The Department of Archaeology at the University of Sheffield is one of the larger archaeology departments in the country, with 33 academic staff (20 permanent, 12 postdoctoral researchers (PDRs), 1 teaching assistant) supported by strong technical and administrative teams comprising 6 technicians and 6 administrative staff. We have 130 UG, 135 PGT and 30 PGR students. Our staff numbers are slightly below average for departments in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities (FoAH; average 37) and below average for the Faculty of Social Sciences (average 53). We have a similar number staff to the History Department (35 academic staff, 10 administrative/technical staff), though a larger proportion of our academic staff are PDRs, and a larger proportion of our students are at PG level.

We are located in two buildings on adjacent corners of a block. Most staff, the departmental office, and teaching space are located in one building, PG students and some academic staff in the other, with laboratories and research space in both. This is necessary to accommodate the numbers of staff and students and, although it would be preferable to be housed in a larger single building, the very short distance between buildings makes face-to-face interaction between staff in each building relatively easy.

All academic staff are research active, and we have a strong ethos of research-led teaching, covering a broad range of specialisms and archaeological periods. Although we are in the FoAH, and have close intellectual affinities with History, we also have a strong archaeological science focus, and cross-disciplinary research collaborations with department, in the biological, material, and mathematical sciences, which are also reflected in our dual degree programmes. Our research groups are typically centred around one to three members of permanent staff, with PDRs and/or PhD students, and each major research cluster has one or more associated Masters programmes. Our overall research strategy is managed by the Departmental Research Committee (RC). The overall management of the department is the responsibility of the Departmental Executive Committee (EC), composed of four women and four men.
A To address gender inequalities, commitment and action at all levels of the institution is required

Senior management support

Ongoing commitment

1. Describe the self-assessment process including information on members of the self-assessment team.

The self-assessment team was set up in October 2013 and encompasses a broad range of experience in different types of roles and with varied responsibilities, stages of career progression, home responsibilities and family circumstances, including both academic (on fixed-term and open-ended contracts) and support staff (technical and administrative), as well as UG and PG students. All staff and students were given the opportunity to volunteer for the self-assessment team, which resulted in an even gender balance, without the need to co-opt other members onto the team on this basis alone.

The self-assessment team has met once a month since October to decide on procedures, discuss the results of data analyses, and develop an action plan. Information and opinions from staff and students have been gathered through a combination of written questionnaires, formal routine meetings and informal discussions. Statistical data were provided by the University HR department. The self-assessment process was made a specific agenda item at meetings of the EC and RC, at which information and views on management were elicited. Progress on the self-assessment was reported to these committees and to the Departmental Meeting during Spring 2014. The progress of self-assessment was a standing item on the agenda for meetings of the Faculty Equality and Diversity Group (FEDG).

The self-assessment group will continue to meet each semester as the Gender Equality Group to discuss the progress of the action plan. Outcomes of these actions and discussions will be communicated to staff through departmental meetings and our website, and made a standing item on the agenda of EC and RC meetings. Good practice will be disseminated to the Faculty and University via the FEDG.
B  The absence of diversity at management and policy-making levels has broad implications which the institution will examine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio of men and women in:</th>
<th>1.1:1 (11 male, 10 female) over the 3-year period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic departmental senior management team (see table T3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic teaching and learning committee or equivalent (see table T4)</td>
<td>1.1:1 (32 male 28 female) over the 3-year period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research committee or equivalent (see table T5)</td>
<td>1.4:1 (10 male, 7 female) over the 3-year period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **How does line management work in the department? How are line managers chosen, do the roles rotate?**

Line managers are determined by their administrative responsibilities and the role of the employee. Permanent academic staff and PDR fellows, are line-managed by the Head of Department (HoD). The HoD is line-managed by the Faculty Pro Vice Chancellor. Administrative staff are line-managed by the Departmental Office Manager, and technical staff by the Laboratory Technical Supervisor. PDR assistants are line-managed by the PI of the research project on which they are employed.

2. **What is the department doing to address gender imbalance on committees? What success/progress has been made?**

The members of the EC, RC and Teaching & Learning Committees in the period 2010/11-2012/13 were recruited from the permanent academic staff, so Figure 1 compares the ratio of men to women on these committees with the ratio for the permanent staff. There is a fairly even gender balance on all three types of committee, which represents a slight under-representation of men on these committees compared to the ratio on the permanent staff. On the one hand this indicates that male and female staff have an equal opportunity to contribute to departmental management and policy making, on the other it could be argued that female staff bear a disproportionately high level of responsibility for management and policy making (except on the RC). A decision to appoint post-doctoral staff onto departmental committees (see section C2) will not only give them an opportunity to participate in departmental management but, by raising the pool of (especially female) staff from which committees are drawn, will bring the committee gender balance more in line with the overall academic staff gender ratio.
The management of teaching and learning can be considered at a finer level of detail (Figure 1) than that required for the standard table (T4) in the data template. Because of our number of Masters programmes (14) and students (T8), the management of UG (UG) and post-graduate taught (PGT) programmes is undertaken by separate committees, the Undergraduate Teaching Committee (UTC) and the Graduate Teaching Committee (GTC). Our Curriculum Committee (CC) oversees major developments in the UG and PGT curricula.

In 2010/11-2012/13, there were slightly more women than men on the UTC despite a slight gender imbalance in the opposite direction in all staff (Figure 1). This reflects the gender balance of administrative roles: the UTC is composed of The Director of Learning and Teaching (DLT), the three Year Tutors, and the Assessment Officer (with occasional co-options); the GTC is composed of the Head of Post-Graduate Teaching (HoPGT), and the individual PGT Course Directors. We now review membership of this and other committees annually when administrative roles for the following year are assigned. Adjustments can then be made by co-opting additional committee members to ensure that an excessive workload is not placed on one section of staff (see action point 9). In 2012-13 and 2013-14, the gender balance of the UTC was more in line with the overall gender ratio.

3. Where there is an imbalance, what is the department doing to ensure a broad range of views are heard?

All departmental administrative roles rotate on a regular basis, which has thus far resulted in the equitable gender balance on committees, so that the views of both men and women are represented in every area of the department’s activities. The main criteria for appointing members of staff to administrative roles (and so to decision-making committees) are previous experience, the need to acquire new experiences, and other commitments. If this resulted in a significant gender imbalance, this would be addressed through the co-option of additional committee members, to ensure that views of both genders are heard.

