

Adapted from the SM Good Practice Checklist, plus the IoP Juno Checklist and 2009 Departmental Action Plan

The checklist was used to help the new Juno committee members identify areas that we did not address on our original 2009 Action plan because that plan had been produced using the IoP Juno guidelines. We merged the documents so that new committee members could see how our 2009 action plan mapped to the checklist.

It is a valuable document to use as a tool to induct new members onto the committee.

We have decided to include it in the paperwork so that the SWAN panel can see some aspects of the working progress of the committee.

This check list has helped to inform

The 2012 Action Plan going forward set out in **document A**.

Progress towards actions set out in the original 2009 Action Plan is given in **document B**

Key

Score : **A** fully met: **B** almost met: **C** partially met: **D** not met at all



: Indicates areas with action items in the 2012 Action plan document

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

Ref SWAN	Ref 2009 Action Plan Doc B	Description	Action and brief outcome from 2009 Action Plan	Comment/Notes/Description of arrangements	Score	
Bench -mark		FUNDAMENTALS FOR ACTION 1A Organisation for Action				
1		Leadership and Engagement				
1		HOD and management team champion and endorse	Not identified as a specific action in original 2009 plan because the reporting structure informing HoGs about the workings of the committee was already in place from 2007 and fully embedded. ✓	Where the system in place has been embedded for > 3 years we indicate this in the following by simply stating- system in place is already fit for purpose. Continue at current level	A	
2		Senior staff support and encourage	HoGs are supportive and proactive. Juno committee actions are a regular item on monthly HoGs management meeting ✓	Local system fit for purpose. Continue at current level	A	
3		Individuals, participate in/benefit from activities	Wide participation across department. The change over of Juno committee members means that at least 16 people in the department are very aware of the committee, plus the Departmental champions, plus the post doc and PGRReps committees. ✓ Many of our activities are not currently billed as Juno committee driven explicitly	We need to be more proactive communicating Juno activities regularly at staff meetings as an explicit item. Action Plan Document A item 1.5	B/C	
2		Accountabilities				
4		Lead Committee responsible for women and science exists	That is the Juno committee and yes it has existed since 2007 ✓	Local system fit for purpose. Continue at current level	A	
5		Committees and post holders are accountable	Yes they are accountable and report on progress towards actions at regular meetings ✓	Local system fit for purpose. Continue at current level	A	
6		Individuals' responsibilities are clearly identified	Yes they are identified on the Juno web site ✓	Local system fit for purpose Continue at current level	A	
3		Resources				
7		Funding is allocated as appropriate	The chair of our committee is allocated a 20% teaching load to deliver actions.	Local system fit for purpose Continue at current level	A	
8		Administrative and expert support is provided	Since Autumn 2011 we have departmental administration support with an explicit job description role to support actions of the Juno	Local system fit for purpose Continue at current level	A	

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

			committee.		
9		Time is made available for staff to 'manage/lead' women activities.	There is never enough time for this! But all staff serving on the committee have a nominal teaching load allocation of 10hrs.	10 hrs doesn't even cover the 12 1hr meetings a year. If the department want staff to be active proper load allocation needs to be made.	B
Bench -mark		FUNDAMENTALS FOR ACTION 1B Evidence Base for Action			
4&6		Student data and Qualitative Data for students			
10	1.1	UG and PG Student data	Autumn 2009, 2010, 2011 – these stats are collected and reviewed regularly. ✓	Local system fit for purpose Standard item on action plan 2012	A
11		Student progression: UG and PG (taught and research) by gender	Autumn 2009, 2010, 2011 – these stats are collected and reviewed regularly. ✓	Local system fit for purpose Standard item on action plan 2012	A
12		Use of time series for F/M student data, and comparison to national picture	Autumn 2009, 2010, 2011 – these stats are collected and reviewed regularly. ✓	Local system fit for purpose Standard item on action plan 2012	A
	1.2	UG exit questionnaire	To start Jan 2010 Completed May 2010 for 3 rd and 4 th years ✓	Will be rerun May 2013. See new 2012 Action Plan Document A item 1.6	A
16	1.3	Female UG exit interviews introduced	To start June 2009 Teaching committee and DUG completed in Feb 2010 for all UG focus was on “improving feedback to students” ✓. Admissions tutor conducted interviews in May 2011 ✓	COMPLETE	A
	1.4	Data monitoring extended to Masters courses	Oct 2009, 2010, 2011 onwards ✓	See new 2012 Action Plan Document A item 1.3	A/B
16	1.5	ISB, PRES survey M/F analysis	2009,2010 ISB and PRES broken down by gender on request by department, report made to HoD, DUG and DPS by international office. No specific gender issues ✓	No specific gender issues from these surveys where data is present. Except women request more access to lecturing experience Nevertheless continue this activity as part of standard annual data collection exercise	A
16	1.6	PG student experience Improve web pages improve Interview process PhD experience	Ongoing from Summer 09 ** incomplete until new departmental administration was put in place 2011.** Web pages revamping - ongoing Initiated at HoGs – annually.	Web pages are now much more inclusive. Activities have been devolved very successfully to PG Rep committee	A
	1.7	PG drop out rate	Report received for 2008-09 from PG Welfare Officer Report received for 2010 -11 from PG Welfare Officer	Action COMPLETED ✓ Monitor as part of annual statistics report	A

