Physics Department Equity Working Group

Results and Recommendations from the Project Juno Survey.
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# Preamble

Project Juno is an initiative run by the UK Institute of Physics to recognise and reward physics departments that can demonstrate that they have taken action to address the under-representation of women in physics, and to encourage better departmental practises for all genders.

In October 2017 the Physics Department Equity Working Group surveyed all physics staff on their experiences and perceptions of the department relating to processes, structures, and culture that would support improving gender equity. The questions were based on October 2015 survey, which was constructed from the Project Juno Checklist – 32 items that correspond to the five Project Juno principles and key criteria. Presenting the checklist items as survey questions means that the responses reflect staff perceptions, awareness, and experiences of how the department is performing on the principles and key criteria.

Participation was invited from 61 staff associated with the Physics Department, including Post-docs; Research Fellows; Teaching Fellows; and Technical, Professional and Affiliated Staff. The last grouping includes those staff listed on the department’s webpage but not housed within the department, and other University employees affiliated with the department (e.g. through the CoREs Te Pūnaha Matatini and the Dodd-Walls Centre) and located within floors six and seven of the department. 46 responses were received. These were comprised of Professional Teaching Fellow: 2/4 (2W); Post-doc/Research Fellow: 10/14 (2W, 7M); Lecturer/Senior Lecturer: 8/11 (3W, 4M, 1T); A-Prof/Prof: 16/18 (2W, 14M); Technical/Professional/Affiliated Staff: 10/14 (7W, 3M).

Each question presented respondents with a statement corresponding to an item on the Project Juno checklist and asked respondents to rate their assessment of the extent to which the statement was reflected within the department, according to a five point scale:

A - embedded

B - adopted

C - developing

D - compliant

E - not in place

Each section of questions also provided an option for respondents to add a comment to elaborate on their response. Most questions received around 5 or 6 comments. Respondents were able to skip questions, but there was no option to click an “I don’t know” response. As a consequence, it is likely that some respondents used a middling response – C – to indicate a “don’t know” or “no perception” response rather than skipping the question. This is consistent with the low skip rate (around 2—3) for each question.

We report on the responses aggregated to the level of the nine main components covered by the Project Juno principles. We have summarised comments to avoid identifying individuals. For each component we include a table with quantitative responses for individual questions, colour-coded by quintile.

# Survey results

## **Principle 1**: A robust organisational framework to deliver equality of opportunity and reward.

### **1.1** Establish an organisational framework:

Quantitative responses were mostly middling (B: adopted - C: developing), and rarely E(not in place). Question 1.1.1a (*The Head of Department, or another senior academic, leads and champions good practice for women-in-science initiatives and programmes.)* in particularwas rated higher than in the 2015 survey.

Comments indicated that a number of staff had good intentions, and some progress was being made. However, these positive perceptions were all followed by caveats. Primarily, comments indicated that positive changes were fragile and often poorly resourced. Practices were framed as often “adopted”, but rarely “embedded” or proceduralised, which made them particularly vulnerable to disappearing. Moreover, comments indicated that good “talk” needed to be backed up by increased resource allocation, which was presented as currently lacking. Overall, responses indicated that there was support for positive changes, however this support needed to be made more routine and backed by proper resource allocation to be successful.

Quantitative summary:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| Q1a (1.1.1a) | 28% | 38% | 28% | 8% | 0% |
| Q1b (1.1.1b) | 3% | 38% | 54% | 5% | 0% |
| Q2 (1.1.2) | 5% | 28% | 49% | 8% | 10% |
| Q3 (1.1.3) | 11% | 45% | 26% | 16% | 3% |

*Figures are rounded to the nearest percentage point and therefore may not sum to 100.*

1.1.1a: The Head of Department, or another senior academic, leads and champions good practice for women-in-science initiatives and programmes. **(This one did much better this year)**

1.1.1b: Senior staff are generally committed to making change happen and “owning” the action.