4. How is consideration for gender equality embedded in the thinking and processes of committees and their related structures and procedures?

All staff are encouraged to play an active part in the management and decision-making processes of the department, at a level appropriate to their career development, which has resulted in broad representation of age, gender and experience at committee level. These committees are sensitive
to the needs of individual staff circumstances, in particular relating to the balance between work and home responsibilities, and account is taken of the level and types of responsibility staff feel able to accept at different points in their lives and careers. Our teaching committees also monitor the gender balance of UG and PG students, and take positive action to attract and recruit students of both genders (see section D).

5. What training and induction is provided to committee members and those with decision-making powers?

The University provides management training through the Sheffield Leader Programme, which was shortlisted for the 2013 THE award for ‘outstanding contribution to leadership development’. This programme provides leadership development for staff who lead or have the potential to lead, and ensures that these staff have the knowledge, skills and behaviours needed to lead others. Staff are nominated to this programme by their line manager, at one of four levels according to their leadership experience, scope and responsibilities. In the past three years, four academics and one administrator (3 women and 2 men) have participated in this programme at Levels 2-4.

The department provides induction into committee work and decision-making through participation in committees at an early career stage and one-to-one mentoring of staff taking on a particular administrative role for the first time. Staff leaving the role are required to hold a formal ‘hand-over’ meeting(s) with the person taking over from them. At these meetings, written procedural instructions and/or files are passed to the new occupant of the post. It is expected that, in the first few months of a new role, advice will be sought from the previous occupant of the role, which is of particular benefit to inexperienced members of staff.

Current and previous HoDs have attended the University Head Start programme, which includes specific diversity training. Chairs of selection panels must have completed the University Recruitment & Selection Training for Chairs of Interview Panels, which includes diversity training, and four members of departmental staff (3 academics and 1 administrator) have undertaken this training.
That employment policies, practices and procedures should actively promote gender equality

1. How is gender equality considered in the development and implementation of departmental policies, practices and procedures?

Gender equality is considered at every stage of employment from recruitment onwards. Departmental interview and selection panels (see section D1) always include both male and female staff and at least the chair of the panel (and usually one other) will have undergone specific diversity training, as part of the Head Start programme and/or the Recruitment and Selection Training for Chairs of Interview Panels. A member of the HR Department is present at interviews for the recruitment of permanent staff and can provide additional advice on issues of diversity.

The departmental panel of reviewers for the University Staff Review and Development Scheme (SRDS, see section D4) is made up of both male and female staff. SRDS provides an opportunity for staff to raise issues of gender discrimination or departmental policies and procedures that may adversely affect one or other gender.

The Departmental Promotions Panel (PP) considers all staff for promotion each year, whether or not they request this (see section D5). A CV is requested from each member of staff and, if the panel feels that someone who has not submitted a CV may be a candidate for promotion, or they have not been promoted recently, they request a CV and review the staff member’s case again before recommending promotions to the Faculty. This encourages staff who may not actively put themselves forward for promotion to submit a CV, so that they can be given an equal opportunity of achieving promotion.

2. How does the department monitor the effect of policies, practices and procedures on gender equality? What steps does it take when positive and/or negative impact is found?

SRDS is a major route through which gender-related issues raised by staff are monitored. Our annual data monitoring of staff statistical data has identified a potential ‘stumble’ between a high proportion of female post-doctoral staff (on fixed-term contracts) and a lower proportion of female lecturing staff (on open-ended contracts) – see section F1. Having identified the transition from researcher to permanent academic position as a key point at which female careers in particular have tended to falter, our HoD met with our PDRs in March 2013 to discuss ways in which we might better integrate them into the professional and intellectual life of the department - and to discuss any other issues they might want to raise. This was reported to a departmental meeting in April 2013 and, as a result, it was agreed to apply the same induction procedures to all post-docs, to include them on departmental committees, ensure they play an active part in the Staff Research Day and Away Days, and co-supervise UG and PG dissertations where appropriate.

Post-doctoral staff employed in the department are also encouraged to attend university-wide training programmes and workshops on a wide range of subjects, and to apply for independent research fellowships and permanent academic posts. The department provides support and mentoring during the application process, initially through their line manager, and all funding applications from PDRs are subsequently read by at least two members of the RC, who offer advice on the content and presentation of the application. One of our female PDRs was recently (2013) awarded a University of Sheffield Vice Chancellor’s Fellowship, leading to an open-ended lectureship in the department. Our most recent appointment to an open-ended lectureship (2013) is also female. We will continue to monitor the gender balance across this and other career thresholds, to evaluate the effectiveness of our current mentoring procedures, and actively pursue interventions and activities that support early career staff at these crucial stages of their career.
development (see action point 2). There is some evidence (section D1) that these measures are beginning to redress the gender imbalance between fixed-term and open-ended appointments.

3. **Does the gender balance of staff whose research outputs were submitted to UK funding bodies’ Research Excellence Framework 2014 (see table T6) reflect the gender balance of department staff eligible to submit to the REF?**

Yes. The ratio of men to women whose research outputs were submitted to REF 2014 is 0.7:1 (7:10), and the ratio of men to women amongst the departmental staff eligible to submit to the REF is 0.8:1 (11:13). These figures include both permanent teaching staff and PDFs. Given the small numbers, this is about as representative of eligible staff as is possible.

4. **Where a gender imbalance is identified, what action will the department take to enable a more representative sample of returns to future research assessment and funding allocation exercises?**

No significant gender imbalance was identified so our actions are focussed equally on both genders. Each member of staff is invited to an annual research meeting with the Departmental Director of Research and Innovation (DRI), HoD, and one other member of the senior staff, chosen because of their expertise or understanding of the staff member’s research area. Ahead of this meeting, each person is asked to submit an outline their research plans for the next few years. At the meeting, their research and publication plans are discussed, and advice offered regarding research direction, funding and outputs, including impact and outreach activities. Potential barriers preventing the staff member from achieving their research goals are considered, and ways of overcoming these obstacles are sought and followed up. These may include judicious use of scheduled study leave, application for externally-funded leave, a lighter teaching load at strategic points, or support from a research assistant.

In addition, members of staff who were not submitted to REF 2014 has been asked to choose a research mentor, with whom they will work closely for the next five years, and strongly encouraged to meet with their mentor at regular intervals. Their mentor and the DRI will also advise on research applications. For these staff, in particular, research will be an important aspect of their annual SRDS interview, providing another opportunity to discuss their research and devise a plan for obtaining the training, resources and support they need to achieve their research objectives.
There are personal and structural obstacles to making the transition from undergraduate level to PhD and then into senior academic positions and managerial levels, which require the active consideration of the institution.