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

			No specific gender issues ✓		
5					
13		Staff profile and turnover (grade, gender, contract type)	Completed every 3 years, presented to HoGs and on Juno Committee web page as part of Juno/SWAN submission statistics	Monitor as part of annual statistics report See new Action Plan Document A, item 1.4	A/B
14		Representation in management	Completed every 3 years and presented to HoGs and on Juno Committee web page as part of Juno/SWAN submission statistics	Monitor as part of annual statistics report See new Action Plan Document A, item 1.4	B
15		Use of time series F/M staff data	Completed every 3 years and presented to HoGs and on Juno Committee web page as part of Juno/SWAN submission statistics	Monitor as part of annual statistics report See new Action Plan Document A, item 1.4	B
6					
16		Student surveys, and/or focus/discussion groups	See Juno 1.2.,1.3 and 1.4 above	To be continued in 2013	A
17		Staff opinion surveys, focus/discussion groups for academics and postdocs	See Juno 1.8 below	To be continued in 2013	A/B
17	1.8	Departmental Web based survey for all staff groups rerun, with other College depts.	Input to national Asset questionnaire summer 2009✓ Developed over the summer 2010 Physics had input to Asset survey questions 2010✓ Physics participated in Athena Index pilot 2011✓ Physics Participated in College Survey 2011✓	To be continued in 2013 Monitor stats on: Mentoring, Promotion Teaching allocation See new Action Plan Document A, item 1.5	A
18		Use of data: data from staff opinion surveys etc (workshops and consultation exercises) is shared to raise awareness	Original 2008/9 staff survey informed the 2009 Action plan.	Probably not enough sharing of data or wide enough consultation at staff meetings. Post results and planned actions more clearly on web See new Action Plan Document A, item 1.5	B
	1.9	RA destination statistics review and improve Annual report to HoGs Juno Committee	Start Dec 09 Complete set of statistics produced in 2012✓	Monitor going forward. See new Action Plan Document A, item 1.7	B
13	1.10	Post docs and Academic staff - monitor and report appointments	Start Autumn 09 Staff document produced 2010 ✓ Staff document produced 2011 ✓ Complete documentation for RA appointments is lacking	Request that more complete versions of RA paperwork is produced for each post filled See new Action Plan Document A item 1.4 and 2.1	C

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

		Description	Action and outcome From 2009 Action Plan	Action Plan from April 2012	Score
SWAN Bench -mark	Juno Ref	KEY CAREER TRANSITIONS 2A Appointments and Promotions			
7&8	2	2 Appointments - Decision Makers/information			
22/23	2.1	Recruitment and Appointment of Staff Transparency of processes	Start Summer 09 Staff and Fellowship candidates guideline produced 2011 ✓	Local system fit for purpose in terms of transparency	A/B
28	2.2	Appointments maximise field	Start autumn 09 ** Started but incomplete	This is a action item in the new Action Plan Document A item 2.4	C/D
19/20	2.3	Female representative on all appointment panels	Start autumn 09 Satisfied for appointment of academic staff, not post docs, and not for shortlisting panels for either staff category NOTE MIT 2011 report advises against this type of action due to excessive work load for female staff	We do not think it is realistic to have more female staff on RA shortlist and appointment panels. Given the size of the department this would be enormously burdensome to the existing academic female staff. We have taken a different approach to tackle this Action Plan Document A item 2.1	A for Acad- emic staff B/C for RA staff
	2.4	Induction checklists	First draft Dec 09 Discussed at June 2010 committee meeting Discussed at July 2011 committee meeting Delivered and on the Web Jan 2012 ✓	Problem here was lack of administrative staff. Department made a financial commitment to addressing SWAN activities and hired new staff , Caroline Walker http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/physics/staff/ induction	B
21		Unconscious bias/no candidates disadvantaged	The department is increasingly aware of these issues as more people become are involved in activities across the department, and there is a noticeable culture change. Difficult to tackle unconscious bias directly as it is unconscious.	Information about unconscious bias can be provided on the web to educate current staff members by making them aware of certain facts of unconscious bias. There are implicit bias tests that we could encourage staff to take. https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/demo/se lectatest.html Action Plan Document A item 2.1	B/C
24		Information on adverts and on the web is useful, attractive and inclusive	Wording in adverts now makes Juno and SWAN awards explicit ✓	Central HR is running a review of recruitment practices across college with	B