1.1.2: The departmental structures for management, organisation, operations and decision-making are clear, transparent and accountable to all staff.

1.1.3: The department allocates resources (time, admin support, facilities and funding) to support women in science initiatives.

### **1.2** Monitoring and evidence base

Respondents tended to rate the collection and reporting of data in the high middling range (B: adopted – C: developing). These ratings were higher than in the 2015 survey, particularly with regards to the analysis of information on the differential representation and progression of different genders.

Qualitative responses indicated that some data is collected, however this is not always presented to staff, and is rarely embedded in planning and decision-making processes. Some responses suggested that progress had been made, however this progress was slow and often limited to certain areas (such as at undergraduate level). Limited resourcing of equity work was positioned as a key cause of a lack of progress in this domain.

Quantitative summary:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| Q4 (1.2.1) | 8% | 50% | 34% | 5% | 3% |
| Q5 (1.2.2) | 8% | 40% | 39% | 11% | 3% |

*Figures are rounded to the nearest percentage point and therefore may not sum to 100.*

1.2.1: Information on differential representation and progression, by gender (at all levels from undergraduate entrants to Professors) is analysed. **(This is much better)**

1.2.2: The department accesses and uses qualitative data gained from staff surveys, discussions, and focus groups. **(This is better)**

## **Principle 2**: Appointment and selection processes and procedures that encourage men and women to apply for academic posts at all levels

### **2.1** Ensure that processes and procedures are fully inclusive.

Responses tended to be middling (B-C) for most measures. However, responses to Q8 (*There is a departmental induction programme that introduces departmental practices and procedures to all staff, including post-doctoral researchers.)* were particularly low, clustering around C (developing) and E (not in place). Comments indicated that the induction process has been previously raised as an issue, but has not been formally implemented. One comment suggested that senior staff support and resourcing was needed to support the development of an induction programme. With regards to bias training, comments suggested that there was a period of bias training of interviewers, however this had dropped off as these practices had not been procuduralised. As with previous principles, increased resourcing and the embedding of good practices were positioned as needed to create lasting change in this area.

Quantitative summary:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| Q6 (2.1.1) | 11% | 32% | 30% | 19% | 8% |
| Q7 (2.1.2) | 14% | 27% | 41% | 14% | 5% |
| Q8 (2.1.3) | 5% | 13% | 40% | 8% | 34% |

*Figures are rounded to the nearest percentage point and therefore may not sum to 100.*

2.1.1: The department has a clear policy on how career breaks are considered in relation to appointment and selection.

2.1.2: The department ensures that all staff involved in hiring decisions have undertaken appropriate equity and diversity training so that they are aware of unconscious gender bias.

2.1.3: There is a departmental induction programme that introduces departmental practices and procedures to all staff, including post-doctoral researchers.

### **2.2** Take positive action to encourage under-represented groups to apply for jobs.

Quantitative results indicated a relatively positive view that the department proactively encourages people of all genders to apply internally for appointment. However, respondents indicated less faith that the department can identify steps and processes that actively attempt to identify and attract appropriate external candidates of all genders, with answers falling lower than in 2015. Qualitative responses indicated that there were few proactive policies, and little transparency regarding recruitment.

Quantitative summary:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| Q9 (2.2.1) | 30% | 32% | 24% | 8% | 5% |
| Q10 (2.2.2) | 16% | 30% | 40% | 5% | 8% |

*Figures are rounded to the nearest percentage point and therefore may not sum to 100.*

2.2.1: The department proactively encourages people of all genders to apply internally for appointment.

2.1.2: The department can identify steps and processes that actively attempt to identify and attract appropriate external candidates of all genders. **(This is worse)**

## **Principle 3**: Departmental structures and systems that support and encourage the career progression and promotion of all staff and enable men and women to progress and continue in their careers.

### **3.1** Transparent appraisal and development.

Quantitative responses in this section were mixed, with two measures on the appraisal of staff (Q11 and Q12) falling lower than 2015. Question 16, that the department encourages all staff (i.e. trains them and provides them with guidance) to become mentors or mentees, was rated particularly poorly.

