Summary of Athena Swan discussion
Good Practice Scheme Workshop
5/10/2018 De Morgan House
London Mathematical Society

1) What quantitative data beyond that available from HESA needs to be collected and collated nationally to get a meaningful picture of diversity in UK mathematics?
    - Information on diversity among different categories of staff, eg, permanent academic staff, PGR student tutors, bought in teaching staff.
    - International vs UK staff and PhD numbers for women vs men
    - Other diversity data, eg, race/ethnicity, economic diversity, etc.
    - Data on progression through pipeline, ie, recruitment, promotion, retention and not just on proportions at various levels at various times.

2) What qualitative data needs to be collected and collated nationally?
    - Exit interviews of PhD students and PDRAs on destinations and reasons for academic/non-academic and maths/non-maths path

3) What data issues do Athena Swan SATs run into when completing applications?
    - Inconsistencies between the data requested by Advance HE and the data provided by HESA
    - Some HR departments create data summaries that do not accurately represent departments submitting.

4) What guidance or data could the LMS make available that would make the data collection process less onerous and more useful?
    - National standards/formats for HESA data presentation (eg, a proposed set of data summary tables to include in applications)
    - Annual benchmarking of this data by quartile.
    - Online exit questionnaire for PhD students and PDRAs

5) What should our goals be as UK mathematicians for diversity?
    - Culture change within departments
    - Effective outreach to young people
    - NOT just more data collection!

6) How can the LMS support these goals?
    - Pipeline progression project based on CV data collated for the relatively small set of UK women mathematics professors as compared to a sample of UK men professors at matched institutions.
    - Work to understand what the culture is in mathematics departments and what aspects of culture are most important to change—develop ways to support change effectively.
        i. Visibility of women and other minorities
        ii. How do we define, talk about and measure success?

iii. Accessibility: How do we support alternative paths to success in mathematics?
iv. Countering emphasis on “genius” over incremental work
v. How do we assess and appraise staff and their work? Recognising bias in these processes and working to make appraisal more transparent.
vi. How does community operate in mathematics, and how can it be made more inclusive?
vii. How do we talk about diversity in the mathematics community? How can we extend the discussion?
viii. How can we target outreach at those sitting on the fence, not on those already committed (see schemes at KCL and Manchester)?

- Work with IMA, RSS, ORS, EMS, etc. to support effective culture change
  i. Accreditation and support for outreach activities (E.G. Girls in Mathematics Days, see also Higher Education Access Tracker)
  ii. Include E&D considerations in LMS responses to government consultations on any issue of relevance to the community.
  iii. Provide a set of recommendations for departments (EG, inclusion of outreach in workload models, inclusion of culture questions in staff surveys, inclusion of EDI as a standing item in department meeting agendas, etc)
  iv. Create standardised staff and student survey questions on culture to be used nationally to measure and track changes
  v. Develop National Action Plan to Improve Culture in UK Mathematics Departments and work to develop buy-in from entire community
  vi. Proposed GPS workshop topic: Effective Outreach and Supporting Diversity