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

				external consultants March 2012. We may learn more – but it will be beyond current action plan. We will incorporate into the existing Action Plan Document A item 2.2	
9		Monitor Appointments and Promotions			
	2.5	Encouraging: -RAs to put themselves forward for pay awards and job regrading as well as lectureships/fellowships -Academic female staff to put themselves forward for promotion	Start June 2010 before 2010/11 promotion round begins. **All increments and bonus rewards were frozen in 2009, so this action held back. Department run a Fellowship Workshop where current fellowship holders, HR and College staff offer advice. ✓ College has a very well attended guidance to the promotion process- workshop which is fit for purpose COMPLETE	Continue to put on the Department led Fellowships workshop for RAs Action Plan Document A item 2.9 Continue to promote the College promotion guidance workshop for all staff considering applying for promotion If an RA is at the end of a scale – the PRDP with line manager should be the correct forum to discuss the regrade. PRDP training for academic staff and for RAs are ongoing in new plan Action items 3.6 and 3.7	A/B
	2.6	Length of time to promotion	Monitored for 2009, 2010, 2011 ✓ No gender specific data emerging	Monitor as part of annual statistics report See new Action Plan Document A, item 2.6	A
25		Applications for appointments	We are not proactive on our hiring policy but there is a gradual positive trend which though slow, is in the right direction.	Note the MIT backlash on affirmative action policies is undesirable.	B
26		Promotion candidates: HOD monitors lists of candidates,		Local system fit for purpose Statistics related to the promotion processes are on the Web but should be more easy to locate See Action Plan Document A, item 2.5	B
27		Outcomes of appointment and promotion processes			B
SWAN Bench -mark	Juno Ref	KEY CAREER TRANSITIONS 2B Levelling Appointment & Promotion Playing Fields			
10		Identify and Encourage Candidates			
28		Widening the candidate pool:	See Juno 2.2 above	Only informally and in some cases not at all. Action – to write a guideline for HoGs to endorse	C/D

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

				Check any formal procedures or guidelines in place to maximize applications in particular? Monitor the candidate pool by group administrators for particular recruiting/ appointment? Provide the staff and fellowship hiring guidelines to all staff on the web? See new Action plan Document A item 2.4	
29		Positive review of potential promotion candidates:		Local system fit for purpose Continue at current level	A
30		Encourage applications: HOD/ Heads of sections encourage individuals		Local system fit for purpose Continue at current level	A
11	Support promotion candidates				
31		Support with candidates' cases for promotion:	Not identified as a specific action in original 2009 plan because the structure involving the HoGs for academic promotion has been in place for many years ✓ Also College activities – see 2.5	Local system fit for purpose Continue at current level	A
32		Personal support: individuals can access	Again the department prides itself that it provides good support for individuals going through this process ✓	Local system fit for purpose Continue at current level	A
33		Activities/experience to strengthen case:	A departmental committee called the WISE panel, checks all applications and feeds forward suggests to strengthen the case. HoGs will also work closely with the candidate to help make the case as strong as possible. ✓	Local system fit for purpose Continue at current level	A
12	Feed back and follow up for promotion candidates				
34		Positive feedback is offered to candidates whether successful or unsuccessful	Not identified as a specific action in original 2009 plan because the structure involving the HoGs for academic promotion has been in place for many years ✓	Local system fit for purpose Although feedback from Faculty/College might not be uniformly useful. Request baseline feedback guidelines See new Action plan Document A item 2.5	B/C
35		Unbiased advice/guidance is available to unsuccessful candidates	Not identified as a specific action in original 2009 plan because the structure involving the HoGs for academic promotion has been in place for many years ✓	Difficult to know about bias or how to change it. But advice and guidance is offered. Is this different to Qu 34? How?	A
36		Activities and opportunities available to candidates:	Not identified as a specific action in original 2009 plan because HoGs help to identify any specific actions that might help strengthen the	This happens through the PRDP process	A