Comments indicated that mentoring was an area of particular weakness for the Physics Department, stating that any mentoring which occurred was informal. One respondent indicated that the APR process provided semi-regular appraisal of staff, but that there was no transparency about whether mentoring was valued at all in the promotion process. The recent APR changes were seen as having made this more ambiguous. Respondents also indicated that this is an area where changes could be relatively easy to achieve, and could be modelled after other formal mentoring schemes at the University of Auckland.

Quantitative summary:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| Q11 (3.1.1) | 16% | 30% | 24% | 16% | 14% |
| Q12 (3.1.2) | 6% | 19% | 39% | 19% | 17% |
| Q13 (3.1.3a) | 3% | 16% | 24% | 18% | 39% |
| Q13 (3.1.3b) | 8% | 14% | 14% | 19% | 46% |
| Q14 (3.1.4) | 8% | 27% | 24% | 19% | 22% |
| Q15 (3.1.5) | 5% | 22% | 30% | 14% | 30% |

*Figures are rounded to the nearest percentage point and therefore may not sum to 100.*

3.1.1: All staff, including post-docs, are regularly appraised. **(This is worse)**

3.1.2: Staff are clear about what happens to appraisal documents and what follow-up action should be taken, where necessary. **(This is worse)**

3.1.3a: The department has a career development/mentoring scheme in place.

3.1.3b: The department encourages all staff (i.e. trains them and provides them with guidance) to become mentors or mentees.

3.1.4: Staff understand their responsibilities towards providing career development and career advice for research staff, including post-docs.

3.1.5: The department encourages all staff to access career advice and monitors the suitability for all staff (from post-docs to professors) of the career development training, advice and appraisal.

### **3.2** Transparent promotions processes and procedures

Responses in this section tended to be middling (B-C) to low (C-E). Comments stated that promotion processes tended to be done outside the Department, relying on University-wide processes or done at a Faculty level. Respondents indicated that these wider processes often had little transparency, particularly around whether the staffing committee had bias training. Comments also suggested that the Department’s reliance on University of Auckland processes is concerning, as the University as a whole was not seen as particularly inspirational with regards to gender equity processes. Respondents indicated that there was significant work to be done to ensure these processes were transparent, while one participant also indicated that when these processes are clear, they often did not take underlying and systemic biases into account.

Quantitative summary:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| Q16 (3.2.1a) | 14% | 24% | 38% | 16% | 8% |
| Q16 (3.2.1b) | 5% | 16% | 38% | 14% | 27% |
| Q17 (3.2.2) | 5% | 30% | 32% | 19% | 14% |
| Q18 (3.2.3) | 11% | 16% | 38% | 24% | 11% |
| Q19 (3.2.4) | 5% | 19% | 38% | 22% | 16% |

*Figures are rounded to the nearest percentage point and therefore may not sum to 100.*

3.2.1a: The department’s promotion processes and criteria for nominating candidates for promotion are well communicated, consistent, fair in application and transparent.

3.2.1b: Staff in the department are supported through the process of promotion with, for example, help in the preparation of the application and mock interviews.

3.2.2: There is a clear policy on how career breaks are considered in the promotions process.

3.2.3: Feedback is given to unsuccessful applicants for promotion.

3.2.4: The department ensures that those involved in promotion decisions have undertaken appropriate equity and diversity training.

## **Principle 4**: Departmental organisation, structure, management arrangements, and culture that are open, inclusive and transparent and encourage the participation of all staff

### **4.1** Promote an inclusive culture

Quantitative responses tended to cluster around C-D for most questions. Question 21 (*The department ensures that all staff undertake equity and diversity training and/or unconscious bias training, as part of their induction or their career development*) however, was clustered around C-E. 3 items (4.1.1, 4.1.6a, and 4.1.6b) were rated higher than in the 2015 survey, showing particular improvement in the monitoring and reporting of the gender of seminar speakers, and the seeking of speakers from under-represented groups for departmental seminars. Qualitative responses indicated that this monitoring is largely driven by individuals in the department, particularly those who are members of the equity committee, with minimal leadership from senior staff or other members of the department. Moreover, respondents suggested that international speakers in colloquia are often members of dominant groups, which raises the question of whether staff who invite international visitors are inviting women and people from ethnic minority groups.

