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You should refer to this handbook at all times during completion of your application form.

Applications that are incomplete or do not comply with the criteria set out in this handbook may not be accepted.

Website  www.sciencegenderequity.org.au
Email  sage@science.org.au
Twitter  @SciGenderEquity
Facebook  https://www.facebook.com/ScienceInAustraliaGenderEquity

This guide was published by SAGE in October 2015. © Copyright, Equality Challenge Unit, 2015. Reproduced by the Australian Academy of Science under licence from Equality Challenge Unit.

Athena SWAN® is the registered trade mark of, and is used by the Australian Academy of Science under licence from Equality Challenge Unit.

Information contained in this publication is for the use of Athena SWAN Charter member institutions only. Use of this publication and its contents for any other purpose, including copying information in whole or in part, is prohibited.
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ATHENA SWAN PRINCIPLES

The Athena SWAN Charter process is based on ten key principles. By being part of Athena SWAN, institutions are committing to a progressive charter; adopting these principles within their policies, practices, action plans and culture.

1. We acknowledge that academia cannot reach its full potential unless it can benefit from the talents of all.
2. We commit to advancing gender equality in academia, in particular addressing the loss of women across the career pipeline and the absence of women from senior academic, professional and support roles.
3. We commit to addressing unequal gender representation across academic disciplines and professional and support functions. In this we recognise disciplinary differences including:
   • the particularly high loss rate of women in science, technology, engineering, mathematics and medicine (STEMM).
4. We commit to tackling the gender pay gap.
5. We commit to removing the obstacles faced by women, in particular, at major points of career development and progression including the transition from PhD into a sustainable academic career.
6. We commit to addressing the negative consequences of using short-term contracts for the retention and progression of staff in academia, particularly women.
7. We commit to tackling the discriminatory treatment often experienced by transgender people.
8. We acknowledge that advancing gender equality demands commitment and action from all levels of the organisation and in particular active leadership from those in senior roles.
9. We commit to making and mainstreaming sustainable structural and cultural changes to advance gender equality, recognising that initiatives and actions that support individuals alone will not sufficiently advance equality.
10. All individuals have identities shaped by several different factors. We commit to considering the intersection of gender and other factors wherever possible.

COMMITTING TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ATHENA SWAN CHARTER

To join the Athena SWAN® Charter, SAGE requires a letter of endorsement from the Vice-Chancellor/ Director (or equivalent) of your institution. The letter confirms the institution’s acceptance of the Athena SWAN principles, their commitment to these at the highest level, and commitment to action at institutional level.

There is a template letter for new members available on the SAGE website.
BRONZE INSTITUTION AWARD

Prerequisites
The applicant institution must be an Athena SWAN Charter member that has signed up to the Athena SWAN principles, and have no outstanding membership fees.

What needs to be demonstrated
Bronze institution awards recognise that the institution has a solid foundation for eliminating gender bias and developing an inclusive culture that values all staff. This includes:

- an assessment of gender equality in the institution, including quantitative (staff data) and qualitative (policies, practices, systems and arrangements) evidence and identifying both challenges and opportunities
- a four-year plan that builds on this assessment, information on activities that are already in place and what has been learned from these
- the development of an organisational structure, including a Self-Assessment Team (SAT), to carry proposed actions forward.

Potential outcomes
- Bronze institution award
- No award.

Feedback
The award panel provides constructive feedback on all submissions to provide encouragement and support. The feedback highlights effective practice the panel would like to commend as well as areas in which the panel considers that improvements can be made.

AWARD VALIDITY
Awards conferred are valid for four years from the award submission deadline. If you are unsure of your award validity please contact the SAGE team.
SUBMITTING AN APPLICATION

SAGE has a mandatory body of training, workshops and activities that all institutions must meet in order to be considered for an Athena SWAN award. This program is detailed in the Participation Agreement. The program begins with a three-month preparation period, followed by two years of formal award application duties, including data collection and analysis, workshops, forums, network meetings and other activities.

Application forms should be submitted by email to sage@science.org.au by 5pm on the last working day of January, two years from beginning the formal award application duties.

Applications should be consolidated as one PDF file and should include:

- cover page including contact details
- a copy of the original letter of endorsement from the head of institution (we do not require this as a separate original)
- completed award application form
- action plan.

The receipt of applications will be acknowledged within five working days.

Colour copies

SAGE will reproduce your application for consideration by the awards panel. These copies will be printed in black and white. If you prefer that your submission to be considered in colour you should post ten colour copies to arrive within five working days of the deadline. These should be printed double-sided and corner stapled, rather than bound.

Send copies to: Athena SWAN awards
SAGE
The Australian Academy of Science
GPO Box 783
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Extensions on submission of application

There are no extensions granted for the submission date, other than for exceptional circumstances affecting key members of the SAT. Administrative changes within the institution, teaching, research, grants or other commitments are not grounds for an extension for submission. Extensions must be agreed to by SAGE prior to the submission deadline.

Applications that are not submitted on the due date will not be considered for an award.

Additional information

If a panel is not able to reach a decision based on the information in the application, in exceptional circumstances they may seek additional information from the applicant.

Applicants should be prepared for such requests, which could be made up to three months after the submission deadline. The applicant will be given ten working days to provide the additional information.
### SUBMISSION TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By November</td>
<td>An email reminder will be sent out to the SAGE primary contacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last working day of January, 5pm deadline</td>
<td>Submissions should be sent in PDF format to: <a href="mailto:sage@science.org.au">sage@science.org.au</a> Late submissions that are not already agreed with SAGE will not be considered. Institutions wishing for their submissions to be assessed in colour should send ten colour copies within five working days of electronic submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By March</td>
<td>Awards panels take place. Supplementary information may be requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June</td>
<td>Results of awards are sent to all applicants. Feedback on application is sent to unsuccessful applicants. Awards ceremonies are held. SAGE will publish all applications (successful and unsuccessful) on the SAGE website. SAGE will work with institutions to remove any private or confidential information that may identify individuals prior to publication. Applicants that receive awards are also encouraged to publish their submission on their website and inform SAGE of the associated web address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By August</td>
<td>Feedback is sent for applications which were successful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The timeline given above is indicative and is subject to change.
ASSESSING APPLICATIONS

See Peer Review Processes at Section 2 in the SAGE Athena SWAN Charter: Procedures Manual for more details.

AWARDS PANELS

Athena SWAN Charter Award applications are assessed by peer review panels convened by SAGE. The panels recommend decisions on awards to SAGE.

At least two SAGE team members will be present on each panel to moderate and provide secretariat functions. The moderator will assist the panel by providing guidance on the application and assessment process and ensure that the panel complies with the requirements and guidance set out in the panellist role description.

To ensure consistency of panel assessment, if required, the moderator will provide guidance on whether the application meets the requirements of the award. The secretary will record the key discussion points of the award panel and request that the panel identifies what feedback should be provided to the applicant.

The panel will review up to six submissions in advance of the meeting. Panellists will discuss each application and make a decision on whether to recommend that an award be conferred. The panel has a number of options when making a decision about each application. The panel may recommend to SAGE that they:

- confer the award
- do not confer the award.