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

Swan Bench-mark	Juno Ref	Description	case for reapplication✓ Action and outcome From 2009 Action Plan	Action Plan from April 2012	
Action Area 3 Career Development					
3A Career Development					
13	3	Development needs and take up			
37		Awareness of development needs and what is available:	Evidence from Asset and College surveys suggest that staff are well aware of development provision	Local system fit for purpose All	A
38		Encourage participation: Senior staff encourage junior colleagues to take up training/development provision, and recommend courses they know are useful	Training is currently checked through the PRDP process.	Improve training for use of PRDP Monitor all training See new Action plan Document A items 3.6, 3.7	A/B
	3.1	Mentoring to explore, develop and implement a scheme for department	Work starts Summer 2009 timetable tbc Good start made. Some training initiated. Created Departmental Champions 2010 Decided against full mentoring scheme Creating Mentoring web site listing all current schemes for RAs and Staff 2011 Discussed mentoring with RA and female academic staff – Autumn 2011 ✓	Press College to provide a full mentoring scheme, including relevant documentation (handbook, list of contacts, etc.). NB: Contrary to the College's description, we do not believe that mentees should work through Administrative Assistants; mentoring should be a confidential partnership between mentee and mentor. See new Action plan Document A item 3.1	B/C
39		Monitor participation: where a section has low training participation rates (academic and/or post doc), this is 'explored' with the head of section	Post doc training – we have just gone through this exercise as it became evident that the take up of development activities was very low indeed. Staff take up of training is also very low in general. But this is out of choice. Staff know what is available (determined from Asset and College surveys).	RA Committee has requested Postdoctoral Centre to conduct survey in 2012 See new Action plan Document A item 3.8	B/C
14	3	Early career researchers (ECR) development			
40		ECRs Access to impartial advice	Not originally identified as a separate group.	ECR now identified as a separate group. All ECRs will have received impartial advice along with all other staff groups. At Faculty level there is a Fellows Forum	A

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

				that caters specifically to those ECRs on prestigious fellowships. See new Action plan Document A item 3.4	
41		Individual responsibility for ECR career progression	Not originally identified as a separate group but all staff have impartial career advice from their HoG.	Local system fit for purpose Annual PRDP	A
42		Monitor utility of provision		Just started to do this systematically – so far we haven't reported it Note: we monitor destinations, but to monitor "appropriateness" of training would need to get feedback from employers and ex-ECRs no longer at Imperial. Primary problem is low take-up.	B
15	3	Appraisal			
43/44	3.2	Maximising use of information from PRDPs	<p>From 2009/10 PRDP round onwards</p> <p>HoGs have been reporting on this. However, there is no visible follow-on discussion or feedback, e.g., via HoGs. The RA Committee has been very active and effective in collating RA issues via its report and representation to HoGs.</p> <p>PRDP rate for academic staff fell in 2010 to 65% because of separate performance metrics submission by all academic staff</p> <p>PRDP rate increased back to 90% in 2011 due to better monitoring and chasing by HoDs office</p>	<p>Follow on discussion at HoGs needs to be initiated.</p> <p>It would be helpful for HoG's summaries to be recorded on a pro-forma, e.g., with prompts and area headings.</p> <p>Improve the Equality & Diversity section of the PRDP form to encourage more meaningful appraisee/appraiser discussion</p> <p>Introduce light but effective PRDP training for all parties to increase awareness of objectives and benefits [see also 3.4]</p> <p>See new Action plan Document A item 3.6, 3.7</p>	C
	3.3	<p>Communication between staff groups PG, RA and lectureship staff</p> <p>a) Support for post grads</p>	<p>Excellent progress on communication with PG students 2009, 2010, 2011 ✓</p> <p>Good progress in this area has been achieved across all staff groups through new initiatives, including the RA Committee, the PG Committee. ✓</p> <p>The 2011 PGR Symposium (new initiative) successfully opened up communication amongst staff, PGs, and external companies</p>	<p>Establish the Fellows Forum for ECRs on a more firm footing</p> <p>Progress has not been gender-specific but it has enabled much better communication links. Check using focused group meetings that actions are addressing female PG, RA and ECR needs.</p>	B