Respondents also suggested that the lack of induction and career development activities mean that there are limited opportunities for equity training and the communication of departmental values. One respondent also indicated that they were unsure if the department values were written down, and was unaware how these values were expected to be manifested in the everyday processes of the department.

Quantitative summary:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| Q20 (4.1.1) | 22% | 35% | 24% | 8% | 11% |
| Q21 (4.1.2) | 8% | 8% | 44% | 14% | 25% |
| Q22 (4.1.3a) | 19% | 28% | 31% | 14% | 8% |
| Q22 (4.1.3b) | 19% | 19% | 39% | 14% | 8% |
| Q23 (4.1.4) | 22% | 39% | 25% | 14% | 0% |
| Q24 (4.1.5a) | 17% | 42% | 25% | 8% | 8% |
| Q24 (4.1.5b) | 11% | 33% | 39% | 8% | 8% |
| Q25 (4.1.6a) | 17% | 50% | 25% | 3% | 6% |
| Q25 (4.1.6b) | 17% | 42% | 36% | 0% | 6% |

*Figures are rounded to the nearest percentage point and therefore may not sum to 100.*

4.1.1: The department has clearly communicated values and expectations of the behaviour of individuals to each other (staff and students). **(This is better)**

4.1.2: The department ensures that all staff undertake equity and diversity training and/or unconscious bias training, as part of their induction or their career development. **(slightly better)**

4.1.3a: Social activities are encouraged and involve all staff (including part-time and non-academic staff as well as staff on sabbaticals, career breaks, long-term sick leave and maternity leave). **(Slightly better)**

4.1.3b: All staff are encouraged and supported to network at faculty, university, regional and national levels.

4.1.4: The departmental image (publicity, photographs, newsletters, job particulars, and prospectus) reflects the contribution of women and under-represented groups.

4.1.5a: Women and under-represented groups are encouraged to raise their profile internally, e.g. by contributing to departmental research seminars and presenting to research sponsors.

4.1.5b: Junior staff, including post docs, are encouraged to raise their profile internally, e.g. by contributing to departmental research seminars and presenting to research sponsors.

4.1.6a: The gender of speakers at departmental seminar programmes and other similar events is monitored and reported on. **(A lot better)**

*4.1.6b: The department aims to ensure that speakers from under-represented groups are actively sought as part of the departmental seminar programmes and similar events.* ***(A lot better)***

### **4.2** Transparent workload allocation model

Quantitative results were generally high (A-C). As in the previous 2015 survey, comments suggest a view that while the teaching allocation is transparent, other work such as service and mentoring is not so well accounted for. Some comments also indicated that

|  |
| --- |
| The departmental teaching allocation model is circulated to all staff, which is good. However, there is no discussion about how some of the numbers in that model are arrived at - some seem a little dubious and don't really match up with reality. The most recent also seemed to show a concerning lack of resourcing for equity work in the department. It is not really clear how service work is covered by the workload allocation model. There looks to be large differences in how much of this people actually do and which tasks are rewarded. There is no discussion about how tasks will be allocated and how those tasks might help people to gain experience, exposure, etc. It would be great to see discussions from mentoring (which doesn't happen) feed into discussions about workload allocation a roles and responsibilities. |
| Enough for compliance |
| There is still much to be done but my sense is that this has improved. Equity work is, still, mostly seen as a volunteer or professional staff activity, though. |
| Transparent for teaching, nothing for service |

Quantitative summary:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| Q26 (4.2.1) | 23% | 31% | 26% | 11% | 9% |
| Q27 (4.2.2a) | 3% | 34% | 40% | 9% | 14% |
| Q27 (4.2.2b) | 20% | 31% | 17% | 20% | 11% |

*Figures are rounded to the nearest percentage point and therefore may not sum to 100.*

4.2.1: The department has fair and open systems for allocating workload (teaching, administration and research) and this is reviewed regularly. The department ensures that the systems are inclusive and fully recognises and rewards all types of contributions (including administration, mentoring, pastoral work and outreach).