Consistency of decisions

**Chair**

The panel is run by a chair appointed by SAGE. The chair is a panellist and is involved in the decision-making process.

The chair will have experience of participating in previous panels and will have normally undertaken SAGE’s panellist chair training. The training includes information on:

- the panel review process
- possible decisions
- the roles of the panellists, the moderator and secretariat
- the role of the chair
- challenges the chair may face and advice on how they may be overcome
- biases and conflicts, including information on unconscious bias.

**Moderator**

The moderator assists the panel by providing guidance on the application and assessment process and ensures the panel complies with the requirements and guidance set out in the SAGE Athena SWAN Charter: Procedures Manual.

To ensure consistency of panel assessment, if required, the moderator will provide guidance on whether the application meets the requirements of the award level process.
Assessment criteria

When assessing submissions the panel expect to see evidence of a rigorous and thorough evaluation process. It will consider the following themes at all levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>How well are the policies and plans communicated to staff?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior or high-level commitment</strong></td>
<td>Is there commitment from senior staff? How is it communicated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective analysis of the data</strong></td>
<td>What do the data show, and which actions are being taken to address the issues identified? How will impact be measured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-reflection and honesty</strong></td>
<td>The panel accepts that challenges may be faced and mistakes may be made, but these need to be recognised openly together with the steps taken to address them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td>Are staff at every level involved in the development, implementation and evaluation of policies?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reaching a decision on the conferment of the award, panels will consider:

- the clarity of the evidence provided of what has been done and what is planned
- the rationale for what has been done and what is planned and how they link to the organisation’s strategic mission and goals
- how successful the actions taken have been, how that success was measured and evaluated and how the organisation and the individuals who work in it have benefited
- the link between the data and the action plans
- the understanding of the institutional context/local circumstances and key issues demonstrated
- the significance of any changes, programs/initiatives in terms of their anticipated outcomes, their sustainability and the likely longer term impact on the organisation, its processes and its culture
- the level of input, investment, involvement, commitment and support from senior management, heads of departments, senior academics and research team leaders (men and women)
- consultation with input from all research academic staff (men and women), particularly encouraging women’s participation
- the extent to which the data analysis presented and the developed action plan was different from existing processes, innovative for the sector or otherwise challenging
- the suitability and sustainability of what has been developed and the ease with which changes have been or are likely to become embedded in the organisational/departmental culture
- the extent to which activities, programs and changes have successfully addressed perceptions and expectations that shape or constrain career choices and outcomes
- the extent to which the value of what has been done is recognised, welcomed and valued by staff generally.
**SELF-ASSESSMENT TEAM (SAT)**

Having an effective self-assessment team will be key to the success of an application to the Athena SWAN Charter. The submission will require significant reflective analysis, which should be driven as far as possible by the full team (rather than it being reliant on a few individuals).

**Representation**

It is likely that the team will include at least one representative from each of the institution’s faculties. You will want each of the main areas of your institution to be represented while maintaining a manageable group size.

The team should comprise a mixture of grades and roles representing different stages of the career ladder (particularly at the early and mid-career stages as well as senior decision-makers in STEMM).

It may be appropriate to consider having a more complex structure to ensure adequate representation, such as a smaller central group and a larger working group.

**Meetings**

The self-assessment team must meet at least three times a year.

**Shared responsibility**

It is unlikely that any one individual will be responsible for completing or working on the whole application. Your final submission should be the result of intensive group work and collaboration across the self-assessment team and the institution or department.

**Data considerations**

The self-assessment team needs to decide the clearest way of presenting data in the narrative to allow the awards panel the maximum insight into the issues affecting the department or institution.

Information on faculty and staff includes all employment contract types, from casual to permanent, including personnel on field sites. Data should be disaggregated by contract type, especially where questions specify such data requirements.
COMPLETING THE APPLICATION FORM

The final submission should be the result of teamwork amongst the self-assessment team and other relevant departments across the institution.

STYLE

There is no prescribed style for completing the various sections of the application form. SAGE staff cannot read through submissions prior to the deadline and cannot provide feedback on specific content.

WORD LIMITS

The word limit for an application is 11,000 words, excluding the action plan. This will help to ensure that submissions are of a readable length for panellists who may assess up to six applications.

The word limit does not extend to:

- tables and graphs providing they do not include stand-alone prose. Any text included within tables and graphs should only make sense within the context of the figure (e.g. titles and data labels)
- details of your self-assessment team: these can be displayed as a table using a maximum of 20 words for each team member
- action points within the body of the application and references to them
- references for example, data sources such as statistical reports
- action plan

The word count does include:

- all body text, including quotes from qualitative analysis and words in screenshots
- any stand-alone text or prose included in tables, graphs, footnotes or references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word limit</th>
<th>11,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended word count</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Letter of endorsement</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of the institution</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-assessment process</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A picture of the institution</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supporting and advancing women's careers</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supporting transgender people</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intersectionality</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indigenous Australians</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Further information</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION GUIDELINES

There are no specific word limits for the individual sections and you may distribute words over each of the sections as appropriate.

At the end of every section, please state how many words you have used in that section.

REQUESTS FOR EXTENDED WORD LIMITS

Applicants who wish to request extensions to word limits on the following grounds must contact the SAGE team at least two months before submitting their application.

Exceptional circumstances

Requests for additional word allowances to account for exceptional circumstances are considered on a case-by-case basis. Examples of where such cases may be made include where a restructure has recently taken place, or where the submitting unit has a particularly unique or unusual structure, or is subject to particular constraints.

Additional words will only be granted to explain how the special circumstances have impacted or been taken into account with respect to the Athena SWAN activities and the progression of gender equality.

Applicants who wish to extend their word limit in this way should contact the SAGE team for approval at least two months in advance of the submission deadline. Where additional words are granted, the increased allowance will be at the discretion of SAGE.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Appendices are not permitted. Any appendices will be removed from submissions and will not be considered by the awards panel. Do not include links to further information, as panellists will not consider anything in addition to the information included in the application form itself. Relevant information should be included in the substantive application.

GENDER DATA AND ANALYSIS

Athena SWAN Australia recognises an inclusive definition of gender. The terms women and men include: cisgender people (individuals whose biological sex assigned at birth matches their gender identity); transgender people (individuals whose gender identity differs from their sex assigned at birth), and other gender minorities (see Section 7). Institutions are also required to consider gender diversity with respect to other socio-economic issues such as ethnicity and race (intersectionality, see Section 7) and to pay special attention to Indigenous Australians (see Section 8).

Quantitative data on women and men should be inclusive of all genders.

Sections on transgender people (Section 6), intersectionality (Section 7) and Indigenous Australians (Section 8) entail analysis of gender equity policies. No quantitative data is required in these sections, but institutions may present qualitative data and seek expert guidance to address questions.

Throughout the application, applicants should consider gender diversity, and present gender equity actions that are inclusive of transgender people, other gender minorities and Indigenous Australians.
EVIDENCE OF GOOD PRACTICE

Panels are particularly keen to see examples of innovative and inventive good practice. While it is recognised that good practice benefits people of all genders, including men, Athena SWAN awards are designed, in particular, to recognise efforts to address the absence of women, including in senior academic, leadership, management and policy-making roles. Accordingly, panels expect to see some evidence of gender-specific measures if appropriate, and/or commentary and evidence on how initiatives have in particular benefited women.

