KING'S COLLEGE LONDON DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATICS ATHENA SWAN BRONZE ACTION PLAN, 9 January 2017.

Except for our action to establish a new E&D Committee, we arrange our action plan according to the 6 key challenges identified in our self-assessment.

Key Challenge Areas		
Student focussed	1. Proportion of students who are women.
	2. Attainment of female UG students.
Staff focussed	3. Proportion of staff who are women.
	4. Promotion and progression of women.
Culture and environment focussed	5. Managing career breaks and caring responsibilities.
	6. Attitudes, behaviour and inclusivity.

We also categorise each action as being primarily about:

- **governance** structures and embedding of Athena SWAN principles;
- **recruitment** of staff and students;
- **understanding** better the issues we face around gender equality;
- **support** of both staff and students in their career progression;
- **communication** of the Athena SWAN principles and related policies and opportunities, and of our expectations of our staff and students.

The matrix below shows the distribution of types of action planned within each challenge area. High priority actions are marked in our action plan with "H" (under Ref).

	Proportion of students who are women.	Attainment of female UG students.	Proportion of staff who are women.	Promotion and progression of women.	Managing career breaks and caring responsibilities.	Attitudes, behaviour and inclusivity.
Governance	1.11		3.10	4.4, 4.6, 4.11		6.1, 6.4, 6.6
Recruitment	1.3, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9		3.1, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.9			
Understanding	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.8, 1.10	2.1, 2.2	3.2, 3.8			6.9
Support		2.3, 2.4, 2.5		4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10	5.2, 5.3, 5.5	6.2, 6.3, 6.10
Communication	1.5		3.4		5.1, 5.4	6.5, 6.7, 6.8, 6.11

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure
Governance	0.1H	Department E&D Committee.	Application of E&D principles and monitoring of HR policies is not currently embedded in department management structures, rather driven by individuals (Section 5.4.(i-ii)). If good practice is linked to individuals rather than policy we risk losing the good practice if people leave, change roles etc. The new E&D Committee will ensure that consideration of E&D principles is key to the operation of the Department.	The E&D Committee will: • include senior membership and key role holders; • provide oversight and guidance on the development of policies and working practices across the department; • monitor consistency in application of related HR policies; • drive implementation of this action plan; • ensure staff are kept informed about relevant policies; • monitor all relevant data for any gender differences, including: participation in influential external committees, PGR completion data, applications for flexible working.	January 2018: Terms of Reference and membership agreed. February 2018: first meeting held.	HoD. Diversity Lead.	All relevant data regularly monitored. Minutes of all department committees show evidence of consideration of E&D aspirations. E&D aspirations explicitly referenced in all policy and practice documents, and all committee terms of reference.

Challenge 1: Proportion of students who are women

Rationale

We want to increase the proportion of our students who are women. In 2015/16 we had:
- UG: 14% women;
- PGT: 28% women;
- PGR: 27% women.

We're particularly concerned about the UG level, where we have dropped from 22% in 2012/13 to below the national benchmark of 15%.

We want to increase the proportion of applications that come from women. In 2015/16 we had:
- UG applications: 16% women;
- PGT applications: 31% women;
- PGR applications: 23% women.

We want to increase the proportion of our female UG and PGT offer holders who accept. In 2015/16:
- UG % of female offer holders who accept: 33% (vs. 35% men).
- PGT % of female offer holders who accept: 25% (vs. 31% men).

Overarching targets

Student numbers
By 2021:
- UG: 17% women.
- PGT: 30% women.
- PGR: 29% women.
By 2025:
- UG: 20% women.
- PGT: 32% women.
- PGR: 31% women.

Applications
By 2021:
- UG applications: 19% women.
- PGT applications: 33% women.
- PGR applications: 25% women.
By 2025:
- UG applications: 22% women.
- PGT applications: 35% women.
- PGR applications: 27% women.