See Athena SWAN factsheet: best practice: work-life balance (www.athenaswan.org.uk/content/factsheets)

Comment and reflect on the following student data for the past three years:

- Ratio of students by gender on access or foundation courses (see table T7). Describe initiatives to attract men or women.

- Ratio of first degree undergraduate, other undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research (see table T1 or T8) students (full and part time) by gender in comparison to national picture for the discipline (See subject information on pages 38 – 53 of ECU Equality in higher education: statistical report: Part2 Students). Describe initiatives to attract men or women.

- Ratio of first degree undergraduate, other undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research applicants and offers made by gender (see table T9). Describe any initiatives/actions taken to address any imbalance and their effect to date.

- Degree classification of first degree and other undergraduate qualifiers by gender (see table T10). Describe actions being taken to ensure assessment processes are unbiased.

Comparisons are made below with data for ‘historical subjects’ in the ECU Equality in HE report but it should be noted that these data are predominantly derived from History departments and therefore not directly comparable with data for Archaeology.

Our UG student gender balance has shifted from predominantly female in 2010-11 to a more equal gender balance in 2011-12/2012-13. Overall, this is comparable with the gender balance seen in historical subjects across the UK, where there is a small female bias (Figure 2). The upward trend in the proportion of male UGs over the last three years does not reflect a bias in the application process as applications and offers closely match by gender (T9). Applications in 2010-11/2012-13 were very evenly balanced, with more women than men applying (and receiving offers) in 2011-12. It appears therefore that a greater proportion of men are choosing to accept offers from Sheffield than in the past.

We will continue to monitor these figures and, if a significant gender imbalance emerges, will consider measures to attract more female (or male) applicants onto our UG degree programmes (see action point 6). When a similar gender imbalance was identified a few years ago, we appointed a female member of staff to the then all male admissions team, updated the images used in open-day presentations and admissions publicity material to represent the diversity of our student body (by gender and age) and ensured that our student ambassadors are a mix of men and women. This has given a more public face to women (and mature students) and provides role models for both genders.

Figure 2. Gender balance of UG students (totals for 2010/11-2012/13)
We have no foundation courses or other UG degree programmes in the department. We also have very few PT UG students (male and female).

In all three years, the percentage of women achieving a 1st class degree classification was greater than that for men (Figure 3). The proportion of male and female students achieving a 2:1 classification was approximately equal in 2010-11/2012-13 but greater for men in 2011-12, so that the overall gender balance for students with a 2:1 or 1st class degree, was slightly greater for women in 2012-11/2012-13 and men in 2011-12. This compares favourably with historical subjects across the UK, where there is a gender bias in the award of degree classifications, with women achieving a higher proportion of both 1st and 2:1 degrees.

We use varied forms of assessment that provide students with different strengths the opportunity to do well. Assessment briefs are handed out at the beginning of each semester to allow all students, including those who are PT or need to work around a family or job, to manage their workload effectively. Where assessments are based on activities undertaken in class, an alternative assessment is provided for those who cannot attend for various reasons including sickness, caring responsibilities etc., with no penalty. Special Circumstances Boards consider students who have not submitted work or are not achieving their potential for personal reasons. These seek to ameliorate any negative impact on students’ performance caused by personal factors, including those that might discriminate between genders (e.g. caring responsibilities, paid work).

Figure 3. Gender balance of UG degree classifications
To establish whether different forms of assessment disadvantage one gender over another, we compared the 2012-13 assessment results for all 2nd year modules which are assessed by both coursework and a sat examination (Figure 4). For a few modules, female students tended to perform slightly better than male students at coursework, but for most modules both genders performed equally well (or the tendency was slightly reversed). There was no bias in the performance of one gender or another in sat examinations. We will continue to monitor this and, if a consistent gender difference is apparent from year to year, we will reassess the types of assessment for the modules concerned (see action point 5).
Both our PGT and PGR data show a significant gender imbalance with a ratio of c.2:1 women to men while, within historical subjects across the UK, there is a more equal gender balance (Figure 5). At both levels, it is possible that this results from a greater number of female UG students being awarded 1st class degrees. This is apparent amongst our own UG students (see above and T10) and, if this pattern is consistent across other Archaeology departments, it may well result in a greater number of women being awarded PG scholarships, which are highly competitive and often available only to those with 1st class degrees.

This conclusion is supported by the fact that the gender imbalance is apparent for FT PG students (both PGT and PGR), who are more likely to be funded through scholarships, but not for PT students, who are usually self-funded (Figure 6). It is also borne out by recent surveys of our Masters and UG students. Of those who responded, 78% of Masters students and all UGs (male and female) cited funding as the major obstacle to embarking on further study. While all of the male students were self-funded for their Masters programme, 25% of female students were funded through a scholarship, and half of the UGs considering applying for a Masters cited a scholarship as the means by which they intend to fund their studies.

Figure 5. Gender balance of PG students (PGT and PGR)
The same gender imbalance is seen in our PGT/PGR applications – twice as many women as men apply for PG degrees. In all years female applicants have a slightly higher success rate than male applicants (T9), which may again reflect better UG qualifications of female applicants. The success rate for male PGR applicants is unusually low in 2011/12.

We are putting in place measures to monitor the destinations of UG students and the reasons for their choice of future study or employment (see action point 4). The University has recently set up a Doctoral Academy with the aim of attracting high quality PGRs, and our department will also raise this gender issue with the Academy’s strategy group.

1. Comment, reflect on and explain gender differences in staff data on recruitment job application and success rates (see table T11).

Note differences between levels, and describe any action that is being taken. If the data set is large, please break it down into the different disciplines or units. Where this data is not available explain why.

Comment on how the department’s recruitment processes ensure that female (or male, where appropriate) candidates are encouraged to apply, and how the department ensures its
shortlisting, selection processes and criteria comply with the university’s equal opportunities policies.

Overall, 212 applications were received between 2010 and 2013 from men and 386 from women. 31 staff were hired: 11 men and 20 women. In each year, the proportions of successful male and female candidates is almost exactly the same as the proportions of applicants (Figure 7). There are minor fluctuations in male and female success rates from year to year but these are probably accounted for by the small numbers of staff recruited each year (7-12). These data suggest that there is no gender bias during the selection process, with male and female applicants having an equal chance of success.

