**Minutes - Equality and Diversity subcommittee Tuesday 31st October 2017**

10.00-11.00am

In attendance: Irene Roberts (IR; Chair), Mary Deadman (MD), Alex Holmes (AH), Sarah Willcox-Jones (SWJ), Caroline Hartley (CH), Rebeccah Slater (RS), Katherine Corr (KC)

1. Apologies: Marta Valente Pinto (MVP), Georg Hollander (GH), Dominic Kelly (DK),
2. Confirmation of minutes from last meeting

The Committee agreed the minutes from the previous meeting.

IR welcomed KC to the Committee as the new divisional representative and AS facilitator. There was a discussion about the best practice database, which KC will circulate to the committee. IR then asked if SWJ could post this into the right boxes in the application to make it clear what we need to include.

1. Review of the Athena SWAN draft application and the action points in the application

IR asked that all members of the Committee review the draft application and make comments, these should then be fed back to SWJ. MD commented that based on the last 2 submissions they want to see evidence and graphs, KC added that impact as well as evidence is important.

It was clarified that we could put as many graphs into the documentation, as well as pictures and screen shots, the limitation is the word count. It was agreed that we would send in colour copies when sending the application to the EDU.

KC mentioned that coming up to April, there will be workshops to get the full application reviewed with the divisional team. It was also discussed that the reviewers of the application in the EDU would not have access to the department’s website or to our previous applications and we did not have to include the previous action plan.

IR asked that the application have page references and that the action plan was mapped against the application. It was agreed that the action plan should be cross referenced to the sections in the application.

SWJ is to sit with KC and go through how best to measure ‘Impact’ (to meet the assessment criteria used by the committee assessing our application. These measures of ‘Impact’ need to be as objective as possible, i.e. measurable. We need to build SMART success measures, which might relate to the staff survey.

The action plan was reviewed and discussed; the following points came out of the discussion:

* Ask all PI’s to update their research pages on the website (the aim, i.e. Impact we are looking for, is to show that we can attract more applicants for relevant jobs, including DPhil applicants)
* IR asked committee members to take on certain areas
	+ (MD: bullying and harassment (plus input from our 2 Bullying and Harassment Officers),
	+ RS ‘Key Career Transition points: mentoring, communication about career development, grant applications, Post-doc and DPhil networks
	+ CH: to comment on the same areas from the post-doc point of view
	+ DK to add anything additional from the clinical academic point of view (via Rebeccah)- may need input from Matthew too.
	+ Ruth (+ Caroline with specific details from Rebeccah’s group)- outreach to schools
* We need to highlight need for PIs to document discussions about early career applications and grant application support in the PDRs

RS informed the committee that she will be offering a 1:1 mentoring scheme for our Postdocs, with support from DK if required. The feedback she had received was that they wanted to know more about role models and suggested a how to apply for fellowship session with a range of speakers. KC commented that one department had made videos of successful grant applications, which might be of use. RS will add more about the junior fellowships in the application, including the timetable they have been given.

Thanks were given to the Events Committee who have organised the Christmas event and have many great ideas for future events. In particular Sezgi and Sorcha who have been heavily involved.

1. Any Other Business –

It was agreed that the next departmental staff survey would be run in December/ January 2017/18, as the MSD will have to have run the staff survey by Easter 2018.

KC will forward on the questions once she has reviewed them and the Committee will agree additional questions to be put into the survey. These will be fed back to KC as quickly as possible.

1. Date for the next meeting –

The Committee will agree the additional staff survey questions by email.

The next Committee meeting should be the week commencing 27th November, at this meeting we will discuss the action plan and feedback on DPhil stuff.

Committee meetings will then be monthly if required.

Actions for the next meeting:

* Committee to send comments on the draft application back to SWJ (SWJ to collate the information)
* SWJ to sit with KC and look at impact and to put the best practice information into the application.
* IR to take the below points to the Management Committee
* RS to ask DK if require input regarding career support for clinical academics
* SWJ to ask Ruth to collate information on outreach for the application.
* RS to take on the career support area of the application and review it
* SWJ to look at the previous questions asked in the staff survey and circulate these to the committee for review when we have the list of questions from KC

Points to go to the Management Committee:

* Ask PI’s to update their research pages (to attract more applicants
* Ask PI’s to document discussions about early career applications and grant support in the PDRs
* We propose to hold a staff survey in December/ January 2017/18 – as all MSD departments will need to hold one by Easter 18. We ask for the PI’s support in getting their staff to complete the survey and any recommendation on how we can increase response rates.