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

			and organisations. ✓ RA Committee set up RA-PG “Tea” programme to provide PGs with a friendly RA’s ear, but take-up has been zero. ✓	Monitor all planned initiatives to maintain and improve effectiveness. new Action plan Document A items 2.3, 4.1	
44	3.4	PRDP and RAs	Work starts Spring 2010 timetable tbc Monitored: uptake dropped in 2010, was more rigorously chased and numbers picked up in 2011. Still requires further action	Post doc – how to improve? Merge actions with 3.2 Monitoring participation is still patchy and could be improved new Action plan Document A items 3.7.	C B
	3.5	RA Statement of Achievement document	Piloted Spring / Summer 2010 Discussed at Juno committee and HoGs June 2010, Discuss again July Juno committee 2011 This was attempted; little success or RA enthusiasm. NB: HoGs DO review all PRDPs and provide feedback to RAs/Line managers and summaries of issues to HoD.	Revert to PRDP to gather this information. Amend PRDP form as necessary to incorporate this activity and appraisee/appraiser discussion. See proposed pro forma in (3.2) ACTION COMPLETED	B
	3.6	Buddy scheme for RAs	2010 start but little take-up. Note that the RA Committee has become strong and fully integrated into the Department structure. No need for Juno committee to take an active role in this.	This role has been transferred to the RA Committee itself, which is sufficiently numerous and aware to provide this personal and mentoring role from its own ranks. ACTION COMPLETED	A/B
	3.7	Training and development for female RAs	Exploratory activity started Autumn 2009 Good start made in early 2010 to follow it up Lapsed later in 2010 Reinvigorated in 2011 with new post doc committee membership. Increased and improved training has been offered by the Development Centre; monitoring reveals that the take-up by RA staff has been very low. This report acted to reinvigorate the discussion in 2011. Being taken forward by new post doc committee membership. Postdoc development centre has a “Springboard” programme that is comprised of 4 women-only sessions plus follow-ups. Facts to be checked with Elise Laird and Susan	Female RA focus group discussion around this. Involve post doc development centre. The Postdoc Development Centre's Springboard programme is fit for purpose. ACTION COMPLETED	A

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

	3.8	Training of academic staff	Parker. To start Autumn 2009 Encourage HR Learning Development office to ensure that the portfolio of training is targeted, effective, and time efficient. Health and Safety training delivered to the whole department in 2011 Supervisor refresher training delivered to the whole department in 2012	Identify Core Courses for different staff groups, frequency of repetition, etc., and monitor through appropriate reviews (PRDP, promotion, etc.) to increase take-up and effectiveness. See new Action plan Document A item 3.6	B
45		Follow through: checks are made to ensure that the development needs of academics and post docs, which are identified at appraisal are met	At the next appraisal but not <i>before in a systematic sense</i> Outcome: HR LD does have an increased portfolio of courses, but take-up has been small.	Note most appraisors are relevant line managers and can/often do follow up through line management role. Additionally, some responsibility lies with the academic concerned.	A/B
Domain 3B: Developmental Activities					
16		Mentoring			
46		Availability information and contacts: information on schemes (university/department and/or external) for academics, post docs and post graduates is easily accessible/well publicised, and up to date, with named scheme contacts available	We have a web site set up now with all current schemes set out✓	Introduce Poster Campaign at start of year. See new Action plan Document A item 3.1	B
47		Academics and postdocs act as mentors: becoming a mentor, and the training for it, is encouraged by heads of groups/sections	Not done in any formal sense. Although we have encouraged several academics to become departmental champions to coach people in certain areas.	The history behind mentoring provision is complex. Many different types of mentoring provision are available. We have an action plan to simplify this structure – Action plan item 3.1	C
48		Mentoring: the take up of mentoring is monitored and its usefulness is monitored	RA-PG “Tea” fulfils this role, but not heavily subscribed.	Monitored but not reported. Would need to be anonymous to preserve confidentiality of mentoring process. Academics on probation are attached to an Advisor who acts as mentor.	C
17		Networks and role models			
49		Support and encourage networks:	Not monitored – not done in any formal sense Most (all?) Groups would strongly encourage membership and participation in relevant body (IOP, RAS, MetSoc.).	Fellows' Forum and RA Committee provide internal networks.College-wide Imperial 600 provides sexual orientation support. Monitor via Departmental Survey 2013 See new Action plan Document A 1.5 , 3.4	B