The appointments made in the last three years were mostly research posts (54.8%) and permanent academic posts (22.6%) with the remaining 22.5% divided between all other types of post. 55.5% (106/183) of applications for research posts were from women, and 58.8% (10/17) of appointments were women; 71.2% (52/71) of applications for permanent academic posts were from women, and 71.4% (5/7) of appointments were women, again suggesting no gender bias in the selection process.
Over the three years, three managerial and professional appointments were made (2 female and 1 male) broadly reflecting the ratio of applicants (1.9:1, female:male). Applications for the two teaching-only posts advertised were predominantly from women (3.9:1 female:male) and the successful candidates were both women. Three clerical/secretarial posts were advertised resulting in a ratio of 2.4:1 female:male applicants. All three appointed candidates were female. A technical post was advertised in 2012-13 resulting in 9 female and 5 male applicants, and a male applicant was appointed. The FoAH has recently considered the bias towards female applicants for support roles and has made changes in job descriptions to attract a more diverse range of applicants. The replacement of the word ‘secretary’ with ‘administrator’, for example, has had a dramatic effect not only on gender balance but also on the suitability of applications.

In sum, these data indicate that the overrepresentation of female appointments in most types of employment results from a predominance of female applicants rather than a bias introduced during the selection processes. This could result from a gender bias in the job market, or an advertising process that attracts more female applicants. It is particularly interesting that applications (and appointments) for permanent academic posts in the last two years have been predominantly female, while those for research posts are increasingly male. This trend (in applications and recent appointments) is the exact opposite of the evidence for a predominance (amongst staff already in post) of female staff in fixed-term (research) posts and male staff in open-ended (permanent academic) posts (see section C2), and suggests that this previous imbalance in favour of male academics is in the process of equalising or even reversing. We will continue to monitor this important career transition from fixed-term researcher to permanent academic post, and to pursue policies that provide equal opportunities for both genders. It is also encouraging that we are succeeding in encouraging more male post-docs into fixed-term research posts though we are unclear why this is and will continue to monitor the gender balance for research posts (see action point 3).

Recruitment places the requirements of the post central to the process, thus regardless of gender the aim is the hire the best person for the job. Advice provided by HR also emphasises the need to consider internal promotion, explicitly advises recruiters to consider flexible working, and cautions against offering fixed-term contracts without suitable justification. Although these policies are independent of gender, they serve to mitigate any tendency for women seeking flexible but secure working to be excluded from posts. Our department is fully committed to the University’s policies concerning interviewing and shortlisting, and we follow HR advice that panels should include “…a diverse representation of perspectives and backgrounds, e.g. gender, race, dis/ability”.

Figure 7. Gender balance of staff recruitment (all types of post)
2. Describe the induction and training support provided to new staff at all levels, and how consideration of gender equality is embedded across the department and/or in the institution. Please provide data and analysis as appropriate.

All staff are offered the same induction and support opportunities, with the addition of role-specific training. Induction materials are provided as soon as the post has been accepted as an online welcome pack, which instantly engages staff with the online services of the University and allows those with diverse commitments time to digest them. Managers are also provided with an online induction toolkit to assist them. Events such as campus tours, welcome to the university and induction coffee mornings are run regularly and are scheduled at varied times to facilitate the inclusion of those who work non-standard hours. The mixture of formal induction and informal coffee is designed to cater for all. One attendee noted that “it was a very enjoyable event. I met lots of new starters and was able to feel as though I was part of the bigger picture in terms of the University's mission and plans for the future”. Within the department, all staff are provided with an induction checklist and a mentoring scheme is in place for new academics. New staff are given tours, introduced to relevant colleagues and formally introduced at departmental meetings. The range of activities and meetings are designed to suit all types of personality, and thus embed equality (gender or otherwise), to ensure that all new staff feel included and comfortable from the outset.

3. Comment on career development and progression, looking at staff in all levels.

Career development is monitored and supported through SRDS, and through the separate line management of academic, technical, and administrative teams such that each line manager supports a relatively small group of staff, understands their work responsibilities, and is able to build a personal relationship with their team. Career progression for staff at all levels and in all types of role, is overseen by the PP, drawn primarily from the DE, comprising academic and support staff, a representative from HR and a member of staff from a cognate department. The policies, procedures, results and effectiveness of departmental and university career development and progression processes, support and initiatives are covered in other sections (notably, D4, D5, F1, G1).

4. Describe current appraisal schemes for staff at all levels.

Are staff able to choose their appraiser? Are promotion and changes in work-life balance routinely discussed in appraisal? Is information in past appraisals considered when discussing promotion? Is there a separate scheme for postdocs? If not, is the general scheme fit for them?

The Department follows the University-wide ‘Staff Review and Development Scheme’ (SRDS), which is used for staff at all levels and in all types of role. This includes an annual review meeting, for which the reviewee prepares a report on the highs and lows of the previous year. This meeting is used to consider the previous year in light of an individual’s main duties and responsibilities, and the objectives set during the previous year’s SRDS meeting. The reviewer provides feedback to the reviewee and an assessment of their contribution during the previous year. During the meeting, objectives are also agreed for the following year, and the support needed to achieve these objectives is identified. These meetings are also an opportunity to discuss a range of employment issues, which routinely include work-life balance.

Support staff are appraised by their line managers, as are PDRAs, who are line managed by their PI. Permanent academic staff and PDRFs are appraised by senior colleagues, who are usually assigned by the member of staff with overall responsibility for administering SRDS. Staff may, however, request a particular reviewer, or a change of reviewer. To date, all such requests have been granted.
Staff whose contribution has been assessed as ‘exceeded the job requirements, expectations and objectives’ are automatically considered for a ‘one-off’ Exceptional Contribution Pay Award, but SRDS is not considered when discussing promotion.

There are no separate appraisal schemes for post-docs, other academic staff, or support staff, but the areas covered in the SRDS form, and the review meeting, are not geared towards any particular type of post. The template uses the following generic headings: Review of the Previous Year (identification of both highs and lows and progress made) – completed by the reviewee; Feedback (with evidence) and Assessment of Contribution – completed by the reviewer; Objectives (smart), Identification of Support required to achieve objectives, and Development Needs - proposed by reviewee and approved by reviewer.