There is no prescriptive list of measures that panels expect to see in place. It is important, however, to show that you recognise issues fundamental to career progression, for example, the importance of universal appraisal and equitable promotions processes.

Where good practice is cited, ensure that policies are explained in sufficient detail rather than just stated as a title. Submissions should also avoid presenting legal compliance as good practice.

EMBEDDING ACTIONS WITHIN THE APPLICATION

Panellists will be looking to see that appropriate actions have been put in place to address the issues and challenges identified throughout the application.

There is no need for the narrative to describe each action in full. It is very helpful for a brief description to be provided of a key action which will be implemented to address the issue identified. Such descriptions should be cross-referenced to the full action plan. The action plan should form a comprehensive summary of all actions at the end of the application.

DATA GUIDANCE

Applicants should use data for the following:

• As an evidence base and rationale to formulate proactive actions, including activities, programs and changes to policy to address problems identified, that can be measured and evaluated. Demonstrate both in the narrative and the action plan where the rationale/evidence of need to implement initiatives comes from, and how hypotheses will be tested through future activities in the action plan.

• To identify key trends and issues. Consider whether this can be used to demonstrate positive (or negative) effects of existing actions/policies on particular groups of staff.

Consultation

Staff should be consulted for their views on a broad range of issues covered by the submission. Teams should consider what strategies can be employed to learn about and be responsive to the views and issues pertaining to the culture and processes of their institution. This will help the self-assessment team to identify key areas for development and to put in place actions to address these.

Consultation may take a variety of forms, for example, focus groups or staff surveys.

• Where a survey is conducted, consider how any qualitative data will be presented. Where appropriate, qualitative consultation responses may be presented alongside quantitative data to provide further evidence.

• An honest appraisal is essential. Panels welcome reflection on good practice and that which requires development, attention or improvement. For example, if a staff consultation identifies a problematic culture, outline and evaluate the results and set out the actions you will implement, together with any successes in addressing the problems.
General data requirements

• Data should be presented in whichever way applicants feel most explanatory and appropriate (tables or graphs), as long as they clearly highlight trends and draw these out in the narrative.
• Data should correspond to the section heading, and present at least the three years preceding the submission.
• Where data are not available, this should be explained with reasons given (and, in most cases, a relevant action). Applications will not be penalised for only presenting the minimum number of years of data. Check each section of the relevant application form for the exact data requirements for that section.
• Percentages and raw numbers should be presented (both in tables and within the narrative).
• Graphs and tables should be clearly cross-referenced to the narrative and relevant section number and trends should be evaluated.
• Data should be compared with the national benchmark data. The data will be made available through the SAGE website: [http://www.ScienceGenderEquity.org.au](http://www.ScienceGenderEquity.org.au)
• Where data are used to inform a particular action point, the rationale and the actual action point should be embedded in the narrative and cross-referenced to the full action plan. The panel will look at how effectively data, evaluation and action plans have been linked.
• Data about the institution will compare outcomes for men and women; where requested, analysis will comment on any differences between STEMM faculties and non-STEMM faculties within the institution (i.e. arts, humanities, social science, business and law).

Tips on presenting data

A mix of graphs and tables should be used to present the data.

• Do not feel the need to present all the data that have been collected: carefully consider which data are relevant to the application.
• Make sure that graphs and tables are clearly labelled so that it is clear to the panellists what data are being presented.
• If using greyscale rather than colour for applications, consider how clearly the data in the graphs are represented.
• Refer to national benchmark data throughout the application.
• Consider the size of the graphs and text in tables. It should be easy and clear to read and understand.

BENCHMARKING DATA

• Throughout the self-assessment and subsequent action plan, the applicant should be benchmarked against comparators, both to measure progress and to ascertain where there may be good practice to learn from and strive towards.
• Appropriate benchmarking provides assessment panels with an indication of applicants’ understanding of the scale of the issues they are facing as well as an indication of their ambitions and awareness of gender equality initiatives.

Purpose of benchmarking

Benchmarking is for the benefit of the applicant; while panels are interested in the benchmarking data used, and it can help to inform their decision to award the charter mark, the main focus should be on using the data to drive the applicant’s aspirations.
Benchmarking initiatives and actions

Benchmarking can be used not only to compare the demographics of your workforce or student population, but also to measure the success of the initiatives you implement.

For example, you might choose to introduce a program of work to improve the rate of promotions for women staff. Part of the evaluation of that program could be to compare its success with different programs undertaken in other organisations (which need not be related to higher education) tackling similar issues.

Which benchmarks should we use?

The Athena SWAN process is not prescriptive as to what data are used or how datasets are benchmarked, as it will depend upon the institutional context.

Be ambitious in the benchmark chosen and use the benchmark to challenge your institution to make significant improvements as well as to measure progress and celebrate successes. Make sure that it is clear throughout the application which benchmarking data source has been used, for example, the Higher Education Statistics Collection, and the timeframe the data refers to.

Some organisations may find it particularly challenging to identify appropriate external benchmarking data. For example, departments may focus on a particular specialism for which there are very few research centres. In these cases, benchmarking should still be attempted, and it should be explained in the submission why particular benchmarks (as opposed to, for example, the national averages) have been used.

Internal benchmarking is also a particularly important element of the action plan. For example, where a success measure is an increase on an initial proportion, an indication of both the current and targeted outcome should be presented.

INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL AND SUPPORT STAFF

SAGE requires information on professional and support staff to be included within the application in Section 2 and Section 5. Data should cover the three years preceding the submission. Reasons should be provided where data are unavailable, and, in most cases, a relevant action included to address this in the action plan.

INTERSECTIONALITY

People's identities are shaped by several factors at the same time, creating unique experiences and perspectives. These factors include, among others: age, disability, gender identity, race, religion and belief, sexuality and geographic context. Intersectionality is a framework for thinking about how various forms of inequalities are interconnected for minority women and other under-represented groups.

Under-represented groups within STEMM include: Indigenous people; other people of colour of various culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) origins; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex and asexual (LGBTQIA) people; people with disabilities; religious minorities; and people living at intersections of these groups. While all people belong to multiple social categories, individuals who belong to more than one under-represented group face multiple forms of discrimination, including sexism, racism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism (thinking of the world solely from the perspective of able-bodied experiences), class discrimination, and more.

Institutions should be mindful of the impact of intersectionality when exploring issues and developing solutions. For example, the experience within higher education may vary greatly for a Black migrant woman compared with a White woman who is of third-generation Anglo-Australian heritage. An Indigenous transgender woman scientist living in regional New South Wales will also be subject to forms of inequalities different from those affecting a White queer woman in metropolitan Sydney. While everything within the Athena SWAN application should be considered through the primary lens of gender, the other factors that shape people's identity and therefore their experience within the institution should not be ignored.
Review of policies

Athena SWAN Australia does not accept legal compliance as evidence of good practice. Listing policies against discrimination, harassment and bullying is not adequate. The theory of intersectionality was developed specifically in response to existing racial and gender discrimination legislation, which compartmentalises experiences of disadvantage and discrimination.

