Executive summary

In 2014, as part of improving gender equity for research-active women at QUT, a suite of seven recommendations arising from the ‘Gender equity, research, and related issues at QUT’ report, was funded and approved. One of these recommendations focused on women in the STEM disciplines and sought to improve the retention and advancement of women in STEM, through support programs, removal of barriers and biases, better access to leadership positions, and the active involvement of senior staff in the program.

This body of work became the ‘Women in STEM Project’ and this report outlines the 2016 program of activities and its outcomes.

(For this Project, STEM includes ongoing and fixed term academic staff in the Science and Engineering Faculty; Institute for Future Environments; Institute of Health and Biomedical Innovation; and the School of Biomedical Sciences in the Faculty of Health.)

A pre-program survey guided the development of activities for the Project which consisted of:

1. A mentoring and career advancement program (predominantly for academic women in STEM Levels A-D).
2. A leadership shadowing/deputising program (predominantly for academic women in STEM Levels C-E).
3a. Training and development workshops for all academic women in STEM.
3b. Improving organisational culture workshops for academic and professional STEM men and women in senior positions.

Of the 221 potential female participants, 62 opted in to the program elements initially, although the number of female attendees across all program elements by year’s end was 180. The biggest barrier to participation was lack of time. As well, over 100 senior staff participated as mentors, leaders or in unconscious bias seminars. All activities were evaluated and all achieved an overall rating above 4 out of 5, which is considered an excellent result. A similar suite of programs is underway for 2017.

Since the Women in STEM Project began, the Athena SWAN (SAGE) process has been introduced and involves a broader group of STEM staff. The SAGE pilot is a national pilot that uses the Athena SWAN Charter, an evaluation and accreditation framework from the UK that addresses the improvement of gender equity policies and practices in the Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathemetic and Medicine (STEMM) sector. In 2017 the Project will broaden its scope to match that of SAGE, (which doubles the number of potential participants), and will be monitored by the Self-Assessment Team.

A full evaluation of the Women in STEM Project 2016 pilot program and activities is outlined on the following pages.
Background

As part of improving gender equity for research-active women at QUT a suite of 7 recommendations has been approved and funded, arising from the ‘Gender equity, research, and related issues at QUT’ report:

- View Report
- View Appendices

The STEM-specific Recommendation 7 seeks to improve the retention and advancement of women in STEM, through support programs, removal of barriers and biases, better access to leadership positions, and the active involvement of senior staff in the program.

In February 2015 the STEM Sub-Committee designed a survey for female academic staff in STEM disciplines (SEF, IFE, IHBI and the Faculty of Health School of Biomedical Sciences) to gather insights and opinions to guide the development of programs across QUT designed to maximise the retention and advancement of women in STEM.

A Women in STEM Project Officer was appointed end September 2015 to undertake analysis of the survey responses, develop a suite of programs and activities and implement these.

During this time, QUT was also accepted as an inaugural Athena SWAN Charter Member and Science in Australia Gender Equity (SAGE) pilot participant. SAGE is an initiative of the Australian Academy of Science in partnership with the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering that addresses gender equity in the Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematic and Medicine (STEMM) sector.

The SAGE pilot uses the Athena SWAN Charter, an evaluation and accreditation framework from the UK that addresses the improvement of gender equity policies and practices in STEMM.

QUT is one of 40 institutions participating in the Australian pilot and is working towards an Athena SWAN Bronze Institutional Award which will be prepared throughout 2017 and submitted in early 2018. Programs and activities conducted for the Women in STEM Project will form part of the action plan that is a required element of the submission.
Women in STEM Project pre-program survey

The purpose of the pre-program survey was to guide the development of activities for the Women in STEM Project. The survey design was based on Recommendation 7 arising from the ‘Gender equity, research, and related issues at QUT’ report. Details of this recommendation are:

a. That a mentoring / coaching (or similar) program be developed for existing female staff in SEF, IFE, IHBI, Health Faculty’s School of Biomedical Sciences to maximise the chance of their retention and advancement, and that senior men play a key role in the program.

b. That for existing leadership positions, consideration be given to having standing deputies or to shadowing, as well as acting roles and secondments, as a means of involving more women in leadership roles.

c. That senior and influential staff be assisted to be active champions of gender equity in their professional spheres of influence e.g. advocating inclusion of women as conference speakers / chairs, editorial panels, invited scholars and the like.

d. That SEF give consideration to the suggestions arising from the ATN process, including participating in the Athena SWAN charter. (Note: QUT was subsequently accepted into the first tranche of the national Athena SWAN (SAGE) pilot program.)