4.2.2a: Departmental roles and responsibilities, including committee memberships, are rotated for staff to gain experience / exposure.

*4.2.2b: The department communicates the model it uses to determine the workload allocation to all staff.*

## **Principle 5**: Flexible approaches and provisions that enable individuals, at all career and life stages, to optimise their contribution to the department, their institution and to STEM.

### **5.1** Support and promote flexible working practices

Quantitative responses here were either broadly distributed (for questions about perception of supportive attitudes) or low (for questions about concrete actions like policy and monitoring).

Comments indicated that people perceive that things have somewhat improved with regards to flexible working, but that this has happened more by accident than through any explicit effort or communicated practice. Comments also identified the lack of process and policy for offering and monitoring the uptake of flexible working, consideration for work-life balance, career breaks and maternity leave, parental and caring leave, and support for getting people back up-to-speed after a career interruption.

Several comments identified that there are individual cases where some staff appear to have negotiated their own flexible working arrangements – in particular it was remarked that senior staff demonstrate their own flexible work arrangements. However, there is no clear indication that flexible working is supported or how arranging it might be approached. This is problematic as it disadvantages certain groups such as new staff or junior staff who are more likely to lack both support and information in negotiating flexible working arrangements. This is exacerbated by an apparent lack of documentation of any existing flexible working arrangements.

Quantitative responses indicated a general positive perception of support and understanding from the department with regard to parental or caring leave, but were poor with regards to proactively managing career breaks such as maternity leave, including making allowances for those returning to get back up-to-speed.

|  |
| --- |
| It is not clear that any of the above take place in the department. I suspect that it would be possible to negotiate many things with the current HoD if one was confident to and had the opportunity. Who know whether that will continue with a future HoD, since I don't think anything is written down. Again, I think the department lets the university take a lead on these things, but don't go to any effort to operationalise UoA policies about flexible working within the dept, or to improve on any of them. |
| The head does provide leadership on this issue, in particular, and I have seen it reflected in teaching and meeting schedules. |

Quantitative summary:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| Q28 (5.1.1) | 20% | 29% | 34% | 14% | 3% |
| Q29 (5.1.2a) | 9% | 26% | 34% | 17% | 14% |
| Q29 (5.1.2b) | 6% | 20% | 34% | 14% | 26% |
| Q30 (5.1.3) | 17% | 37% | 20% | 14% | 11% |
| Q31 (5.1.4) | 14% | 14% | 29% | 29% | 14% |
| Q32 (5.1.5) | 29% | 23% | 40% | 9% | 0% |

*Figures are rounded to the nearest percentage point and therefore may not sum to 100.*

5.1.1: There is clear support from the head of department for flexible working, evidenced by personal uptake by senior staff.

5.1.2a: The department’s policy and practice on flexible working is transparent and consistently applied.

*5.1.2b:* The department monitors the take-up of flexible working options for both male and female staff.

5.1.3: The department’s management and operational arrangements reflect the department’s understanding of, and commitment to, a good work-life balance for all its staff. For example, department meetings are timed to take account of caring/family responsibilities, work allocation discussions are held with new staff to pick up work-life balance issues, and changes in caring responsibilities are dealt with in a supportive and practical way.

5.1.4: The department proactively manages arrangements in advance of, and during, career breaks or maternity leave and provides the support and flexibility to allow returners to get back up to speed. For example, by enabling individuals to focus on their research initially and/or work part-time with teaching duties limited in the first year after the break.