STEMM culture (including teaching materials, workplace norms and practices) are set up so that the “default” idea of a scientist/researcher/clinician is an older, White, heterosexual, able-bodied male who is cisgender (a person whose biological body matches their gender identity – that is, not transgender). Evidence shows that people outside of this “default” feel under-served and under-protected by existing policies and reporting mechanisms.

At the same time, research demonstrates that gender equity and diversity improves innovation and productivity. Addressing intersectionality ensures institutions are supporting the needs of all personnel, to the betterment of inclusion and scientific boon.

Completing your application

For the Bronze Award, institutions are expected to consider the role of the intersection of gender with ethnicity for academic, professional and support staff. Section 4.1 and Section 7 in particular specifically address intersectionality, but applicants are encouraged to consider intersectionality throughout the application. Additional intersecting variables may be especially relevant depending on the geography and socio-economic context of local settings. Self-assessment teams are expected to consider intersectionality in increased detail the higher the level of award.

If it is not possible for the institution to cover this within the application (e.g. because of lack of data), the panel will expect to see that appropriate actions have been put in place (e.g. actions to improve collection of data).

INDIGENOUS AUSTRALIANS

In addition to the intersectionality issues discussed above, Athena SWAN Australia recognises that Indigenous Australians face multiple and ongoing discrimination. This impacts their ability to gain the training and support needed to achieve success in STEMM.

Review of policies

Athena SWAN Australia does not accept legal compliance as evidence of good practice. Institutions must go beyond simply listing policies against discrimination.

Bronze Athena SWAN applications will present an analysis of existing policies, programs and activities already in place, as well as gaps and opportunities for improvement. The institution will reflect on how it will progressively work towards increasing the education, recruitment, promotion and retention of Indigenous Australians within STEMM.

Institutions will reflect on the training and resources provided to non-Indigenous students, faculty and staff to increase awareness of intersectionality issues affecting gender equity for Indigenous Australians. Bronze applications should lay a foundation for enhancing the contribution of Indigenous knowledge to STEMM teaching, research and practice.

Completing your application

For the Bronze Award, institutions are expected to consider impact of intersectionality with respect to gender, race and ethnicity for academic, professional and support staff of Indigenous background throughout the application. Section 8 requires applicants to consider how policies designed to improve the inclusion of Indigenous Australians are adequately meeting these objectives within STEMM. Self-Assessment Teams are expected to consider intersectionality issues for Indigenous Australians in increased detail the higher the level of award.

If it is not possible for the institution to cover intersectionality within the application (e.g. because of lack of data), the panel will expect to see that appropriate actions have been put in place (e.g. actions to improve collection of data).
GUIDANCE TO THE APPLICATION QUESTIONS

1. LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT OF VICE-CHANCELLOR/DIRECTOR

The letter of endorsement from the head of the institution sets the tone for the submission. It is vital that it demonstrates support, commitment and investment.

The letter should explain why the institution values the Athena SWAN Charter, and how the action plan will help meet their strategic aims.

Wherever possible the letter should outline specific activities/actions undertaken by the head of the institution (and/or senior leadership team) or the head of department to promote gender equality.

Although the head of the institution may well wish to refer to an institution's history and achievements, this should not be the focus of the letter. Panels are keen to get a sense of individual commitment to gender equality at the top of the organisation.

The letter should include a statement that the information presented in the application (including qualitative and quantitative data) is an honest, accurate and true representation of the department.

Letters should be addressed to: Dr Zuleyka Zevallos
SAGE Coordinator
Australian Academy of Science
GPO BOX 783
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Recommended word count: 500 words

The letter should endorse and commend any initiatives for women and STEMM initiatives that have made a significant contribution to the achievement of the institution mission. It should highlight key challenges and explain how the Athena SWAN action plan and activities in the institution contribute to the overall institution strategy and academic mission.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTITUTION

Describe the institution so that panellists can readily understand this without specific prior knowledge. Clearly outline the structure including reporting structures and anything that may be particularly different from sector norms. Remember that panellists assess the application as a stand-alone document.

Recommended word count: 500 words

Information on the institution’s teaching and research focus should be provided. For example, whether the focus is mainly on arts and humanities, so to what extent is it a research-intensive institution?

Present information on the numbers of staff, with academic and professional and support staff disaggregated. Information on the number of departments and the total number of students should be given. Present the numbers of staff and students in STEMM departments in a table.
3. THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Recommended word count: 1000 words

Having an effective self-assessment team will be key to the success of an application to the Athena SWAN Charter. The submission will require significant reflective analysis, which should be driven as far as possible by the full team (rather than it being reliant on a few or single individuals).

(i) **Description of the self-assessment team**

The description of the self-assessment team should include:

- members’ roles including identifying the chair
- how people were nominated or volunteered to the role and how time involved in being a member of the team is included in any workload allocation or equivalent
- how the team represents the staff working in the institution (eg. a range of grades and job roles, professional and support staff as well as academics and any consideration of gender balance, work-life balance arrangements or caring responsibilities)

**Note:** This description can be displayed as a table (maximum 20 words about each team member) and is not included in the word count.

(ii) **An account of the self-assessment process**

Outline the process the self-assessment team has gone through preparing for the application. This should include information on when the team was formed, how often it has met, and what was the focus of the meetings.

This section should specifically include:

- when the team was established, including how the team communicated, for example, face to face, email, etc
- how often the team has met
- the focus of the meetings
- how the team has consulted with members and students
- consultation with individuals outside the institution, for example, a critical friend reviewing the application, consultation with other successful Athena SWAN institutions
- how the self-assessment team fits in with other committees and structures of the institution. It is important to include information on the reporting structure. For example, is there a direct route to which the team to report? Is Athena SWAN a standing item on the institution’s key decision-making board?

(iii) **Plans for the future of the self-assessment team**

Outline:

- how often the team will continue to meet
- how the team intends to monitor implementation of the action plan, including how it will interact with other relevant committees and structures within the institution
- how the team intends to keep staff (and students) updated on ongoing work
- succession planning for where membership of the team will change, including any transfer of responsibility for the work, role rotation and how the workload of members of the team will be accounted for in workload allocation
- at institution level, how the team will engage with departments to encourage them to apply for awards.
4. A PICTURE OF THE INSTITUTION

Recommended word count: 2000 words

Contracts

Section 4.1. of the application form include questions on contract type (casual, fixed-term and open-ended/permanent) and contract function (research-only, teaching-only, research and teaching). Further definitions of contract-related terms can be found in the Terminology section of this guidance.

Both sections require the use of available data to examine contractual issues by grade and gender, for example, if there are there any issues related to the retention and progression of staff.

State whether data on staff is presented by FTE or headcount. Please refer to the Terminology section for full definitions of these terms.

- Data on professional and support services staff should be presented and evaluated separately.
- Data on function should also be presented separately, drawing on data already collated for the Higher Education Information Management System (HEIMS).