Conversions of offers to accepts
By 2021:
- UG % of female offer holders who accept: 35%.
- PGT % of female offer holders who accept: 27%.
By 2025:
- UG % of female offer holders who accept: 37%.
- PGT % of female offer holders who accept: 29%.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Understanding	1.1 H	Investigate why women are more likely to choose "with management" programmes.	At UG and PGT, % of students on "with management" programmes who are women is significantly higher than on other programmes. If we can understand reasons for this we can try to make all our programmes more attractive to women, and can preserve the attractive qualities of these programmes when we undertake our teaching portfolio review (Action 1.9).	Further interrogation of data to see if there is any interplay with other characteristics such as nationality.	By July 2018.	Diversity Lead.	Reasons why "with management" programmes attract higher % of women understood. Programmes modified to be more attractive to women. Increase in % of applications from women at UG and PGT levels.
				Survey and focus groups with UG and PGT students on reasons for choosing programme.	February 2018 – April 2018.	Diversity Lead.	
				Report on what attracts women to "with management" programmes.	July 2018.	Diversity Lead.	
Understanding	1.2 H	Investigate why women are more likely than men to decline offers.	Women are less likely than men to accept offers (UG and PGT). We do not know why this is.	Survey UG and PGT women and men who decline offers to explore reasons not to come to King's and to understand any gender difference.	From June 2018.	Diversity Lead. With support from Faculty Senior Marketing Officer.	Better understanding of why women less likely than men to accept offers. Action plan updated accordingly to better target reasons why women less likely than men to accept offers.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Recruitment	1.3	Student recruitment material specifically aimed at women.	Current material does not highlight support aimed at women and we do not currently do anything to specifically target female offer holders.	Material to include: • KCL Women in STEM student society; • our Amazon Women in Innovation Bursary scheme; • NMS Women in Science scholarships; • what it is like to be a female student in Informatics; • female role models from Informatics; • women in Informatics lunches (Action 6.3); • Department's core values and expected behaviours (Action 6.6).	From April 2018: circulated to potential applicants. From July 2018: circulated to all offer holders. November 2018: material updated with Department's core values and expected behaviours.	UG, PGT and PGR Admissions Tutors. Information Strategy Lead. With support from Faculty Senior Marketing Officer.	When surveyed after enrolment, women indicate positive effect of material. Increase in % of applications coming from women. Increase in % of women who accept offers.
Understanding	1.4	Online question and answer sessions for female offer holders with current female students.	We do not currently do anything to specifically target female offer holders. Current students can encourage offer holders to join King's in a relatable way.	Q&A session to be held once a year for UG and PGT students. Members of student societies to be encouraged to participate.	From April 2019.	UG and PGT Admissions Tutors. Information Strategy Lead. With support from Faculty Senior Marketing Officer.	When surveyed after enrolment, women indicate positive effect of sessions. Increase in % of applications coming from women. Increase in % of women who accept offers.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Communication	1.5 H	"Why study at KCL Informatics" webpages.	Current material does not highlight the breadth of support and opportunities available, nor that the Department values inclusivity and diversity.	To include interviews and blogs with diverse students and information about: • range of social and extra-curricular activities; • student societies based in Informatics; • support structures in place; • inclusive and friendly nature of the Department; • Department's core values and expected behaviours (Action 6.6).	April 2018: Webpages in place November 2018: updated with Department's core values and expected behaviours.	UG, PGT and PGR Admissions Tutors. Information Strategy Lead. With support from Faculty Senior Marketing Officer.	When surveyed after enrolment, women indicate positive effect of webpages. High number of page visits (>60% of the number of visits to our "About us" page). Increase in % of applications coming from women. Increase in % of women who accept offers.
Recruitment	1.6	Coordinated outreach scheme targeted at girls.	Current outreach activities are ad hoc, reactive to requests, do not particularly target women and are not well-monitored or evaluated; their effectiveness is unclear.	To be developed in a principled manner, through consultation with other relevant departments with successful schemes such as Liverpool and UCL.	November 2017 – September 2018: consultation with other universities. January 2020: scheme in place.	Widening Participation Coordinator. With support from the Faculty Senior Outreach Officer.	Qualitative feedback shows positive influence of outreach on schoolgirls. Longitudinal study shows influence of outreach on career choices.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Recruitment	1.7 H	Marketing campaign for new engineering programmes to highlight project-based learning approach and its benefits.	Evidence suggests women in particular thrive with project-based learning approach.	Recruitment material to highlight project-based learning, with evidence of the benefits.	May 2019 (for first entry in 2020/21).	Vice Dean (Technology). Information Strategy Lead. With support from Faculty Senior Marketing Officer.	% of applications to our engineering programmes coming from women is 3% higher than national benchmark (for engineering). When surveyed after enrolment, women indicate positive effect of material.
				Recruitment material also includes interviews with diverse students.	May 2021.		
Understanding	1.8 H	Monitor impact of new engineering programmes on recruitment of women.	We need to collect data in order to understand the impact of any decisions we make with these new programmes, so as to identify any best practice.	Data routinely collected and analysed annually.	From May 2020 (first year of the programmes).	UG Admissions Tutor.	Good practice adopted on other programmes. Increase in % of applications coming from women on all programmes.
				Report on how other programmes can be improved based on findings from above.	December 2022.	DepHoD(Ed). E&D Committee	

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Recruitment	1.9 H	Diversity to be explicit consideration in teaching portfolio review.	We have seen that women are disproportionately attracted to our "with management" programmes. We want to ensure our teaching portfolio attracts a diverse cohort.	Review carried out, taking account of the findings from Action 1.1.	August 2018.	DepHoD(Ed).	Increase in % of students who are women.
				Identification of any opportunities to increase diversity and of any changes planned that may negatively affect diversity.	September 2018.	DepHoD(Ed). E&D Committee	
				Actions devised to take advantage of any opportunities and to mitigate against any negative effects and added to the action plan.	October 2018.	DepHoD(Ed). E&D Committee	
Understanding	1.10	Collect and monitor data relating to recruitment of DTP and GTS positions.	We do not currently collect this data so we cannot monitor for bias in recruitment.	Applications data routinely collected and analysed. Where any evidence of bias found, actions implemented to address this.	Data monitored from January 2018.	PGR Admissions Tutors. DepHoD(Res).	Any bias in recruitment of DTPs and GTSs is identified and actions added to the action plan to address this.
				Actions to address any bias identified from October 2019.		DepHoD(Res). E&D Committee	

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Governance	1.11	Formalise process for DTP and GTS recruitment.	We have no policy around how DTPs and GTSs are recruited, meaning we cannot be sure that Athena SWAN principles are being adhered to.	Process should include: • how positions are advertised; • eligibility requirements; • shortlisting and interview process.	September 2018.	DepHoD(Res).	Consideration of E&D explicit in process. Introduction of process shows reduction in any bias identified for 1.10.