5. Comment, reflect on and explain gender differences in staff data on promotion and success rates (see table T12).

What action is being taken? Where numbers are small, comment on individual examples of staff who have been through the promotion process. Explain how potential candidates are identified and what support is provided to them.

Consider:
- how staff are made aware of promotions criteria
- how staff are put/put themselves forward for promotion
- whether initiatives designed to encourage women to apply for promotion exist
- how career breaks including maternity leave are considered in the promotions process
- comment on any mentoring (formal and informal) or advisory schemes that are in place or being considered to encourage female staff to apply for promotion
- comment on professional and personal development opportunities and how they are promoted for staff
- comment on any initiatives in place or planned to encourage females to take up leadership and management roles

The Departmental Promotions Panel (PP) meets annually to discuss potential promotions. Prior to this meeting, all staff are asked to submit their CV to the panel for consideration. Staff may also actively put themselves forward for promotion. Five men and three women were promoted over the census period. In T12, this appears as 100% success rate because all staff are considered for promotion, regardless of whether or not they put in a formal request, so the ‘successes’ usually exceed the number of formal ‘applications’. Of these promotions, one was of a member of the technical staff (all our current technical staff are male), two were to senior lecturer (both male), two were to reader (one male, one female) and two were to professor (both female). These numbers reflect the career stage of individuals rather than providing an indication of gender (im)balance in promotion chances. For example, two women academic staff were at the stage where they might be considered for a professorship, and several male staff were potential candidates for a senior lectureship. The promoted technician did not initially submit a CV to the panel but was asked to do so as he had not recently been promoted.

Staff are made aware of the promotion criteria through the HR web pages. Individual circumstances, such as part-time working and career breaks, are actively taken into account when considering promotions. Where the PP feels that a staff member’s case for promotion is hindered by lack of experience in a particular area, feedback is provided, and actions are taken to enhance their promotion prospects. These may include, for example, encouraging a staff member to take on a particular role to provide them with leadership experience, a strategy that has proved
successful in a number of cases. Our recent informal survey of staff opinion has, however, indicated that some members of staff are unclear about the promotion process or find the preparation of a CV inappropriate for their type of post, and would like more feedback from the PP. HR guidance on the preparation of a CV for promotion also leans towards academic staff. We will therefore be reviewing our procedures in the light of this, and anticipate a number of changes.

The university provides a wide range of staff development provision, which offers a variety of ways to engage including personalised mentoring meetings, online fora and formal courses designed to suit all working styles and timetables. Support designed to enhance promotion prospects is provided within the department through through mentoring and SRDS. Research support meetings help research-active staff to set realistic goals, which explicitly acknowledge non-standard working practices and personal circumstances, and the office/technical managers arrange similar meetings for support staff. Outside the formal meeting processes, line managers provide support throughout the year.

Initiatives offered by the University to encourage and support female staff include personal and professional development support (Springboard for Women) and targeted careers advice (Transitions), in addition to fora such as Parents in Academia, which is available to both men and women and provides a place where available support can be championed. Mentoring schemes designed to encourage and support women through academic promotion include specific initiatives such as the Futures Mentoring Programme. This was recently attended by one of our academic staff, who was promoted to Professor soon afterwards. Faculty-level senior responsibilities are shared among senior staff. These roles are diverse and appeal to people of different genders or those with different lifestyles and timetables, permitting those raising children, for example, to be engaged with the responsible roles needed to build a strong CV for promotion.

The University offers the Sheffield Professional scheme, to promote and value the talent of professional staff, provide networking opportunities, staff development and options for career development secondments. This scheme explicitly highlights development and wellbeing in its scope, thus addressing key areas that may be relevant to gender.

6. **Comment, reflect on and explain gender differences in staff data on staff turnover (see table T13).**

What does exit interview data show? Consider the history of staff, ie have they progressed internally or are they usually external appointments.

In 2010/11-2012/13, 11 men and 21 women left the department. Approximately equal numbers of men and women left academic posts (11 men and 12 women) while, amongst technical and clerical staff, all leavers were women. The period saw the departure of four senior male academic staff and a higher turnover of female than male researchers, which is unsurprising given the predominance of female researchers. Amongst the former, two were promoted to more senior positions elsewhere and two moved to other institutions for personal reasons (one new marriage, one to join family). Of the seven professorial staff in the department, six (3 men and 3 women) were promoted internally so it is possible that, while women may be less inclined to move for promotion, female staff may equally feel that their career progression is well supported at Sheffield and have no need to move away.

The fixed-term contracts of four (female) teaching staff came to an end. In one case, two people worked in similar fixed-term, part-time posts and, when an open-ended post became available, both were interviewed and one was successful, therefore progressing internally. One of the
technical staff (female) left for a research post one clerical worker (female) was promoted to a more senior post at another institution.

Overall over the census period, there is a balance between internal progression and those on open-ended contracts who left for promotion elsewhere, suggesting that both are viable options for departmental staff.

7. Describe what the department does to support staff on maternity leave and the arrangements in place to provide cover during a period of maternity leave.

Consider support for female staff before they go on maternity leave, the arrangements for covering work during maternity absence, how women are kept in touch with developments while on maternity leave and what help they receive to achieve a suitable work-life balance on their return. Where applicable, this may include providing details of additional funding arrangements available (e.g. budgeting maternity cover into research grant applications).

The department covers maternity leaves through a combination of replacement appointments (for all support and some teaching staff) and (for some teaching staff) cover from colleagues, depending on the amount of teaching/administrative work to be covered which, for academics, varies depending on the time of year. For most (or all) of the grant awarding bodies funding archaeological research, maternity cover cannot be budgeted into applications, but the university is compensated for maternity cover costs at the end of the grant.

Staff are kept up to date on departmental and university matters through email circulars, and access to departmental papers, minutes, and other documents archived online. On their return, a briefing meeting is held with the returning member of staff and the replacement staff providing cover during the leave period. Staff may request flexible working arrangements for a number of reasons including the period leading up to and following maternity leave. Such requests are treated sympathetically and normally granted. A phased return to work, or a reduced workload in the few months following a return from leave may also be agreed.

8. Comment on data on maternity leave return rate (see table T14).

If it is low, what plans are in place to improve this rate? If the department is unable to provide a maternity return rate, explain why. Data on staff whose contracts are not renewed while on maternity leave should be included in this section.

Both members of staff who took maternity leave in the last three years returned as expected.

