the plan is for it to go to EB at the end of November, then Council in December. It integrates our reporting on progress with our Equality Objectives, analysis of our workforce diversity, and our gender pay gap report.</p> <p>The group agreed that it would be useful to have a briefing on the headline findings from the workforce diversity analysis and pay gap report at a future meeting. FDO to provide this.</p> <p>CL asked about a communications plan around the launch and offered a slot in NU Connections in the new year, which was welcomed.</p>	<p>FDO</p> <p>PB & CL</p>
9	<p>AOB</p> <p>MS shared the FMS EDI video for NUMed students coming to Newcastle to inform them about EDI and culture of UK and asked if this could be replicated for the University for all international students.</p> <p>AR and JR agreed this would be beneficial. AR to share the video with the group and next steps to be considered at the next meeting.</p>	AR
10	<p>Date and time of next meeting</p> <p>Thursday 27 January 2022, 10.00 – 11.30, King’s Gate Level 5.15 plus Zoom</p>	