Challenge 2: Attainment of female UG students

Rationale

We have identified a gender attainment gap at the UG level. Across the period 2012/13 – 2015/16, at UG level:
- women are less likely than men to get a first (p-value 0.0036);
- women are less likely than men to get either a first or an upper second class (p-value 0.0003).

Overarching target

By 2021, no statistically significant difference in the performance of men and women at UG level.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Understanding	2.1 H	Thorough investigation of gender attainment gap.	Reasons for attainment gap are currently unclear. We need to identify underlying cause, as well as any confounding factors, in order to target actions effectively.	To include: • investigation of impact of other characteristics such as ethnicity, socio-economic background and entrance qualifications; • module level analysis; • analysis of students who do not progress; • analysis of students who do not achieve intended degree.	January 2018 -April 2018: Work with central analytics team to ensure useful progression and completion data.	Diversity Lead.	As consequence of better understanding of the problem, targeted actions developed and added to action plan. No statistically significant difference in performance of men and women on UG programmes.
					Investigation complete by July 2018.	Diversity Lead. With support from Faculty E&D Coordinator.	
					By September 2018: Action plan updated with targeted actions based on findings from above.	E&D Committee	

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Understanding	2.2 H	Monitor impact of new engineering programmes on performance of women.	We need to collect data in order to understand the impact of project-based learning approach, so as to identify any best practice.	Data routinely collected and analysed annually.	From July 2021 (first year of new programmes).	Director of Engineering Programmes. With support from Programme Administrators.	Good practice adopted on other programmes. No statistically significant difference in performance of men and women on UG programmes.
				Report on how other programmes can be improved based on findings from above.	December 2024.	Diversity Lead.	
Support	2.3	Peer support initiative.	Peer support has been shown to be an effective way of improving women's confidence and performance.	Possible schemes investigated for suitability to our Department.	September 2017 – March 2018.	UG Senior Tutor. Student engagement lead. With support from Programme Administrators and from the Disability Advisory Service.	40% of women UG students participate in scheme. Qualitative feedback (gathered from survey and focus groups) indicates positive effects of the scheme on women. Improvement in performance of women participating in the scheme.
				Scheme in place for UG students.	September 2018.		
				Investigate whether such a scheme could benefit PGT or PGR students, with a view to extending it to these groups if perceived to be beneficial.	September 2018 – March 2019	PGR Senior Tutors. PGT Senior Tutors.	

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Support	2.4	Funding for women students to attend the womENcourage conference[1].	Attendance at women focussed events like this has been shown to increase women's confidence, passion and performance. Women students report that they want more access to female role models.	Policy in place for allocation of funding for up to 5 students at year.	February 2018.	HoD.	5 women sent to womENcourage each year. Qualitative feedback (gathered from survey and interviews) indicates positive effects of attendance. Improvement in performance of women attending the conference.
				First allocation made.	June 2018.	E&D Committee.	
Support	2.5 H	Encourage female students to attend hackathons and other extra-curricular events.	Working in teams at events such as hackathons has been shown to improve female students' confidence and thus performance. Our female students have reported that being in such a minority is intimidating and makes it uncomfortable for them to participate in events such as these.	Through working closely with our student societies to improve the inclusivity of their events.	January 2018 – March 2018: Discussions with student societies to determine ways of making events more inclusive. May 2018: plan to improve inclusivity of events agreed.	Diversity Lead. Student Community Manager.	Increase in % of participants who are women.

---

[1] This annual ACM Europe Celebration of Women in Computing is "a scientific event, as well as an event aimed at networking and exploring career opportunities for women in computer science and related disciplines. This conference brings together undergraduate and graduate students, as well as researchers and professionals, to present and share their achievements and experience in computer science." https://womencourage.acm.org/2017/02/01/about/

Challenge 3: Proportion of staff who are women

Rationale

During the period 2012/13 – 2015/16, the proportion of our academic staff who are women has remained reasonably steady, at around 22% (FTE: ≈10 – 11), just over the national benchmark of 21%, and the proportion of our research staff who are women has grown from 17% (FTE: 3.9) to 23% (FTE: 6.1), just above the national benchmark of 22%.

We are especially concerned about the proportion of our senior staff who are women: the percentage of our professors who are women has dropped from 13% (FTE: 2) to 11% (FTE: 1.2), below the national benchmark of 13%; and since September 2012 we have recruited for 7 professor posts, which were all appointed to men.

Overarching targets

Research staff
By 2021:
- 25% women.
By 2025:
- 27% women.

Academic staff
By 2021:
- 24% women.
By 2025:
- 26% women.

Professors
By 2021:
- 20% women professors (ca. 4 FTE).
By 2025:
- 22% women professors (ca. 7 FTE).