9. Comment on data on uptake of paternity (see table T17), additional paternity (see table T18) and adoption (see table T19) leave by grade and gender.

Has this improved or deteriorated and what plans are there to improve further? If possible, compare actual take-up with potential take-up.

If you are unable to provide this data, explain why.

Male staff eligible for paternity leave have taken the 2-week period of ordinary paternity but have not availed themselves of additional paternity leave. However, at least one member of staff is planning to take additional paternity leave next year, allowing him the take greater responsibility for childcare, and his wife to return to full-time employment sooner. In one case during the last three years, a request to take 1-2 days leave per week over a longer period, rather than a two-week block of leave, was granted by the department.
10. Comment on data on formal requests for flexible working by gender and application success rate (see table T18).

Comment on any disparities. Where the number of women in the department is small, applicants may wish to comment on specific (anonymised) examples. Comment on the numbers of staff working flexibly and their grades and gender, whether there is a formal or informal system, the support and training provided for managers in promoting and managing flexible working arrangements, and how the department raises awareness of the options available.

Requests for flexible working in the past have been mostly informal, the University has recently introduced a more formal process. So, in 2012-13, 7 members of staff submitted a formal request for flexible working (5 women and 2 men), and all applications were successful, as were all informal requests over the three-year period. There have been more requests from women than from men, due to the tendency for female staff to have greater family commitments, though two of our male academic staff are also working flexibly for the same reason. Requests for flexible working come from staff in a range of different grades and roles, and recent applications include one member of the office staff and one senior lecturer.

Flexible working is now firmly embedded in the departmental culture and all line managers are aware of the possibilities and options (and have often benefitted from these themselves). Staff are made aware of the options for flexible working by their line-managers and through the SRDS process.

11. Provide information on support for staff who are carers or have caring responsibilities.

The University and department recognise that the needs of each carer differ, and staff with caring responsibilities may request a flexible working pattern to suit their specific needs and/or make alternative arrangements for unplanned problems that arise. Over the last academic year, six members of staff (3 men and 3 women) have been working flexible hours to allow for their parental and other caring responsibilities. Three of these (1 male, 2 female) work different hours each day to accommodate child care, 2 (male) have a flexible arrangement to deal with unpredictable issues that arise due to caring responsibilities, and 1 (female) has temporarily changed their working days. The University has its own nursery though no departmental staff currently use this. Staff also have access, if needed, to the University’s staff counselling service and the employee assistance helpline that can provide support and advice.

12. Describe the work the department has undertaken to evaluate the impact of its initiatives designed to tackle personal and structural obstacles to progression for staff.

The department has evaluated the effect of some of its initiatives relating to career progression through a recent survey of PG students, focussing on the issues of (a) progression from UG through to PGR level, which may have posed obstacles to the progression of male students in particular and (b) progression from fixed-term research posts to open-ended permanent academic posts, which may have posed obstacles particularly to the progression of female staff. We have also conducted an informal survey of academic staff relating, in particular, to issues raised in the 2012 University Staff Survey. The findings of these surveys are referred to in relevant sections of this document. The 2014 University Staff Survey, which covers all categories of staff, has recently been completed. This bi-annual survey covers a wide range of employment aspects under the headings ‘my job’, ‘my manager/supervisor’, ‘my department’, ‘university leadership’, ‘my learning and development’, ‘my reward and recognition’. The results of this survey will be available later this summer.
E to tackle unequal representation of women or men requires changing cultures and attitudes (within the department) and across the institution

‘Culture’ refers to the language, behaviours and other informal interactions that characterise the atmosphere of the institution or department, and includes all staff and students.


1. Using the UKRC cultural analysis tool for staff (see page 7 of the trial handbook) – what do the findings indicate?

What actions are you taking as a result of the findings? What actions are you already taking that may help to improve your staff experience?

What do staff think about working in the department? What kind of social spaces do you have, and how supportive are staff of one another?

The 2012 University Staff Survey highlighted issues that should be celebrated or that needed further investigation/improvement. This was discussed at a meeting of the DE, at a departmental meeting, and at a Faculty Away Day in November 2012. It should be noted that this survey was conducted during a period when staff morale was at a particularly low ebb due to anxieties concerning departmental finances, and the impact of government-level changes to the way in which students are recruited. Nevertheless, the negative responses to certain questions were treated as a wake-up call that should not be dismissed lightly but rather required departmental action (see action point 7). The 2014 staff survey has just been completed (results not available yet) so we have not duplicated this initiative by circulating the full UK cultural analysis tool (which covers many of the same issues) at the same time.

39% of staff responded negatively to the statement “My department is a place where it is easy to get things done” and 36% to the statement “In my department, there is a culture where all can flourish and succeed.” As a result of these concerns, and in an effort to encourage a culture of ‘belonging’, more explicit measures have been introduced to ensure openness and transparency in the department’s deliberations and proceedings. For example, in recent discussions about whether or not the department should form a School with the Department of History, particular attention has been paid to ensuring that this process is as open and inclusive as possible. All staff, including administrative and technical staff, PDRFs and PDRAs have been fully briefed, in writing and at departmental meetings, on matters relating to the potential merger, and a group has been formed to represent a broad range of interests and opinions, early career and experienced members of staff, with a balanced gender and age distribution, to take further the process further. A digest of all Executive discussions is made available to all staff.

Just over 30% of staff responded negatively to questions relating to co-operation between staff. A major issue identified in subsequent discussions was the failure of academic staff to provide information by set deadlines. In response to this, regular meetings are now scheduled between the academic and administrative staff responsible for each area of the department’s activities. This has fostered a better awareness of each other’s responsibilities, priorities and duties, and is a forum for improving and streamlining departmental processes and procedures. Staff report that this is working well. Improvements were also made to the electronic space through which information is shared between departmental staff, and we are in the process of defining detailed descriptions of administrative roles for both academic and support staff.
On the positive side, 88% of staff (6% neutral) thought that their manager/supervisor was approachable, 79% (12% neutral) that (s)he was someone with whom they could share work-related concerns, and 85% (6% neutral) that (s)he gave them the opportunity to work flexibly; 71% (12-15% neutral) said that their manager/supervisor communicates effectively and recognises/acknowledges when they have done their job well. 65% of staff (15% neutral) said they would feel able to report bullying or harassment without worrying whether they would be treated in a negative way, and 62% (21% neutral) that they would know where to find support if they felt they were not being treated with fairness and respect. 90% of staff thought that, considering everything, the department is well managed (or had no view on this.)