4.1 Academic and Research Staff Data

In addition to the requirements above the following also need to be considered for the questions relating to academic staff data:

- Comment on the key issues in the institution, what steps have been taken and what support has been given to address any gender disparity.
- Comment and reflect on the proportions/percentages of women and men compared with the national picture for the discipline(s). Where benchmarking data does not provide meaningful comparison, a clear explanation must be provided.
- Comment and reflect on any differences in data for men and women across the institution and any differences between STEMM faculties versus non-STEMM faculties within the institution.

**Note:** Present data for departments grouped STEMM and non-STEMM. Where institutions have departments that have a predominance of one gender, applications should disaggregate this data from the other departments to prevent any skewing of data.

- Comment and reflect on any differences in data for full-time and part-time staff.
- Include postdoctoral researchers (or equivalent) when presenting data and information on academic staff.
- Data should be presented by contract function: research-only, research and teaching, teaching-only (or equivalent).
- Include visiting academics and honorary contract staff.
- Comment and reflect on the role of the intersection of gender with ethnicity.
- Describe any initiatives implemented to address any possible imbalance and biases.
- Include any plans for the future, including how any gaps in the data will be addressed, linking these to the action plan.

(i) Academic and research staff by grade and gender

- This section is an opportunity to present the numbers of academic staff by gender across the whole institution. Data should also be grouped to demonstrate any difference between STEMM and non-STEMM subject areas. It is not necessary to break down the data by department.
• Look at the career pipeline across the whole institution and between STEMM and non-STEMM. Comment on and explain any differences between men and women, and any differences between STEMM and non-STEMM. Any issues in the pipeline at particular grades/levels should be identified.

• The ‘leaky pipeline’ refers to the loss of women or men at consecutive career stages within academia. The data presented should be compared with the national picture.

• Comment and reflect on the proportions/percentages of women and men compared with the national picture for the discipline(s). If it is felt that benchmarking data may not be appropriate, a clear explanation must be provided.

(ii) Academic and research staff on fixed-term, open-ended/permanent and casual contracts by gender
• Comment on the proportions of men and women on these types of contracts.

• Comment on what is being done to ensure continuity of employment and address any other issues, including redeployment schemes.

• The use of fixed-term and casual contracts can have particularly detrimental effects on women’s career development, retention and progression. The use of fixed-term contracts is more widespread in some parts of the sector than others. Institutions adopting the most inclusive approach appoint the majority of staff on open-ended contracts and limit the use of fixed-term contracts to, for example, maternity cover or for one-off appointments lasting less than a year.

• This section should provide analysis and commentary on the proportions of men and women on these contracts. Information on the actions being taken to address issues around contract type should be highlighted, with some focus on what is being done to ensure continuity of employment.

• Do the data show any issues which are damaging to particular groups of staff? What support has the institution put in place to mitigate for any negative impact for particular groups of staff?

(iii) Academic staff by contract function and gender: research-only, research and teaching, and teaching-only
• Comment on the proportions of men and women on these contracts and by job grade. Where institutions appoint academic staff specifying teaching-only contracts, this can be particularly detrimental for the career progression of early career staff. In your application you will need to evaluate contract type by grade and gender and any differences in the support available for staff appointed on these contracts.

• Does the data show any issues which are damaging to particular groups of staff? What support has the institution put in place to mitigate for any negative impact on particular groups of staff?

(iv) Academic leavers by grade and gender
• Identify the main reasons that academic staff are leaving the institution. The proportions of men and women across different grades should also be considered to help to identify if there is a particular point at which people leave the institution. Where possible refer to exit interviews or other appropriate mechanisms. This may help to identify actions to address leavers.

(v) Equal pay audits/reviews
• It is important to identify any significant pay gaps. Comment on the findings from the most recent equal pay audit and identify the institution’s top three priorities to address any disparities and to enable equality in pay.

• As a general guide, any differences in pay of five per cent or more, or patterns of three per cent or more, will require exploration and explanation. Significant differences do not prove that there is pay discrimination, but they may indicate features of the pay system that are indirectly discriminatory and will need to be resolved.
5. SUPPORTING AND ADVANCING WOMEN’S CAREERS

Recommended word count: 5000 words

Information on professional and support staff is required in 5.3 Flexible working and managing career breaks and 5.4 Organisation and culture. Data for professional and support staff in this section should be evaluated and disaggregated from academic staff.

Additionally, please outline future priorities for professional and support staff, for example, implementing induction for new professional and support staff.

Throughout the following sections:

• provide data (numbers and percentages) for at least the past three years, with commentary on their significance: where possible and relevant, use clearly labelled graphical illustrations
• reflect upon the key issues in the institution, the steps taken and the support given to address any gender disparity
• describe the initiatives implemented to address any issues and any impact to date
• provide data and evidence obtained via consultation
• action any plans for the future, including how any gaps in the data will be addressed, linking these to the action plan
• comment and reflect on any differences in data for men and women across the institution and any differences between STEMM and non-STEMM
• comment and reflect on the role of the intersection of gender with ethnicity
• postdoctoral researchers should be included as academic staff

5.1 Key Career Transition Points: Academic Staff

When providing information about academic staff please remember that this should include information about postdoctoral researchers.

This section requires consideration of what your data tells you about the effectiveness of arrangements for key transition points. It provides an opportunity to assess and reflect on policies and practices in place and to identify any areas for improvement. Reflect upon data gathered through staff consultation as well as the data specific to each section.

(i) Recruitment

Break down application data by gender and grade. The data should also include the long- and short-listed candidates, and offer and acceptance rates.

Information on the institution’s recruitment processes should be provided, with particular emphasis on how women (and men where under-represented) are encouraged to apply. For example, are there policies in place to ensure gender representation on recruitment panels, is there any training provided and what is done to try to address unconscious bias?

(ii) Induction

What are the induction processes for new staff? For example, what training is provided, what resources are available and how are they introduced to other staff and welcomed into their new workplace? Comment on uptake and how its effectiveness is reviewed.
(iii) Promotion

Information on promotions should include data on staff applying for promotion and numbers of applications and success rate. This should be broken down by gender, grade (the grade being applied for) and full-time and part-time status. This section should also include:

- details on the promotions process, including how candidates are identified, and how the process and criteria are communicated to staff
- commentary on the criteria for promotion, including how institutional policy and practice considers the impact of career breaks on promotions: comment on how the full range of work-related activities (including administrative, pastoral and outreach work) are taken into consideration
- provide details of any training or mentoring offered around promotion
- comment on staff’s perception of the promotions process, including whether it is transparent and fair.

Data should be presented as proportions of the eligible cohorts. Where numbers are small consider commenting on individual cases and whether particularly onerous tasks an individual may have undertaken are valued. Also consider including information on the decision-making process, how career breaks are accounted for, whether pay is negotiable or standardised and what is done to support those that were unsuccessful in applying for promotion.

(iv) Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC)

Provide data on staff by gender, submitted to HERDC for the past five years. Comment on any gender imbalances identified.

5.2 Career Development: Academic Staff

When providing information about academic staff please remember that this should include information about postdoctoral researchers.

(i) Training

This section should outline the training available to academic staff at all levels of the institution or department. In particular, the application should present information on training that is related to equality and diversity, management, leadership, and/or other opportunities linked to career progression.