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Recruitment	3.1 H	All relevant job adverts to be circulated to staff and PGR students.	When people are redeployed within the department it can be as a result of connections and networking rather than a particular process.	Recruitment process redefined to include this.	From January 2018.	Diversity Lead. HoD. With support from Senior Departmental Coordinator.	Data shows men are no more likely than women to be redeployed within Department.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Understanding	3.2 H	Ensure gender-related recruitment data is recorded.	We need reliable data to allow us to identify any bias in our processes and to measure the effectiveness of our actions. While central HR are meant to collect this data, our experience is that this is not done reliably.	As this is a central process, we first need commitment from senior members of the university to prioritise this. Then we need to work with HR to ensure they understand what data we need, and to help make sure the process functions effectively.	From December 2017: meetings with HR and Central D&I team to discuss process. From February 2018: recruitment data effectively recorded.	Diversity Lead. Faculty E&D Coordinator. Central HR Department. College Director of Diversity.	Complete data available for >80% of recruited posts.
Recruitment	3.3 H	Recruitment agency to prioritise diverse shortlists.	Since September 2012, we have recruited 7 professors, all male. Our planned strategic growth provides an opportunity to recruit more senior posts and the university has committed to supporting this process by providing access to a recruitment agency who will help identify suitable candidates.	Recruitment agency should commit to putting forward at least 1 strongly recommended woman on each shortlist.	From November 2017.	HoD. Vice Principal Arts & Sciences.	Shortlists for professor positions contain at least one woman. Women appointed to professor roles.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Communication	3.4 H	Webpages highlight our Athena SWAN activities and family friendly policies.	Webpages do not highlight our work around, or commitment to, equality, diversity and inclusion.	Comprehensive webpages detailing our Athena SWAN plans and progress to date.	February 2018.	Diversity Lead. With support from the Faculty E&D officer.	When surveyed after appointment, women indicate positive effect of webpages. Number of page visits >60% of visits to "About us" page. Increase in % of applications coming from women.
				Webpages include case studies of diverse staff and what it is like to work in Department.	December 2018.		
Recruitment	3.5 H	Department to offer to pay caring costs incurred by visiting interviewees.	We do not currently show any consideration of caring responsibilities when coming to interview. This will highlight to potential applicants our commitment to E&D.	Budget and process for this agreed and in place for recruitment of academic staff.	February 2018.	HoD. With support from Senior Departmental Coordinator.	Take up of offer from applicants. Increase in % of applications coming from women.
				Investigation of feasibility and benefit of fund to support recruitment of research staff and professional services staff, with a view to extend the scheme if deemed beneficial.	April – September 2018.		
Recruitment	3.6 H	All job descriptions to be reviewed for inclusive language.	Evidence shows that the use of gendered language in job adverts can put women off from applying.[2] While Faculty guidelines encourage review of job descriptions for gendered language, consultation in the Department shows staff are unaware of this.	Job description language to be reviewed for inclusivity and accessibility, with the help of a gendered language decoder website: http://gender-decoder.katmatfield.com To be monitored as part of recruitment process.	From December 2017.	Diversity Lead. With support from Senior Departmental Coordinator.	All job descriptions recorded as having been reviewed. Increase in % of applications coming from women.

---

[2] D. Gaucher, J. Friesen and A. C. Kay. Evidence That Gendered Wording in Job Advertisements Exists and Sustains Gender Inequality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(1), p109-28, 2011.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Recruitment	3.7 H	All jobs to be circulated to at least one mailing list that targets women.	While Faculty guidelines encourage this, consultation in the Department shows staff are unaware of this expectation.	Post manager to confirm that they have done this, otherwise to provide a reason why not.	From July 2018.	Diversity Lead. With support from Senior Departmental Coordinator.	>90% of job descriptions recorded as having been circulated to at least one mailing list that targets women; for others, justification for non-circulation recorded. Increase in % of applications coming from women.
Understanding	3.8	Maintain a list of how many interview panels staff have sat on.	Since June 2014, 26% of interview panels for research staff have not included any women. Some women are overburdened by having to sit on interview panels. By maintaining such a list, people can more easily identify who to ask to join a panel, and people can accurately identify whether they have sat on more than the expected number of interview panels.	To be made available on intranet, together with average number of interview panels sat on, to allow people to accurately judge who is being overburdened. Guidelines to be developed around how to use list (e.g., to decide when to turn down/agree to a request; to decide who to approach).	From August 2018.	Senior Departmental Coordinator.	Reduction in % of interview panels that do not contain a woman. Data shows reduction in women who are overburdened by agreeing to sit on interview panels.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Recruitment	3.9	Staff at one grade below post being recruited to be allowed as member of interview panel.	Currently, one member of the interview panel can be at the same grade as post being recruited. Relaxing this constraint would make it easier to include women on interview panels, and would provide valuable career development opportunities for staff who would benefit from a better understanding of the kind of competition and expectations for a post at the grade above them.	This is determined by the central HR department. We will coordinate with other academic departments in the university and jointly prepare a statement lobbying for this change which we will submit to central management.	Statement to be submitted by May 2018.	E&D Committee.	Change in university policy is implemented. Reduction in % of interview panels that do not contain a woman. Data shows reduction in women who are overburdened by having to sit on interview panels.
Governance	3.10 H	Ensure female representation on committees.	While we currently have good female representation on our committees, given our low numbers of senior women there is a danger (especially for Executive Group, whose academic membership is only the HoD and Deputy HoDs) that we may in future end up with all-male influential committees.	If role holders are such that we have an all-male committee, HoD to identify women to invite to join.	From November 2017.	HoD.	No all-male committees.