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

50		Use of networks:		Only informally – not monitored Monitor via Departmental Survey 2013 See new Action plan Document A item 1.5	B
51		Role models encouraged:	We had requested that colloquium speakers would be equally M/F. Some effort was certainly made in this regard – but continuity to the new colloquium organisers needs to be checked. Attendance at colloquia has also dropped.	Would need to collect statistics from all Group seminars. Monitoring could be implemented, and the results fed back to HoGs as “encouragement”. Could form part of a new action? Action plan Document A items 4.6, 4.8	C
18		Internal and external activities			
52		Internal activities:	All HoGs engage with staff annual during the promotions exercise during which profile raising and career development is the sole topic of discussion.	Monitor via Departmental survey 2013 See new action plan Document A item 1.5	B
53		External activities encouraged for ECRs:	We all do this. How would one collect evidence of “encouragement”?	Evidence? See new action plan Document A item 1.5	B
54		Department nominations and recommendations:	Received a summary report recently from Departmental Prize nomination co-ordinator from the previous 3 years. But this is not monitored regularly.	See new Action plan Document A item 4.5 and 4.6	B/C

Swan Bench -mark	Juno Ref	Description	Action and outcome From 2009 Action Plan	Action Plan from April 2012	score
Action Area 4 Department organisation and culture and communications					
	4	Culture and communications			
57	4.1	Improving department communications	Good start made in 2009 but it lapsed in 2010. Restarted in 2012 with departmental administrator sending regular reports to Faculty and emailing department with this summary.	Surveys indicate that the staff feel that communications to Faculty related issues need to be better communicated. Ensure HoGs minutes are available on web site See new Action plan Document A item 4.7 plus other areas of section 4.	B/C
70	4.2	Valuing contributions	Start Summer 2010 New round of prizes for mentoring, tutoring as well as teaching 2010, 2011 New Prize Anne Thorne PhD thesis prize		B
55		Accountability and reporting arrangements:		Surveys indicate that this is not an issue	A

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

56		Representative management: HOD/management team ensures that the membership and chairs of committees reflect the department staff and student gender profile		Not done formally Document A New action 4.3	B
57		Communications:	See Juno action 4.1 Surveys suggest staff feel communication is not an issue at departmental level		A
20					
58		Systems for allocating resources:		Surveys suggest that this is not understood by post docs	B
59		Offices/labs/equipment/technical support:		Surveys suggest that this is not understood by post docs	B
60		Finances:		Surveys suggest that this is not understood by post docs	B
21					
61		Monitoring the balance of teaching and research:	Teaching load has been reviewed and new rules about minimum loads, buy outs, admin roles etc – are being worked up by HoD. The concerns expressed by post docs have been well - received and understood.	Surveys suggest that this is still not accepted as fair by post docs Plans to address RA load transparency going forward Document A New action 4.4	A/B - staff B/C - RA
62		Rotation of management and administrative roles:	For the most senior roles, the 5 year rotation of posts is being enforced but not formally monitored	Monitor rotation of roles with other statistics reported once a year. See 2013 new action plan Document A item 4.3	B
63		Allocation of workload is fair and open:		Surveys suggest that this view is not widely held by post docs	B
		Domain 4B: workplace culture			
22		Working environment			
64		Standards of behaviour:	All surveys indicate that the vast majority of staff experience a supportive and respectful environment. 12% of staff have experienced or perceived to have witnessed harassment or bullying – College survey. Most cases were resolved satisfactorily.	Minimising the environment where harassment or bullying can flourish -This will be examined in more detail with support from the Equality and Diversity HR division. We can arrange departmental staff training to address this issue. See new Action plan Document A item 3.6 and 3.8	B/C
65		Open and friendly environment: HOD/management team and heads of sections work hard to ensure an open and friendly environment, and checks confirm this		Generally yes – all surveys suggest so	A