Provide information on the uptake of these courses, and break down the information by gender if possible. Also explain how staff are kept informed of training opportunities.

Describe how the institution monitors the effectiveness of training, and provide details of how training is developed in response to levels of uptake and evaluation.

(ii) Appraisal/development review

Use this section to describe the current appraisal/development review process for academic staff at all levels across the institution. Explain whether promotion and work-life balance are discussed and taken into consideration as part of the appraisal/development review process.

Provide information about any training that the institution offers to prepare for the appraisal/development review process. This could be training for those conducting the review, and/or for those being appraised.

Provide information on the uptake of these training opportunities, including any differences by gender. Also include narrative detailing any feedback that staff have provided about this training.

(iii) Support given to academic staff for career progression

This question is an opportunity to provide information about the support you offer to staff to assist in their career progression. The support currently provided should be commented and reflected upon. For example, are mentoring, coaching schemes or shadowing opportunities offered? For academic staff it is particularly important to provide detail about the support given to postdoctoral researchers.
5.3 Flexible Working and Managing Career Breaks

Present data for professional and support staff and academic staff separately.

This section requires consideration of the efficacy of arrangements for supporting staff who may, given a range of circumstances, need to change their working patterns. This may be because they have, for example, started a family, taken on caring responsibilities for another family member or had to change their working pattern to accommodate other personal or physical difficulties.

Also consider what the data shows about the institutional approach to cover absences of staff who take extended absence, for example, for adoption, maternity, parental or paternity leave.

(i), (ii) and (iii) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave

For sections (i), (ii) and (iii) outline the proactive arrangements (including central policy) for covering academic and professional and support staff work during maternity and adoption leave, arrangements to enable staff to keep in touch during leave, and how staff are supported before and upon their return to work. Comment on any difference in maternity leave provision for staff on fixed-term contracts.

(iv) Maternity return rate

Provide data and comment on the maternity return rate for the institution. Provide commentary on any differences of provision for staff on fixed-term contracts, including any information on staff whose contracts are not renewed.

(v) Paternity, shared parental, adoption and parental leave uptake

Provide data and comment on the uptake of paternity leave, adoption leave and parental leave by gender and grade for the institution. Comment on the uptake of statutory additional paternity leave and shared parental leave. Provide details on the institution’s paternity package and arrangements.

(vi) Flexible working

Comment on whether there is a formal or informal system in place for flexible working. Provide data on application and success rates by gender and grade, commenting on any disparities. Give details of the support provided for managers in promoting and managing flexible working arrangements, and how the institution raises awareness of the options available.

Provide information on how aware staff are of flexible working arrangements. Consider using results of staff consultation to evidence staff awareness.

(vii) Transition from part-time work back to full-time work

Evaluate and consider the support given to staff wishing to transition from part-time to full-time work, for example, after childcare or caring responsibilities reduce or stop. Things that may be useful to consider include:

• mentoring or coaching support
• phased increase in workload or working pattern

(viii) Childcare

Describe the institution’s childcare provision. Is there a nursery for staff and students to use; if so, what are the opening times and how many places are available for staff and students? Use staff consultation to evidence whether staff feel the provisions are adequate. Are initiatives in place to support and assist those who have childcare responsibilities, for example, reserved parking?

(ix) Caring responsibilities

Describe the policies and practices in place to support staff with caring responsibilities, for example those with child or adult dependants. If possible, evidence on uptake of these policies should be presented by gender.
5.4 Organisation and Culture

(i) Culture
Culture refers to the language, behaviours and other informal interactions that characterise the atmosphere of the institution, and includes all staff and students.

Illustrate how the institution actively considers gender equality and inclusivity. If the institution has any staff networks or dignity at work or health and wellbeing initiatives they should be highlighted here.

Provide detail of staff and (if applicable) student consultation relating to the culture of the institution. Analyse any data and evidence gathered around the culture, highlight any gender differences, differences between STEMM and non-STEMM departments, and link actions to address any issues the data highlights.

Provide details of how the Athena SWAN principles have been, and will continue to be, embedded into the culture and working of the institution.

(ii) Human resources (HR) policies
Provide an honest assessment of how the institution monitors the consistency of HR policies about equality, dignity at work, bullying, harassment, grievance and disciplinary processes. Describe actions taken to address any identified differences between policy and practice. Applicants will not be penalised for identifying issues.

Comment on any issues that have been identified and what the department has done or is planning on doing to address them.

Note: If this question results in an answer that the institution does not wish to be made public, especially where it may compromise privacy or confidentiality that may affect individuals, SAGE will work with the institution to aggregate or redact data prior to publishing the application publicly.

What is being done to ensure that staff with management responsibilities are up to date in their HR knowledge, for example, training or workshops? How frequently are these updated, how does the department monitor the uptake, what is the uptake and is there any gender discrepancy?

(iii) Proportion of heads of school/faculty/department by gender
Provide data across the whole institution. What are the main concerns and achievements, what are the differences? Is there anything that is being done in non-STEMM that is not being done in STEMM or vice versa? How are heads of school/faculty/department roles decided, are the roles rotated and if so over what time period? What is being done to address any specific gender under-representation? Is there any targeted support or leadership training provided?

(iv) Representation of men and women on senior management committees
Provide data by gender, staff type (academic/professional and support staff) and grade. Comment on how membership of senior management committees is decided; for example, is it role-specific? Comment on any gender imbalance and what the institution is doing to address this, for example, through support and training for potential future senior managers or extending the membership of these committees to get a broader or more balanced perspective.

(v) Representation of men and women on influential institution committees
Identify the influential committees, and provide data about their membership by gender, staff type (academic/ professional and support staff) and grade. Outline how committee members are identified. For example, do they nominate themselves, or are they approached to join and if so, by whom and through what process? What initiatives are in place to improve any gender imbalance on committees; for example, role rotation, deputising, shadowing? Is there a gender imbalance on any committees; for example, senior management, equity and diversity, finance committees? What action is going to be taken to address this imbalance?

(vi) Committee workload
How is committee overload considered and addressed? Is committee work included in any workload allocation model? Are committee roles rotated, and if so, what is the duration?
(vii) Institutional policies, practices and procedures
How is gender equity considered in the development, implementation and review of institutional policies, practices and procedures? Include any staff consultation around the fairness and transparency of institutional policies. Describe how any positive and/or negative impact of existing and future policies is determined and acted upon; for example, carrying out impact assessments before policies are implemented.

(viii) Workload model
Describe any workload allocation model in place and what it includes, for example, teaching, pastoral, administrative and outreach responsibilities. Who is responsible for setting the workload model? Is it fair and transparent? How often is the model reviewed and who reviews it? Is the model linked to the promotion criteria and discussed at appraisals? Use any staff consultation to evidence this and comment on any gender discrepancies.

(ix) Timing of institutional meetings and social gatherings
Describe the consideration given to those with caring responsibilities and part-time staff around the timing of meetings and social gatherings. Does the institution have formal core hours and if so what are they? Use staff consultation to comment on whether staff feel core hours are adhered to. Is there a difference in opinion between staff who work part-time versus those who work full-time?