Challenge 4: Promotion and progression of women

Rationale

Our pipelines (Figure 23) indicate that there are barriers to women progressing to professor level. The percentage of our professors who are women has dropped from 13% (FTE: 2) to 11% (FTE: 1.2), below the national benchmark of 13%.

During the period 2012/13 – 2015/16, 21% (headcount: 14) of eligible men applied for promotion but only 17% (headcount: 4) of eligible women applied to promotion; men who applied were also more likely to be successful than women, 86% of men who applied (12/14) were successful, while only 50% of women who applied (2/4) were.

Results from the 2015 university staff survey: 68% of Informatics staff who do not identify as male (vs. 86% of male Informatics staff) agreed that "King's acts fairly, regardless of ethnic background, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability, age, marriage and civil partnership, or pregnancy and maternity/paternity with regard to career progression/promotion".

Overarching targets

By 2021:
- 20% women professors (ca. 4 FTE).
- When surveyed, 80% of women agree that King's acts fairly with regard to career progression/promotion.
- No difference in application for promotion rates between men and women.
- No difference in promotion success rates between men and women.

By 2025:
- 22% women professors (ca. 7 FTE).

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Support	4.1 H	Formalise mentoring scheme, for all staff.	New academic staff are meant to be allocated a mentor but consultation and review of processes show: • allocation is inconsistent; • role of mentor is unclear; • allocated mentor may have appraisal relationship with mentee; • research staff would also like a mentor. Some staff who are not new would also like access to mentoring. The university runs mentoring schemes for underrepresented groups such as women, but people can only apply for this scheme once a year.	All new staff to be allocated mentor. All staff to be able to put themselves forward for a mentor. Mentors not to have appraising responsibilities for mentee. To include guidance on what to expect from the relationship and how to get the most out of it.	From April 2018.	HoD.	>30% of women being mentored. Qualitative feedback shows positive impact of mentoring relationship. Longitudinal study shows positive impact of mentoring on career prospects.
Support	4.2 H	Department promotions panel.	Given diversity and size of department, it is unrealistic to expect the HoD to provide a balanced view of performance of all staff. A diverse panel will allow the supporting statement and the advice given to potential applicants to be more balanced.	Panel to include female representation. Remit is: • to identify and support staff who may be ready to apply; • to provide guidance on applications; • to provide diverse input into the HoD's supporting statement.	First panel held in November 2017.	HoD.	Qualitative feedback, gathered through surveys, shows positive impact of panel, especially on women. Increase in proportion of female staff who successfully apply for promotion.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Support	4.3	Women who are identified as being nearly ready to go for promotion to be offered promotion mentoring sessions with a senior member of staff.	Women in the Department are less likely than men to apply for promotion and less likely than men to be successful when they do apply.	Department promotions panel responsible for identifying such women, including women who are unsuccessful at promotion or recommended to wait before applying, and women who may not have considered putting themselves forward.	From November 2018.	HoD. Department promotions panel.	At least 1 woman takes up the mentoring every 2 years and is successfully promoted within 3 years.
Governance	4.4 H	Head of Research Group Terms of Reference to include: • responsibility to provide training; • responsibility to encourage staff to receive a PDR; • to be appointed for a term of four years; • responsibility to promote fair and equitable treatment of members; • responsibility to ensure diversity of speakers is considered when organising events.	We do not currently have defined Terms of Reference for our Heads of Research Groups. The SAT has identified inconsistency in support provided by different groups. 2015/16: only 47% of eligible research staff received a PDR. While the role offers potential for Senior Lecturers and above to develop their leadership experience, some staff have stayed in the role for many years, meaning it is not been possible for other staff to take up the opportunity. In 2015/16, only 28% of seminar speakers were women. In 2016/17, only 25% of seminar speakers were women.	Head of Group roles open to senior lecturers and above. Expressions of interest invited and all group members (including PhD students and Research staff) consulted on appointment.	Terms of Reference defined by November 2017. Implemented January 2018.	HoD. Heads of Research Groups.	Qualitative feedback shows improvement of research group culture and support, especially for PhD students and more junior staff members. 100% of staff complete PDR. By 2022, at least 2 more women have held the Head of Research Group role. By 2019, >40% of seminar speakers are women.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Support	4.5	PDR reviewers to undergo relevant training.	University provides some training but it is hard to book a place on this. 2015/16: 23% of reviewers had taken recommended training. 2015 university staff survey: 59% of Informatics staff who do not identify as male agreed their PDR was useful.	Take up of university training to be monitored. Explore possibility of Faculty specific training to be provided by Organisational Development unit. Reviewers not taking up training to be followed up by HoD.	Faculty specific training offered annually from June 2018.	HoD. With support from the Faculty professional services team.	>80% of reviewers take recommended training. >80% of women agree their PDR was useful.
Governance	4.6	Formal policy for DTP and GTS allocation.	PGR students help academic staff to progress their research, but funding is often a barrier to recruiting PGR students. There is no policy for allocation of DTPs and GTSs, which can be affected by lobbying from potential supervisors, and professors have been 1.4 times more likely to be receive such funded students than non-professors.	Excellence of candidate to be primary consideration. In case there are multiple well-qualified incomparable candidates, policy to provide guidelines for selecting which potential supervisor should receive allocation.	May 2018: Policy in place. From May 2018: Allocation data routinely analysed.	DepHoD(Res).	In the case of multiple well-qualified incomparable candidates, reasons for selecting supervisor for allocation are clear and adhere to policy. Data shows women are not disadvantaged by policy.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Support	4.7	Training for applying for: • lectureships; • fellowships.	Informal feedback shows that university-level training not always relevant to our staff. 2015 consultation with research staff showed desire for better support around applying for lectureships and fellowships.	To be developed in collaboration with King's Researcher Development Unit. Open to PGR students as well as research staff. Destinations of leaving research staff and PGR students to be recorded so that impact of this training can be measured.	From March 2018: research staff and PGR students leaving the Department to be surveyed about their destination.	Diversity Lead. With support from Senior Departmental Coordinator and from PGR Programme Administrators.	>50% of women research staff take up training. Qualitative feedback shows benefits of training. Destination data shows benefits of training.
					March 2018 – November 2018: Consultation with research staff and PGR students to establish what is needed.	Research Staff Tutor.	
					September 2019: Training in place.	Research Staff Tutor.	