There is no dedicated staff social space within the department but the common room in Northgate House has recently been refurbished offering a pleasant environment for both staff and students. The local coffee shop has also become an important social space for academic staff as it is located half way between our two buildings.

2. How do you ensure line managers are familiar, or at a minimum aware of the range of policies available to staff? How do you ensure they actively support staff to utilise relevant policies and benefits?

Departmental line-managers use the university’s *Managers’ Toolkit for Induction* during the induction of new staff which, among other information, draws line-managers attention to the range of policies and benefits that are available to all university staff, and how to access information on these, for example through the ‘MyBenefits’ link on the university staff webpages. Departmental policies and processes are made available to line managers and other staff through written documents available online, and changes in these policies are disseminated by the HoD and Departmental Office Manager during monthly departmental meetings.

SRDS, and follow-up meetings arising from this, provide the primary mechanism through which line managers ensure that staff are aware of the policies and benefits that are of relevance to them and their particular circumstances, including, for example, the options for periods of leave, flexible working, and other practical arrangements that would facilitate the staff member’s progress or alleviate their problems.

3. Demonstrate how the department is gender aware and how it promotes the involvement of women.

Gender is one of the factors considered in the department’s annual monitoring of student and staff statistical data, and a number of gender imbalances are identified elsewhere in this document through this monitoring. Gender and family responsibilities are also important factors considered during the annual SRDS interview. Gender awareness, and diversity awareness in general, is embedded in our departmental procedures relating to recruitment (of staff and students), student progress, and staff promotion at all levels. The department has a strong culture of appointing and promoting staff on merit and fairness, and an ethos of supporting staff and students through difficult or unusual circumstances.

We adopt a flexible attitude to periods of Leave of Absence (LoA), and non-standard working patterns. A relatively high number of students take LoA at some stage during their degree programme (20 in the last 3 years), and the vast majority of these (c.90%) return to complete their degrees, often gaining a high degree classification. While students of both genders take LoA, this flexible approach can be of particular advantage to those who have family commitments. In 2009-10, our department contributed the ‘Welcome Diversity’ project to the University’s ‘Inclusive Curriculum’ initiative. As a result, we developed procedures for welcoming returning LoA students (including a ‘Welcome Pack’ sent out in advance of their return) and other strategies to facilitate
the inclusion of a diverse range of individuals (including PT, mature, Erasmus students etc.). We also have a part-time UG degree programme (jointly with the Institute of Lifelong Learning), and PT routes through most of our Masters programmes, which encourage a greater variety of participants. LoA requests from staff are treated equally sympathetically, and several members of staff have taken (and returned from) LoA in recent years.

Departmental staff have taken part in a range of university initiatives promoting the involvement of women. One of our female staff was the faculty representative on the Women Academic Progression Plan steering group (2010-13), and helped to set up the Parents in Academia group. Our HoD spoke at the inaugural event of the group. One of our female professors was chosen as one of the Portrait of a Woman profiles, raising awareness of women's contributions to the university, and two other professors have been active in the Women Professor's Network. Three more junior female staff members were encouraged by the department to take part in the University Springboard programme in 2013. This is a personal and professional development programme for women intended to build their confidence and assertiveness, and balance their lives better to achieve their academic or professional potential. Three members of staff have participated in the university's Impact or Futures mentoring programmes whereby female staff members are mentored by professors or other senior staff.

4. **Provide evidence of how staff with family responsibilities and part-time staff are considered when scheduling meetings and social gatherings.**

The departmental timetable of teaching and schedule of meetings is sensitive to staff members' individual domestic responsibilities. Staff are asked to provide information on their needs in this regard before the teaching timetable is compiled, and the timetable is constructed around these commitments. We use the university online calendar to schedule meetings and social gatherings, and staff can block off periods of home commitments and days/times when meetings may not be scheduled due to their part-time contracts. We have a flexible policy with regard to part-time working in general, which benefits both male and female members of staff, especially those with family responsibilities. Our flexible approach to timetabling and work-schedules is not restricted to part-time working, and some staff have successfully requested more varied arrangements, in one case involving a full-time contract spread over four rather than five working days.

5. **Where long-hours culture is an issue, what actions are being taken to address it?**

There is a tendency for the academic staff to work beyond their contracted hours which seems to be prevalent in the academic community more generally, and is to some extent determined by external pressures on university staff. As a department, we do what we can to manage this through our workload model, so that staff are not *required* to work beyond their contracted hours. We also allow staff to tailor their working hours in ways that make sense for their lives. We continue to explore ways in which overall workloads can be made more manageable, for example by developing more efficient systems for streamlining tasks (see action point 10).

Action has been taken to ensure that administrative and technical staff do not work beyond their contracted hours, primarily by appointing an Office Manager and Technical Supervisor, who manage workloads to avoid this. Support staff report that this is working well.

6. **Comment on the level of participation by female and male staff in outreach activities with schools and colleges and other centres (see table T19).**

How does the department ensure that this is recognised and rewarded (e.g. in appraisal and promotion)?
Our audits of outreach activities are not comprehensive. Based on current records, of 22 (11 female, 11 male) permanent, full-time academic staff, 10 (6 female, 4 male) participated in outreach activities with schools, colleges and other educational centres during the last three years. External engagement (including outreach activities) is recognised in the University's promotion criteria at all levels of the academic salary scale, and is a routine component of the SRDS. We are putting in place procedures for monitoring more accurately the level of outreach activity and other external engagement (see action point 11).
the system of short-term contracts has particularly negative consequences for the retention and progression of female academics

1. Comment on the proportions of men and women on fixed-term, open-ended and zero-hours contracts (see table T20).

What are the department’s policies about transferring staff to permanent contracts? If staff are not transferred, why not?

Are there gender issues and how are they being addressed/have they been addressed?

In 2010/11-2012/13 men on open-ended contracts outnumbered women by approximately 2:1 but, by 2012/13, the ratio was approximately 1:1. In contrast, women more frequently occupy fixed-term posts, with women outnumbering men roughly 2:1 (Figure 8). There are no zero hours contracts in the department.