Are key staff meetings and staff away days planned far enough in advance for those with caring responsibilities to attend? What formal social gatherings are there at the institution? When are they held and how many people attend? Do staff feel they are inclusive and are held at appropriate times? What systems are in place to prevent staff being excluded from activities?

(x) Visibility of role models
Is diversity considered in publicity materials, including the institution's website and images? Comment on how the institution builds gender equality into its organisation of events. Provide data and comment on the gender balance of speakers and chairs in seminars, workshops and other relevant activities.

If the data reveals that there is a gender imbalance of speakers and chairs in talks, seminars and workshops, comment on what is being done to combat this. Consider the visibility of men in under-represented disciplines, for example, nursing, primary teaching, social work etc.

(xi) Outreach activities
Provide data on staff from the institution involved in outreach and engagement activities, by gender and grade. Comment on how gender is considered in outreach. While it is important to have under-represented groups involved in outreach, often people from these groups end up doing a lot of outreach which can impact on other parts of their job, for example, research. Comment on how outreach is formally recognised and whether it is included in workload modelling. Use staff consultation to evidence whether there is any gender imbalance around the participation in outreach.

Comment on the participant uptake of outreach activities by school type (e.g. public, private, single sex) and gender.

(xii) Leadership
Comment on how the institution supports the application for Athena SWAN awards. This could be through, for example, providing data support, mock panels, staff or financial resources. What role will the institutional self-assessment team play?
6. SUPPORTING TRANSGENDER PEOPLE

Recommended word count: 500 words

SAGE does not require quantitative data on transgender staff to be presented in this section.

Any decision to collect data on gender identity should be taken in consultation with transgender staff and student groups. If, following consultation, the institution agrees to collect data on gender identity, consideration must be given to anonymity, confidentiality and secure storage of this data.

Where you decide to present data for this section, please robustly consider confidentiality, anonymity and data protection. SAGE will work with the institution to protect the privacy of individuals.

Where possible, it would be useful for this section to evaluate any available evidence (qualitative information may be useful if you have it) to illustrate what steps you have taken or will be taking to ensure your working and/or studying environment is inclusive of transgender people.

7. INTERSECTIONALITY

Recommended word count: 500 words

SAGE does not require quantitative data on intersectionality to be presented in this section. Note that SAGE will make available introductory training materials and other resources to support analysis of issues of intersectionality within STEMM. The institution might consider making available additional in-depth education and training to members of the Self-Assessment Team to enhance their ability to undertake this section of the application.

Any decision to collect data on intersectional identities should be taken in consultation with advocacy groups that represent the rights and/or interests of under-represented faculty, staff and students, which are led by members of these minority groups. Pre-existing groups within the institution should be presented with an opportunity to shape the SAT’s analysis and action plan. Otherwise, where relevant, the institution may draw advice from external bodies run by under-represented groups. If, following consultation, the institution agrees to collect data on intersectional identities, consideration must be given to anonymity, confidentiality and secure storage of this data.

Where you decide to present data for this section, please robustly consider confidentiality, anonymity and data protection. SAGE will work with the institution to protect the privacy of individuals and vulnerable populations prior to publication of the application.

Where possible, it would be useful for this section to evaluate any available evidence (qualitative information may be useful if you have it) to illustrate what steps you have taken or will be taking to ensure your working and/or studying environment is inclusive of transgender people.

The institution should reflect on their existing policies in a way that engages with the complex reality of intersectionality, as well as gaps and opportunities for improvement in STEMM. The institution will not be penalised for addressing policies and procedures that might need further investigation or revision. Instead, institutions are encouraged to analyse how policies might better address intersectionality.

(i) Current policy and practice

Review whether existing gender equity policies enable the institution to address intersectionality in STEMM, or otherwise identify how policies and practices might better support gender diversity and inclusion in STEMM with regards to intersectionality.

Does the institution adequately understand intersectionality issues? Is training provided to staff to increase awareness of how intersectionality impacts on STEMM education and careers? Are intersectional concerns directly addressed at the strategic level? What steps need to be taken to determine how intersectionality issues potentially impact on the institution? Could it be better supported at the institutional level?
(ii)  Review

Consider how the institution will boost awareness of intersectionality within STEMM. Analyse how the institution will ensure under-represented groups with intersecting identities do not experience unfair treatment at the institution. Assess how the educational, research and professional needs of minority STEMM faculty and staff will be met more effectively.

How will the institution begin to assess whether existing policies adequately capture how intersectionality issues impact on the recruitment, promotion, retention and participation of people with intersecting identities? How might the institution scope an effective framework for reviewing procedures, support programs and training activities to better ensure these meet the lived experiences of faculty, staff and students who have intersecting identities?

(iii)  Further work

Evaluate how the institution will create opportunities to raise the participation, recruitment, promotion, retention, recognition and leadership potential of under-represented groups within STEMM over time.

What existing benchmarking data might the institution draw upon in future to ensure issues of intersectionality of the present and future faculty, staff and students match the local and national contexts?

8. INDIGENOUS AUSTRALIANS

Recommended word count: 500 words

SAGE does not require quantitative data on Indigenous Australian staff to be presented in this section. Note that SAGE will make available introductory training materials and other resources to support analysis of intersectionality issues faced by Indigenous Australians within STEMM. The institution might consider making available additional in-depth education and training to members of the SAT to enhance their ability to undertake this section of the application.

Any decision to collect data on Indigenous staff or students should be taken in consultation with advocacy groups that represent the rights and/or interests of Indigenous Australians. Pre-existing groups within the institution should be consulted, or where relevant, the institution may draw advice from external bodies run by Indigenous Australians. If, following consultation, the institution agrees to collect data on gender and Indigenous identity, consideration must be given to anonymity, confidentiality and secure storage of this data.

Where you decide to present data for this section, please robustly consider confidentiality, anonymity and data protection. SAGE will work with the institution to protect the privacy of individuals and vulnerable populations prior to publication of the application.

Where possible, it would be useful for this section to evaluate any available evidence (qualitative information may be useful if you have it) to illustrate what steps you have taken or will be taking to ensure your working and/or studying environment is inclusive of Indigenous Australian people.

(i)  Current policy and practice

Discuss how gender equity policy and programs are designed to lift the contributions of Indigenous Australians in STEMM. Discuss initiatives to provide cultural training to STEMM staff and students to increase awareness of intersectionality, unconscious gender bias, racism and other forms of discrimination faced by Indigenous Australians within STEMM.

Address how Indigenous Australians are supported in their educational, research and funding outcomes within the institution. Detail specific activities to boost Indigenous career development (including mentorship and sponsorship). Does the university have effective measures for inclusion and participation that resonate with the lived experiences of Indigenous Australians? Review avenues of support available to Indigenous STEMM staff and students facing professional isolation as a result of intersectional issues. How is Indigenous Australians “success” in STEMM measured at the institutional level and how might this differ from the expectations of Indigenous Australians? How can the institution gain and promote a stronger appreciation of intersectionality issues affecting Indigenous Australians amongst non-Indigenous students, faculty and staff within STEMM?
(ii) Review
Provide details of how the institution measures the effectiveness of these policies and practices, and acts on any findings, to ensure gender equity and diversity policies will raise the recruitment, promotion, retention and contribution of Indigenous Australians within STEMM fields.