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Support	4.8	Process for matching research staff with academic staff for whom they could deliver a lecture.	2015 consultation with research staff showed desire for more significant teaching opportunities. Opportunities to deliver a lecture typically depend on PI.	Should provide opportunities for research staff to deliver lectures within their expertise. Academic staff responsible for module to provide guidance and feedback.	From September 2018.	Research Staff Tutor.	>30% of female research staff take up opportunity. Qualitative feedback shows benefits of scheme. When surveyed, research staff report satisfaction with available teaching opportunities.
Support	4.9 H	Intranet to include information for research staff on how they can strengthen their CV.	Informal consultation with staff shows that the opportunity for research staff to act as PI/Researcher Co-I on grants is not well known.	To include both university-wide and Department-specific opportunities.	From May 2018: Page in place and maintained. May 2019: Case studies added.	Research Staff Tutor.	High number of page visits (equal to number of research staff). Qualitative feedback shows research staff are satisfied with available development opportunities.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Support	4.10	Encourage students to participate in university mentoring scheme.	The university runs a mentoring scheme that connects UG, PGT and PGR students with alumni mentors. This scheme is not well known in the Department and is not advertised in the Department's student handbook. Currently 4 Informatics students (1 woman, 3 men) participate.	To be advertised in the Handbook, and via social media, personal tutors and student societies.	From September 2018.	UG, PGT and PGR Senior Tutors. With support from Senior Programme Administrator.	>10 women from Informatics participate in scheme. Qualitative feedback shows positive benefits of scheme.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Governance	4.11H	Workload allocation model used to inform workload allocation.	2015 university staff survey: • 91.7% of Informatics staff who do not identify as male (vs. 78.9% of male Informatics staff) agree with "I have had to put in a lot of extra time in the last 12 months to meet the demands of my workload" • 62.5% of Informatics staff who do not identify as male (vs. 47.4% of male Informatics staff) agree with "I find my current workload too much and am struggling to cope". There is a perception that some individuals, some research groups, and junior members of staff have previously been overburdened. While we now have a model, this has yet to be used to its best effect in workload allocation and analysis of workload for 2017/18 shows allocation is unbalanced.	HoD to refer to model when allocating workload. Model also to be referred to when identifying people to ask to perform service tasks such as attending open days or participating in recruitment panels.	From 2018/19.	HoD.	Staff whose load is significantly different from the norm are identified. Justification for this variation is recorded and agreed between the member of staff and HoD. When surveyed: • decrease in % of female staff who agree with "I have had to put in a lot of extra time in the last 12 months to meet the demands of my workload" • decrease in % of female staff who agree with "I find my current workload too much and am struggling to cope".

Challenge 5: Managing career breaks and caring responsibilities

Rationale

From the 2015 university staff survey: 89% of Informatics staff who do not identify as male agree that King's treats people on their merits regardless of their pregnancy or maternity/paternity (vs. 95% of Informatics staff who identify as male).

From the 2014 NMS staff survey: 50% of women and 65% of men think Informatics is extremely or very supportive of staff facing/planning a career break.