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

66		Co operative working: groups ensure that their members recognise the problems that can be created by an overly competitive environment and/or the relentless pursuit of personal professional ambitions, and the department checks this		Generally yes very positive	A
23		Collegiality		Comment/Notes/Description of arrangements	
67		Support from colleagues: the department checks	Through surveys – staff feel environment is highly supportive	Generally yes – all surveys suggest so	A
68		Line management:		Generally yes – all surveys suggest so	A
69		Sense of belonging: the department checks that all staff feel they 'belong' from their first day,		Generally yes – all surveys suggest so – except for lack of induction check list	A
24		Individual contributions valued			
70		Teaching and research contributions: department expects/checks that individuals' teaching/research contributions are valued by their section/the department and are recognised/rewarded/celebrated	Prizes and awards have been introduced more widely	Continue to recognise contributions by prizes and awards Asset survey suggests women feel more valued for teaching and men for research contributions	B
71		Management and administrative contributions: department expects/checks that individuals' contributions to the running of department/section are valued, recognised, rewarded and celebrated.	Prizes and awards have been introduced more widely within the last 24M	Continue to recognise contributions by prizes and awards	A
72		External professional contributions:		Yes through the appraisal and annual achievement documents True of post docs? Yes from PRDP but the annual achievement document is not in place	B
	Ref		Action and outcome From 2009 Action Plan	Action Plan from April 2012	
5	5	Sustainable careers 5A Flexibility			
25		Approaches to flexible working			
	5.1	Allocation of Teaching takes account of all caring responsibilities	Start Summer 2009 Allocation is clear on teaching load distribution. Timetable considerations take into account	Monitor the number of cases where allocation has taken this into account going forward and report annually at staff meetings	B

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

			those needing to leave early or arrive late into the department.	and in the statistics See new Action plan Document A item 5.1	
	5.2	Career breaks- Advice/ information on managing maternity/paternity	Clearly on the web	New long term leave form will trigger this process – see 82	
	5.3	Promoting Work Life Balance	Autumn 2009 ***NOT yet started ** Not clear how to proceed	No specific action planned but it will be discussed with PRDP context.	B
73		Availability of flexibility: information on the flexible working arrangements		Local system fit for purpose. There is now a link to this as part of the induction web page	A
74		Awareness of individual needs: department expects/checks		Local system fit for purpose	B
75		Long hours culture discouraged:	London issue – many people leave early. But some fraction work late This is a long-term issue, long working hours are deeply engrained, and senior members of staff do it as well; but people should also take personal responsibility, quite a bit of this is personal choice	No action planned	A/B
26		Take up of flexible working			
76		Senior staff lead by example: senior staff are expected to lead by example in their own working arrangements and to go public within their section/the department on the use they make of flexibility	2010 Asset and 2011 College surveys indicate that all RA and academic staff work flexibly in terms of start and end of the work day as well as working away from the Blackett Labs i.e. from home or elsewhere.	Make sure that the results of Asset and College surveys are discussed at Staff meetings and summaries are clearly reported on the web site See new Action plan Document A item 1.5	B
77		Encourage take up: department expects sections to make it easy for academics and post docs to take advantage of flexibility (for example, not requiring long notice and not asking why an individual needs flexibility on particular occasions)	2010 Asset survey suggests that this is fine There is a link: http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/physics/staff with info.	No action planned	A
78		Monitor take up: section heads are expected to 'monitor'/be aware of the take up of flexibility by group academics and post docs and the department checks to ensure this does happen and picks up on groups with apparently low take up	Captured in the various staff surveys that we have participated in - everyone works flexibly√ Short-term leave form has been recently put on web to monitor staff leave to attend conferences etc during term time. √	No action planned	A
27		Flexibility built into arrangements			
79		Timing of meetings/events: department	Departmental staff meetings and all group		A/B