The survey incorporated four questions that addressed:

- Programs to support women in STEM
- Aspects of organisational culture (including barriers/biases)
- Ways that senior staff can support gender equity
- Other program and practice ideas.

The survey was sent via email to all academic and research women in SEF, IFE, IHBI and the Faculty of Health School of Biomedical Sciences, based on being:

- Ongoing or Fixed Term
- Academic Levels A, B, C, D, E & SSG
- Post-Doctoral Researchers
- Research Fellows.

The committee agreed not to include casual staff; teaching only appointments; and professional staff. The number of potential survey participants was 181 and 52 responses were collected (28.73%).

Overall survey findings

1. There is strong support for existing QUT-wide programs (QWIL, Women in Research grants); emerging QUT-wide programs (carers’ support; long leave career planning); and recommended women in STEM programs (mentoring; leadership shadowing; ‘influencer’ activity). Growth in the scale and reach of all programs was strongly supported.

2. The issue rated most strongly on ‘usefulness’ is that of mentoring/support from senior researchers in grants, projects and networking; with strong support for more women in leadership positions, and modifying the competitive culture.
Overall survey findings (cont’d)

3. A mix of optimism and pessimism about the prospects of change is apparent, with a small but significant number quite sceptical. The likelihood of criticism surrounding ‘women only’ programs is seen as an issue.

4. Some women are currently isolated and marginalised; and there is widespread awareness of biases (both conscious and unconscious) and unfair barriers.

5. The impact of inappropriate casual remarks and passive bystander behaviour can be significant.

6. A strong desire exists to see visible senior leadership and widespread support to create a supportive culture.

Gender equity at QUT

It is important to note that the Women in STEM Project sits as a measure within the context of existing and emerging uni-wide gender equity programs at QUT. Since this program began, the Athena SWAN (SAGE) process has been introduced. It is intended that for 2017 there will be a focus on making these two elements nest more closely together. Close liaison with the Women in Leadership Committee and its Women in Research Sub-Committee is ongoing to ensure all activities work as a coherent offering.

Women in STEM Project 2016 pilot program

The pre-program survey and additional consultation informed development of a suite of activities that directly aligned with the six key survey findings. Activities tapped into topics that were raised as being of specific interest and were targeted at various audiences: all academic women in STEM; women in STEM at different academic levels; and importantly senior academic and professional men and women in STEM (a critical component for matters relating to organisational culture).

Existing QUT programs were part of the consideration in developing the full program of activities to determine successful elements that could be relevantly extended to the target. As the challenges facing women in STEM are shared world-wide, there was also scope for sourcing examples of good practice and adapting successful models for new activity that would be an appropriate fit for QUT.

The programs and activities for the Women in STEM Project 2016 pilot program were:
1. A mentoring and career advancement program (predominantly for academic women in STEM Levels A-D).
2. A leadership shadowing/deputising program (predominantly for academic women in STEM Levels C-E).
3a. Training and development workshops for all academic women in STEM.
3b. Improving organisational culture workshops for academic and professional STEM men and women in senior positions.
Women in STEM Project 2016 pilot program (cont’d)

Women in STEM Project opt-in process

With the suite of activities on offer, an opt-in process was developed. Outlines and timing for each of the programs and activities was provided so that respondents could review these and assess in terms of their interest and availability. It was ensured that activities were offered across different days of the week so that part-time staff would still have options to choose from. Activities were also scheduled at family-friendly times.