Overarching targets

By 2021:
- When surveyed, > 95% of women think King's treats people on their merits regardless of their pregnancy or maternity/paternity.
- When surveyed, > 90% of women think Informatics is extremely or very supportive of staff facing/planning a career break.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Communication	5.1 H	Induction process to cover flexible working and other family friendly policies.	Induction process does not currently ensure staff are informed of various family friendly policies.	Family friendly policies to be collected on a webpage. Induction checklist to ensure this page is highlighted to new staff.	January 2019.	Diversity Lead. With support from Senior Departmental Coordinator.	When surveyed, new staff report that their induction gave them the information they needed to understand the family friendly policies in place.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Support	5.2 H	Academic staff returning from career break to receive formal relief in workload allocation.	Current workload allocation model only commits to relief if possible. Planned increase in staff numbers should make it possible to commit to this in all cases.	For all staff returning from extended career break, including long-term sick, caring, maternity, adoption and shared parental leave. To be publicised so that it can be factored into life decisions.	From September 2019.	HoD.	All eligible staff receive relief in workload allocation. Qualitative feedback (gathered through surveying recipients 6 and 18 months after return) shows positive impact of relief.
Support	5.3	Department fund for PGR students' additional care costs resulting from career development opportunities or Keeping In Touch days.	The university provides funding for academic, research and professional services staff to cover additional care costs incurred as a result of attending career development opportunities or Keeping In Touch days, but PGR students cannot apply to this fund.	To follow the university Carers' Career Development fund model.	From June 2018.	Dep.HoD(Res).	Take up of fund. When recipients are surveyed, qualitative feedback shows positive impact of fund.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Communication	5.4H	Better guidance around pregnancy/adoption related career breaks.	Review of current information showed: • lack of guidance for PhD supervisors of PGR students facing career break; • no advice regarding shared parental leave, paternity leave or adoption leave; • difficult to navigate the many relevant university policies; • hard to find relevant funders' policies and to understand how these might apply on a case by case basis.	To be coordinated at Faculty level. To include: • information on adoption leave, shared parental and paternity leave; • advice for PhD supervisors; • clear information about different funders' policies; • case studies of how others have managed career breaks.	By September 2018: information and guidance in place. By September 2020: case studies added.	Faculty E&D Officer.	Qualitative feedback shows positive impact of information (gathered through university staff survey and through surveying staff who take career breaks).
Support	5.5H	Staff transitioning from part-time back to full-time after a career break to receive phased increase in workload allocation and to be allocated a mentor.	We currently have nothing in place to support staff in transitioning from part-time back to full-time after a career break.	Phased increase in workload to be formalised as part of workload allocation model. To be publicised so that it can be factored into life decisions.	From March 2019: to be allocated a mentor (through Department mentoring scheme, action 4.1). From September 2019: phased increase in workload allocation.	HoD.	Qualitative feedback shows positive impact of policy (gathered through surveying part-time staff and particularly staff who transition from part-time to full-time).

Challenge 6: Attitudes, behaviour and inclusivity.

Rationale

Female student focus groups (2017) raised issues including microagressions, lack of access to female role models, feeling uncomfortable participating when in the minority and sexist online behaviour.

From the 2015 university staff survey: 79% of Informatics staff who do not identify as male agree they feel valued by their colleagues (vs. 97% of male Informatics staff); 91% of Informatics staff who do not identify as male agree they feel valued by their colleagues (vs. 97% of male Informatics staff); 2 members of staff reported that they were currently being harassed or bullied at work (1 male, 1 who did not identify as male); 4 members of staff reported that they had felt discriminated against at work in the past 12 months (2 male, 2 who did not identify as male).