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

		timetables meetings and events (academic and social) to ensure as many as possible can attend, it publishes dates of important events well in advances and checks its arrangements to enfranchise staff (including those working less than full time) to work as intended.	seminars are held within the working day. Departmental Colloquia are held at 4pm.	No action planned Juno committee should monitor – see item 81 See new Action plan Document A item 4.8	
80		Timetabling of teaching: the department checks that individuals' needs for flexibility, personal and family circumstances are taken into account when teaching is timetabled	See Juno 5.1	May become more difficult to arrange depending on how accommodating new central College timetabling. Juno committee should monitor	A/B
81		Sections' arrangements: department expects/checks that sections arrange meetings/events to meet working patterns/flexibility needs of their staff, so as to maximise attendance/allow majority of staff to participate		Guidelines for timing of meetings circulated at HoGs (a simple statement), ask HoGs to confirm that timing of their group meetings and seminars are within the working day See new Action plan Document A item 4.8	B/C
Domain 5B: Career breaks and interrupted careers					
28	Supportive approaches to career breaks				
82		Aware and supportive: department demonstrates its ability/willingness to support staff cope with the practicalities before/during/after a career break/unplanned career interruption	There is clearly a need here. This is only dealt with thoroughly at the moment for staff on sabbatical. And a similar arrangement needs to be put in place for all other forms of long term leave	We have now initiated a new checklist/guideline "long term leave form" But its use needs to be embedded. See new Action plan Document A item 5.2	C
83		Practical advice and information: department has well publicised/easily accessible arrangements for providing advice/information, which can be used by all, potential users/partners/family members/line managers/group heads,	HR sends staff a pack of information. All information is accessible on the departmental web site.	No action planned	B
84		Role models and case studies: individuals with personal experience of career breaks/interruptions are identified; some provide case studies which are on the intranet, some act as points of contacts in the department, providing practical and career progression advice	Departmental champions are accessible in person, we have one champion in the area of part time employment. The Juno case studies describing part time work experience are on the web. ✓ Do we need some new case studies; maternity leave, paternity leave, Leave of absence??	Populate the web site with new case studies; maternity leave, paternity leave, Leave of absence. See new Action plan Document A item 5.2	B
29	Career breaks before and during				

Good Practice Checklist – Appendix 1

85		Personal choice: the department's approach reflects awareness that individuals' needs/wants (on advice, support, contact, flexibility) is a personal choice, section heads are expected to arrange for a meeting with individuals to check they are getting support/advice/information they want/need	HoGs and line managers oversee these activities at the moment, but there are no guidelines and no formal arrangements in place to ensure that these meetings happen. We have now initiated a new checklist/guideline "long-term leave form"	Embedding the use of the "long-term leave" form with line managers, will ensure these issues will be properly picked up. Use of the form will be triggered by HR when a member of staff starts the formal request for long term leave with HR See new Action plan Document A item 5.2	B/C
86		Cover arrangements: the department can/does help with, advise on, and/or make/support arrangements (for administration/teaching/research responsibilities) before, during and after the career break which are agreed with the individual and their line manager (preferably in advance)	HoGs and line managers – formal arrangements are not in place. It seems to be working from the teaching side but is not something that can be planned for very well (if it is an emergency) MD	Line managers will oversee the arrangements to pick up the various responsibilities associated with the staff leave as indicated on the "long-term leave" form. See new Action plan Document A item 5.2	C
87		Keeping in touch: the department has arrangements to keep individuals informed of events/changes while on leave,	Based on the experience of those who have taken long-term leave – staying in touch is not a major issue. As long as staff member can access minutes of group meetings, staff meetings and HoGs meetings, they have the option to keep informed about departmental issues.	How to keep in touch with a member of staff, is addressed as an area for discussion in the new "long-term leave" form See new Action plan Document A item 5.2	C
Benchmark 30 Career breaks on/after return					
88		Support to facilitate/smooth return: the department recognises returners need personal support/mentoring to facilitate/smooth return, section heads are expected to look out for returners/check they are getting support	HoGs and line managers – formal arrangements to ensure that line managers are helping to facilitate a smooth return to work - are not currently in place.	A second meeting when the member of staff returns will be arranged and will refer back to the discussion indicated on the "long-term leave" form, issues around smooth return to work are indicated on the form. See new Action plan Document A item 5.2	C
89		Flexibility available after return: information on flexibility (hours, days, pattern of work over a period) that is available (on and after their return, is provided/discussed before the leave, meetings, to agree the pattern of return, are arranged prior to the return	HR, HoGs and line managers – formal arrangements to ensure that line managers have discussed flexible work arrangements - are not currently in place.	A second meeting when the member of staff returns will be arranged and will refer back to the discussion indicated on the "long-term leave" form, issues around flexible work practice are indicated on the form. See new Action plan Document A item 5.2	C
90		Career progression: HOD/head of group holds a meeting with the returner, some weeks after their return, to discuss their career progression, and this is followed up at subsequent appraisals	HoGs and line managers – formal arrangements to ensure that line managers hold a discussion on career progression after return to work followed up in subsequent PRDPs– formal arrangements are not in place	A second meeting when the member of staff returns will be arranged and will refer back to the discussion indicated on the "long-term leave" form. See new Action plan Document A item 5.2	C