5.1.5: There is clear support and understanding from all members of the department, including the head, for parental and other caring leave.

|  |
| --- |
| The department seems to have lots of good intentions but is lacking of follow through. This applies to all aspects of equity and diversity, not just gender. This is probably related to lack of time resourcing, but if the department wants to get better and take these things seriously, it will have to actually front up and engage in the work. |
| More work needs doing. I’d particularly like to see us engaging with someone like Pauline Harris to integrate Māori and Pasifika cultural experiences and history into the teaching curriculum. |
| While there is often focus on the'problem' of 'senior white males' filling the professorial and technical ranks, I see this as an historical anomaly that will pass. Just observe the diversity and energy of the upcoming researchers and leading academics of the future represented by the youth of the department. I have not worked in another place that is more diverse than the Physics department, I see many different ethnicities and a even gender balance. Plus they are generally nice people who are respectful and caring of each other. Not a lot to fix here, career progression and institutional true acceptance of a range of work/life options the only notes of concern. Though this is a NZ/AUST societal characteristic that will take time to evolve. "Social change progresses one funeral at a time" to paraphrase Max Planck |
| At some point, we also need to turn our focus upon diversity and equity for other underrepresented groups, including Maori and Pacific Islanders. In addition, there are very few people from non-European countries among our staff. Training in underlying bias needs to address this issue, as I have personally heard / witnessed attitudes and comments that reflect negative assumptions about people from India, Pakistan, China, Korea and others. |
| Focus on gender far too great relative to cultural diversity |

# Summary

The survey responses revealed a number of themes that cut across the different sections of the survey. These themes reveal some strengths within the department that can be built upon, but also indicate that failings in the department often share common weaknesses. Any plans to address equity and diversity in the department should be mindful of these themes, whatever the context in which the proposed action might occur.

##### Good attitudes:

The department demonstrates some good attitudes towards improving gender equity. Several comments made mention of supportive attitudes in the department when it comes to addressing gender equity, from the HoD and from a set of colleagues. These comments were backed up by quantitative results – statements about supportive attitudes towards gender equity tended to receive more positive responses than those that related to specific actions to improve gender equity.

##### Poor follow-through:

Despite the good attitudes, comments frequently identified a lack of “walking-the-talk” when it comes to addressing gender equity in the department. The poorest quantitative responses tend to relate to those statements regarding specific actions taken within the department to address gender equity, or referring to the existence of specific processes. When respondents did identify positive action that supported gender equity, there was concern that the action was ad hoc and was typically un-documented. This means that when action does take place, the benefit of it is less than it might be – other staff members remain unaware of what is possible and the uptake of positive practises is limited.

##### Lack of information and documentation:

There is a perceived lack of information and documentation about processes, procedures, and practises and this has negative consequences for gender equity. In some cases, information may already exist within university policies but it is unclear how the policies are made operational within the department. Those processes driven by the university (e.g. APR/Evolve/PBRF), were typically seen as being better documented than those within the department or the faculty (e.g. negotiation of flexible working arrangements, support for professional development, promotion and hiring).

##### We should be more transparent:

Transparency of departmental decision making processes in general was seen to be poor, though some departmental processes, such as the workload allocation model, were seen as being reasonably transparent, even if there were reservations about how well this model reflects reality.

There is concern about a lack of consultation within the department and there is a lack of clarity about the role of the HoD advisory committee. Clarifying the role of the HoD committee has the potential to create a more effective leadership group within the department. Not all department members, or students, will always feel that they are able to directly engage with the HoD on all issues. A well-defined leadership group, that played a role in departmental decision making, could provide more avenues for people to seek information and for people to raise concerns. Department members would need to know that the HoD engages regularly with the group. A standing role, for one or more people, as deputy HoD could have a similar effect.

##### Better planning:

Responses to several sections indicated concern that the department’s approach to processes is ad hoc. Better planning can help the department be more proactive in addressing gender equity. A lack of transparent planning makes it difficult to document processes or to collect data on their performance. It also tends to exclude those staff members with weaker links within the department such as newer staff members and under-represented groups. Demonstrating planning will also help improve transparency as processes are documented and formalised.