Overarching targets

By 2021:
- Qualitative feedback gathered from focus groups and survey indicates that female students find the culture in the Department to be inclusive.
- When surveyed, > 95% of female staff agree they feel valued by their colleagues and students.
- 0 staff report being bullied, harassed or discriminated against at work.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Governance	6.1 H	Standard induction process for research staff.	There is no standard induction process for research staff. PIs are expected to provide induction, meaning experience is inconsistent.	Includes checklist for PI to complete and return to Department Manager.	Process in place January 2019.	HoD. With support from Department Manager.	Records show 100% of research staff receive induction. Qualitative feedback shows positive effect of induction on research staff.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Support	6.2 H	Cake morning once a semester to welcome new staff to the Department.	When surveyed, members of staff appointed in past 3 years reported that induction process did not help them to meet their colleagues.	For all new staff. To be arranged so that key members of existing staff can attend. To be advertised well in advance so that as many members of existing staff as possible can attend.	From February 2018.	HoD. With support from Department Oficer.	High levels of attendance (>20% of staff). Qualitative feedback shows new staff more likely to agree that induction process helps them to meet their colleagues.
Support	6.3 H	Regular women's lunches.	Findings from student focus groups indicate: • female students can find it hard to participate in these typically male-dominated events; • perceived inconsistency of support from personal tutors/supervisors; • lack of access to female role models. Regular lunches such as this should allow an informal support network to develop. It will provide female staff and students with: • access to role models and informal careers advice; • professional networking opportunities; • a forum to raise E&D issues.	To happen twice a semester. All staff and students who identify as a woman or have a non-binary gender identity to be invited.	From March 2018.	Diversity Lead. With support from Department Officer.	>20% women staff attend. >20% women students attend. Qualitative feedback shows positive impact of lunches.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Governance	6.4 H	Where groups of students are assigned (e.g., tutor groups, labs, group projects) we do not assign groups with a single woman student.	Some female students are put off participating in group activities because of underrepresentation of women.	Timetabling constraints may mean this is not always possible, but wherever possible, to include tutor groups, labs, small group tutorials, group projects.	From September 2018.	Dep.HoD(Ed). With support from the Senior Programme Administrator.	Qualitative feedback (gathered by focus groups and survey) indicates female students are less affected by the underrepresentation of women and more comfortable participating in group activities.
Communication	6.5	Clearer information on support students can expect from their personal tutor and better monitoring of this support.	Female students perceive inconsistencies in support provided by different personal tutors. Currently, if a personal tutor does not arrange the required number of meetings with their tutees they are sent automated reminder emails but there is no further follow up.	Information to include mechanisms to complain. UG and PGT Senior Tutors to follow up with personal tutors who are not arranging meetings with their tutees to find out why. If a problem with a personal tutor is identified, this is to be reported to HoD.	From November 2017: Senior Tutors to follow up with personal tutors who are not arranging meetings with their tutees. From September 2019: information in place.	UG and PGT Senior Tutors. With support from Senior Programme Administrator.	Qualitative feedback (gathered by focus groups and survey) indicates improvement in female students' perception of support provided by personal tutors.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Governance	6.6 H	Definition of the Department's values and associated expected behaviours.	Female students at all levels report problems with inappropriate and sexist comments being posted on various social media platforms, and pervasive incidences of microaggressions. Women staff less likely than men to: • feel valued by their colleagues; • feel valued by their students; • agree that King's is committed to creating an inclusive environment. Some staff report they are being harassed or bullied, or have felt discriminated against.	Department's values to be co-created with staff and students, and other external stakeholders (such as potential students and industry). Associated behaviours to be identified that embody those values, also through co-creation with staff and students.	January 2018 – August 2018: co-creation of the Department's values and associated behaviours, through a series of events, focus groups and activities. September 2018: Plan in place to embed Department's values and behaviours throughout recruitment and marketing material, as well as webpages, publicity, policy and our environment. Campaign to expose staff and students to values and behaviours throughout the year.	Diversity Lead. HoD. DepHoD (Technology).	Qualitative feedback (gathered by focus groups and survey) indicates reduction in inappropriate and sexist online comments, reduction in occurrences of microagression, and increased satisfaction of female students with Department culture. When surveyed: • >95% of women staff feel valued by their colleagues; • >95% of women staff feel valued by their students; • >95% of women agree that King's is committed to creating an inclusive environment. No staff report they are being harassed or bullied, or have felt discriminated against.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Communication	6.7 H	Compulsory online student training module on expectations of behaviour in Informatics.	Female students at all levels report problems with inappropriate and sexist comments being posted on various social media platforms, and pervasive incidences of microagressions	To include expected behaviour, potential impact of inappropriate behaviour, unconscious and conscious bias, how to directly address or report harassment, support available. To be co-created with students and implemented by an external provider. This is being developed in collaboration with colleagues from Departments of Chemistry and War Studies, financial support from our faculties' teaching funds has been sought for this.	Available to students from January 2019.	Diversity Lead.	Qualitative feedback (gathered by focus groups and survey) indicates reduction in inappropriate and sexist online comments, reduction in occurrences of microagression, and increased satisfaction of female students with Department culture.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Communication	6.8	Guidance on how students can deal with incidents of harassment or intimidation that occur at a non-King's event (such as a conference) and how the Department can support them with this.	Student focus group highlighted female students' experiences of harassment and intimidation at external events and the challenges they face in dealing with this	To include practical advice on how to deal with this oneself, but also information about how members of the Department or university can help deal with such situations.	From January 2019.	PGR Senior Tutors.	Qualitative feedback (gathered by focus groups and survey) indicates positive impact of this guidance.
Understand	6.9 H	Working group to investigate bullying, harassment and discrimination of staff.	2015 staff survey: • 2 staff reported currently being harassed or bullied (1 male, 1 who did not identify as male); • 4 staff reported that they had felt discriminated against in past 12 months (2 male, 2 who did not identify as male).	Addressing harassment and bullying among staff is a priority of the Faculty Equality & Diversity Committee. This working group will explore ways of better understanding the problem and feed into the Faculty level work.	To be established in March 2018	Diversity Lead. Faculty E&D Officer.	Qualitative feedback (gathered by survey) indicates reduction in numbers of staff reporting experiences of bullying, harassment and discrimination.

	Ref	Action	Rationale	Implementation	Timeframe	Responsibility	Success measure(s)
Support	6.10	Fund to cover caring costs incurred by attendance at Department social events.	The main Informatics staff and PGR social events (winter and summer parties) typically start at 4pm, which makes it harder for people with caring responsibilities to attend. Social events for students are also typically in the evenings.	Lightweight application process.	December 2017: Piloted with staff and PGR students at the winter party. January - July 2018: Investigate whether this may be beneficial for UG and PGT students, with a view to implementing for taught students if it is found to be feasible and valuable.	HoD. With support from Department Officer.	Uptake of the fund. Qualitative feedback indicates benefits.
Communication	6.11	Annual high profile public event featuring a woman, trans* or non-binary speaker.	Previously, our distinguished lectures from men have typically attracted bigger audiences than those from women, due to their focus on areas more popular with the general public.	Interest to general public and our student body to be key consideration in inviting a speaker. To be publicised via groups that focus on women in STEM/Tech. Budget to be provided to pay for speaker.	From March 2018.	Events Coordinator.	> 200 attendees. Qualitative feedback shows positive impact, especially on women.