Figure 8. Gender balance of academic staff contract types

The Department follows University’s policy, which states that the appointment of staff onto a fixed-term contract must be justified using at least one of six criteria. The criteria on which the majority of fixed-term appointments are made within the department are research posts associated with externally-funded projects, externally-funded research fellowships, teaching cover for secondments or externally-funded study leave, cover for maternity leave or long-term sickness. Staff nearing the end of a fixed-term contract are invited to attend an end-of-contract meeting with their line manager to discuss the possibilities for redeployment to an equivalent post within the department or the university. In line with UK legislation, after four years of continuous service staff on fixed-term contracts must be considered for transfer to an open-ended contract, and the only grounds on which this is usually denied is where the post is externally funded and no other funds, or similar work, are available.

Most of these fixed-term posts are PDRs, and departmental initiatives to support PDRs’ career development are described in section D1. Most recent fixed-term research and teaching appointments are women, and these temporary posts often provide the first step to an academic career, and the experience needed for successful applications. Indeed, our most recent (female)
appointment to an open-ended academic post had held a fixed-term teaching post in the department in 2009-10.
G a broad range of work activity undertaken by staff is recognised in their career progression and promotion

1. Describe the systems in place to ensure that workload allocations, including pastoral and administrative responsibilities are transparent, fairly applied and are taken into account at appraisal and in promotion criteria.

The department uses a workload model for permanent academic staff based on the premise that all staff (except the HoD) spend one-third of their time on teaching activities, one-third on research and one-third on pastoral, administrative activities (including outreach). The teaching component of the workload model is based on the number of credits assigned to students taking each module. Credits are assigned to each administrative/pastoral role to reflect the workload each entails. The allocation of ‘admin credits’ to each role is reviewed, and potentially adjusted, each year by the EC. Staff are expected to carry out an amount of research equivalent to that of teaching or administration but how they distribute this time is left to the individual staff member.

The projected workload for each staff member in the following year is calculated in the Spring. Where a workload imbalance is identified in either teaching or pastoral/administration roles, these roles are reallocated, in discussion with the staff members concerned, to achieve a more equitable workload allocation. The model is freely accessible to staff, who are consulted before final allocations. Early career staff are allocated lower teaching and administration loads (two-thirds that of other staff). We have used this system, with modifications, since 2005-6 and it works well as a method for redistributing potentially inequitable workloads. We continue to review the model and consider alternatives on an annual basis.

Promotions are based on research, teaching, administration, external engagement/outreach, and standing in the profession. We expect all staff to have a well-rounded academic portfolio including significant contributions in all five areas, and reward the full range of skills and experience including pastoral roles, teaching quality and administrative ability on an equal footing with research achievement. Indeed, cases for promotion have sometimes been unsuccessful because of a weak pastoral/administrative profile, despite a good research record, and the member of staff has been encouraged (and provided with opportunities) to take a more active part if this aspect of the department’s work. The strongest area in some promotions has been in teaching or administration rather than research. All five areas also feature prominently in SRDS interviews and staff are encouraged to develop their profile in each.

2. Is the department using workload management/modelling?

Reflect on whether this enables gender equality in the department and/or any further action that is needed. Where the department is not using this model, is there an equivalent system in place or action to ensure a range of work is recognised in promotion and progression?

The department uses its own workload model as described above. This model allows us to monitor the types of administrative and pastoral roles undertaken by male and female staff, which we have done for the past three years. Over this three-year period, the ratio of male to female staff undertaking pastoral roles or administrative roles relating to day-to-day UG teaching was 1:1, and the ratio of male to female staff in senior non-teaching related roles (excluding HoD) was 1.2:1. The only significant gender imbalance identified in administrative roles was that the Directors of Masters Programmes tended to be predominantly female (with a ratio of 0.65:1 male:female). Since the workload model aims to equalise the teaching workload of individual members of staff, it is not surprising that the overall teaching loads for male and female staff are almost exactly equal.
This model also feeds into the promotion process by documenting the contribution of staff to teaching, pastoral activities and administrative responsibilities.

3. **UKRC Cultural Analysis Tool**: Looking at Table T21 of the data template, discuss analyse and develop any necessary action points in relation to the results. See page 7 of trial handbook for further information.

Of those who responded, 92% of women responded positively to the question concerning appraisal (SRDS), and none negatively, while for men the percentage responding positively was lower (67%). For the question concerning promotions just over half (54% of women and 56% of men) responded positively. This chimes with our recent informal survey where concerns were expressed about the promotion process and the guidance available (see section D5). It further emphasises the need to improve communication regarding promotions, and to consider changes to the procedures themselves (see action plan 8.1 and 8.2). It is unclear why men view SRDS less positively than women and the numbers are small (two negative responses in the case of each question).
to tackle the unfair treatment often experienced by trans people requires changing cultures and attitudes across the institution

ECU does not require data on trans staff to be presented within this section. Any decision to monitor gender identity should be taken in consultation with trans staff and student groups as well as trade unions and the students’ union. If, following consultation, an institution does decide to monitor gender identity, consideration must be given to anonymity, confidentiality and storing of data.

This section should be completed after consulting relevant staff members working at an institutional (rather than departmental) level.

1. What steps is the institution taking to ensure that trans people do not experience unfair treatment when working as a member of staff at your institution?

How do you tackle negative attitudes of students, colleagues and members of the public?

The University has an active Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Staff Network which meets four times a year. The network provides a forum for networking, a means of peer support, and the opportunity for staff from all areas of the University to inform and collaborate on LGBT action and policy issues.

2. What further initiatives are necessary to ensure trans people do not experience unfair treatment at your institution?

The Department fully supports the LGBT and other staff networks organised at a University level and so does not replicate this. Specific support for transgender staff is also available through the Students Union.

3. How does the institution monitor (and act on any findings of) positive and/or negative impact of its policies and procedures on trans people?

University policies and procedures are regularly reviewed with input sought from the University Equality Committee and staff networks such as the LGBT. Feedback is also provided from the quarterly LGBT network meetings and questions within the University's staff survey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLT</td>
<td>Departmental Director of Learning and Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI</td>
<td>Departmental Director of Research and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Departmental Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDG</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Humanities Diversity and Equality Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoAH</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTC</td>
<td>Graduate Teaching Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoD</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoPGT</td>
<td>Head of Post-Graduate Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoPGR</td>
<td>Head of Post-Graduate Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Staff Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoA</td>
<td>Leave of Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDR</td>
<td>Post-doctoral Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDRA</td>
<td>Post-doctoral Research Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDRF</td>
<td>Post-doctoral Research Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGR</td>
<td>Postgraduate Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT</td>
<td>Postgraduate Taught Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Departmental Promotions Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Departmental Research Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>Undergraduate Teaching Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>