How does the institution elicit feedback on the effectiveness of policies affecting Indigenous Australian students, faculty and staff? Considering intersectionality, what barriers may exist for Indigenous personnel communicating feedback on gender equity policies to key decision-makers? How might history, culture, power relations, and other institutional barriers impede Indigenous Australians coming forward for support when existing procedures, programs and activities are ineffective within STEMM?

(iii) Further work
Provide details of further initiatives that have been identified as necessary to ensure Indigenous Australians do not experience unconscious gender bias, racism, and other forms of discrimination at the institution. Also consider how the institution will elevate the knowledge and contributions of Indigenous Australian faculty and staff within STEMM.

What foundational steps might be explored to proactively address gender equity and diversity for Indigenous Australians? How will the institution prepare to benchmark outcomes of Indigenous Australians within STEMM given that this population is already an under-represented and marginalised group at the national level? How can the institution begin to invest in the long-term visibility of Indigenous Australian research excellence?

9. FURTHER INFORMATION
Recommended word count: 500 words

This section is an opportunity to provide additional relevant information that has not already been discussed. It is not compulsory to use this section. Examples of content could include:

- other gender equality-related initiatives not already discussed
- commitment/involvement with other equality work
- work being undertaken with external partners (not covered by the outreach section)
- future changes to the submitting unit that will provide an opportunity to extend gender equality work.

10. ACTION PLAN
The action plan is a crucial part of a submission and its importance should not be overlooked.

- Actions that are identified in the submission document should be clearly highlighted and cross-referenced so that when a panellist reads the action plan the rationale for the action is clear.
- Actions should be scheduled across the four-year duration of the award.
- Actions (and action plans) should be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound).
- The panel will expect to see evidence of prioritisation. Action plans may be ordered by priority level rather than chronologically or thematically.
- Responsibility for completing actions should be distributed across a range of staff. Action plans where HR and equality and diversity practitioners are responsible for everything will not be well received by panels.
- Descriptions of measures already in place should not be included in the action plan without detail on their monitoring or development.
• It is important to indicate how the success of an action will be measured. This should take the form of a column in the table.

• There is no right or wrong number of actions, however, it is important to balance conciseness with a good level of detail.

• Action plans should be aspirational and innovative

• Action plans should be organic documents, constantly reviewed and updated (not just prepared as part of an award submission).

An example action plan template is available below which you may choose to use, or you are welcome to present your actions in your own template. The example below is not an exemplar, and many applicants have successfully used a variety of alternative formats of their choosing. It is possible that internally your actions are embedded into existing action plans, but for the purposes of this application we do ask that you collate all of the actions and present them in one combined, consistent document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Planned action/objective</th>
<th>Rationale (i.e. what evidence is there that prompted this action/objective?)</th>
<th>Key outputs and milestones</th>
<th>Timeframe (start/end date)</th>
<th>Person responsible (include job title)</th>
<th>Success criteria and outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TERMINOLOGY

Within individual institutions terminology may be applied in different ways. The definitions below are for the purposes of clarification in the Athena SWAN application.

Academic contract types/functions: The academic employment function of a member of staff relates to the academic contract of employment and not the actual work undertaken.

Academic staff: Academic staff includes postdoctoral researchers, teaching-only, research-only or teaching and research staff including lecturers, fellows and professors.

Career break: A career break is a period of time out from employment or career. Career breaks are often taken by parents and carers, and also are used to take time for personal or professional development.

Casual contract: Casual contracts in higher education have risen by over 17% since 2010, even though undergraduate enrolment keeps rising. Casual contracts are increasingly used to fill teaching responsibilities, with these staff not receiving annual, personal or sick leave. The casualisation of the teaching and research workforce especially impacts on women, offering them fewer career advancement opportunities and less income security.

Faculty: A faculty is a group of sub-units or departments that come together under an overarching decision-making body, for example, a medical school, which is likely to contain sub-units, or departments such as a department of nursing or institute of neuroscience. An additional example could be a faculty of science, under which there are separate departments of mathematics, physics, biology and chemistry.

Fixed-term contract: A contract of employment that ends on a particular date, or on completion of a specific task, for example a specific research project or covering a period of maternity leave. This includes staff on rolling fixed-term contracts.

Full time equivalent (FTE): A unit which indicates a person’s intensity of study/work comparable to a standard full-time, full-year contract.

Headcount: Looks at the number of people.

Institution: An institution of higher education and research which grants academic degrees in a variety of subjects. An institution may consist of a mixture of colleges, faculties, schools and departments.

Open-ended (permanent) contract: A contract without a fixed term. Open-ended/permanent staff are those who are employed on a contract of employment that states the member of staff as permanent or on an open-ended contract. This includes term-time-only staff who are employed on an open-ended contract.

Non-STEMM: Includes faculties and departments in arts, humanities, social sciences, business and law. Athena SWAN Australia uses the definition of non-STEMM as defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classification (ANZSRC), 2008 (Cat. No. 1297.0). Divisions 13–Division 22 are categorised as non-STEMM, except where courses are predominantly based in traditional “STEMM” departments.

Postdoctoral researcher: Postdoctoral researchers are staff that undertake independent research, leading or acting as principal investigator or equivalent on a research grant or significant piece of research work.

Professional and support staff: For institution applications this includes any staff not included in the above definition of academic staff who are employed by the institution. Staff who are contracted out should not be included. For departmental submissions this includes non-academic staff working in the department. This may include administrators and technical support staff.

Research-only staff: Those staff whose contracts of employment state that the primary academic employment function is research only, even though the contract may include a limited number of hours teaching (up to six hours per week or pro-rata for part-time staff).

STEMM: Science, technology, engineering, mathematics and medicine. Athena SWAN Australia uses the definition of STEMM as defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classification (ANZSRC), 2008 (Cat. No. 1297.0). Divisions 01–Division 12 are categorised as STEMM, except where courses are predominantly based in arts, social science, humanities, business and law. For example, for Division 12 Built Environment and Design, we accept architecture and other traditional
“STEMM” courses but not graphic and fashion design. Neurosciences, nursing and most health sciences drawing on biomedical, engineering, mathematical or technological sciences are classified as STEMM.

**Teaching and research staff:** Those staff whose contracts of employment state that they are employed to undertake both teaching and research.

**Teaching-only staff:** Those staff whose contracts of employment state that they are employed only to undertake teaching.

**Transgender:** An inclusive umbrella term for people whose gender identity and/or gender expression differs from the sex they were assigned (male or female) at birth. The term may include, but is not limited to, transsexual people, cross dressers, intersex people and those who see themselves as not clearly fitting into a binary male or female identity. Transgender people may or may not alter their bodies hormonally and/or surgically. The term transgender should only be used as an adjective, for example, ‘transgender people’ not as a noun ‘transgendered people.’ For further guidance on how to discuss transgender issues, please see the [Attorney-General’s Department, GLADD](https://www.ag.gov.au) and refer to the SAGE website for further resources.

If you need more information about terminology used in the Athena SWAN Charter, please feel free to contact the SAGE team.