##### We could do worse:

While the survey responses identify a number of concerns and areas where work is needed to address gender equity, and other diversity issues, in the department, there was a feeling amongst the respondents that the department is ahead of many others in the university, in demonstrating a willingness to engage positively with the issue of gender equity.

Several people noted in the final “open feedback” question that ethnic diversity within the department is another area of concern.

# Recommendations

Based on the findings above, we have formulated a set of five recommendations that are intended to help address some of the weaknesses identified. In formulating these, we have focused on points that the department can easily implement itself. We note, however, the importance of the department adopting and implementing existing University or Faculty policies and guidelines relevant to improving gender equity. This process can be facilitated by the department fully engaging with, for example, the Faculty Equity Committee and the Gender Equity Platform. Good communication between these groups and the department also means that effective initiatives within the department can spread to other parts of the University.

1. Develop and implement an induction process for new staff
   * Put together a cheat-sheet of 1-2 pages including guidelines and expectations around equity (e.g. meeting times, arranging flexible work, applying for leave and how requests will be treated). The content of this needs to be developed collegially in order to build a culture of support for the practices it covers.
   * Ensure that all new staff, at any level, are assigned a mentor for their first year of employment. Develop and document expectations for what the mentoring relationship would cover and how the mentoring process might operate. The mentor need not be from within Physics, and in many cases there may be advantages to the mentor being external to the department.
2. Establish regular staff forums to promote transparency of processes and to share information and expectations.
   * Pre-schedule monthly staff meetings as a forum to hear reports from each departmental committee (research, equity, teaching, HoD advisory group, et cetera) and discuss current issues or future plans. It is important that these be regular and clearly advertised as a forum for both information sharing and for gathering feedback.
   * The annual staff retreat (already in place) is an opportunity for staff to engage in longer term planning and to develop departmental guidelines and processes for improving gender equity. There is an opportunity to link such planning to Faculty initiatives, such as the recently launched Gender Equity Platform. We would like to suggest that in the first year, this could focus on discussing and developing departmental expectations and guidelines for gender equity at conferences associated with the department and its staff.
3. Establish regular reporting and discussion on the state of gender equity in the department. Every 2 years hold a presentation of the current state of equity. This would be a forum to report on progress by the department relating to equity. In the future, reporting would include presentation of data collected by the department, related to any processes it runs, student demographics and performance, staff demographics, colloquium speaker statistics, et cetera.

We propose that this year we should cover:

* + Presentation at a staff seminar of the work by Steven Turnbull on analysis of gender effects in student performance data; followed by discussion.
  + At one of the monthly PhD meetings, hold a similar discussion with PhD students and discuss potential initiatives with students.
  + Presentation of these survey results at a staff meeting; followed by discussion.

1. Establish guidelines for departmental expectations for *any* open recruitment processes, from selection of summer students, though to appointment of staff. These guidelines should ensure that any such processes begin by planning to ensure gender equity.

Steps might include:

* + Ensuring that people involved in the process have participated in unconscious bias training.
  + Checking that job descriptions and advertisements are worded so as to engage with under-represented groups.
  + Ensuring that data on gender is recorded at each stage of the selection process. Where these processes are led externally to the department, it will be necessary for the HoD or a senior staff member to advocate on behalf of the department to ensure that data is collected and shared.

1. Identify departmental processes where it is possible to collect data for monitoring gender equity (and other diversity relevant statistics). Document expectations about:
   * Data collection:
     + Which processes will be monitored?
     + What will be recorded?
     + Who is responsible for ensuring that data collection takes place?
   * Data use and storage:
     + Who should have access to any records?
     + How will data be stored?
     + How will the department keep track of what records it holds?
   * Data analysis and reporting:
     + How frequently will data be analysed and reported on?
     + Who will be responsible for this?