The opt-in process allowed respondents to choose up to four program and activity selections. This was to assist in meeting differing needs and the aim was to ensure that everyone had the opportunity to participate in at least two of their choices. The option of a residential writing retreat was issued as a separate Expression of Interest in conjunction with two additional uni-wide writing retreats so that respondents interested in this option could choose the dates that best suited them.

Respondents were made aware that the project had top level support, with the following quote from the Vice-Chancellor included as part of the opt-in process:

“We are very aware at QUT of the importance of gender considerations as part of our core mission. Diversity is good for business, and we are in the knowledge business. We therefore aim for our teaching, research and community service to be informed and enriched by a diversity of perspectives. It is our hope that, by focussing on the area of women in STEM, gender equity will become a firm reality.”

Professor Peter Coaldrake AO, Vice-Chancellor
Women in STEM Project opt-in process (cont’d)

The number of potential project participants was 221 and 62 opt-ins were collected (28.05%). The biggest barrier to participation was lack of time:

“I have been overwhelmed with work and just do not feel I can opt-in for additional activities – even for the ones that I am interested in, I just don’t have the time to commit to them.”

Details of respondents by academic level and work area can be found in Appendix A.

Opt-in process results

- 62 respondents (221 potential respondents – response rate 28.05%)
- 45 respondents from SEF/CTCB/IFE (72.58%)
- 17 respondents from Health/IHBI (27.42%)

The table below contains all of the choices made by respondents and indicates a good spread of interest across the suite of activities. The two lowest opt-in levels were for facilitated group mentoring and leadership shadowing, which may not be as familiar as some of the other activities, but awareness of and interest in them is expected to increase as a result of the activity undertaken in 2016.

Based on the final choices, it was decided that respondents would be able to participate in all of their selected choices. Separate outlines for each program/activity are included on the following pages.

### Ranking of (up to) 4 x program/activity choices for each respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Activity</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>3rd Choice</th>
<th>4th Choice</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual mentoring</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated group mentoring</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership shadowing/deputising</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep dive workshop: Time management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep dive workshop: Leading self and others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short workshop: Engaging with industry and seeking funding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short workshop: Grant application planning and development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short workshop: Preparing and applying for a promotion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Mentoring and career advancement

Program objectives
- Create a supportive environment/community
- Encourage female academics in STEM with a focus on sharing skills, knowledge and experience
- Foster the potential and confidence of mentees to develop their careers.

1a. Individual mentoring
- 27 opt-ins (5 did not proceed due to changed commitments – eg moving faculty, reducing commitments due to pregnancy, resignation – 22 mentee/mentor pairings were completed, avoiding direct lines of report)
- Mentees:
  - By level: Level A – 4; Level B – 14; Level C – 4.
  - By work area: SEF – 18; Health – 3; IHBI – 1.
- Mentors:
  - 15 females and 7 males (mentors are not only from SEF, IFE, Health, IHBI, but also Business, Creative Industries and 1 x external mentor from The Brisbane Times).

1b. Facilitated group mentoring
- 11 opt-ins (2 did not proceed due to changed commitments – eg recently returned from maternity leave – 3 groups were configured and matched with a senior academic as facilitator, avoiding direct lines of report)
- Mentee Peer Groups:
  - Group 1: Level A/SEF; Level A/Health; Level C/SEF.
  - Group 2: Level A/SEF; Level A/SEF; Level B/SEF.
  - Group 3: Level A/SEF; Level B/SEF; Level B/Health.
- Mentors:
  - 1 female and 2 males (from SEF and Health).

Process/cycle
Mentees were sent an initiation questionnaire to identify the types of mentoring they were seeking: eg scholarship of teaching; research related; career planning; work life balance; etc. Mentees were also asked: how senior they wanted their mentor to be; whether they had a specific interest/need for a female mentor; whether they wanted their mentor to be in their specific field, in any STEM field or even a field outside STEM; and also whether they had someone in mind as a mentor. Where mentor suggestions weren’t provided, and this was the majority, mentor options were sourced to match the mentee’s needs and the options discussed with the mentee. The agreed mentor was then approached to participate. Separate orientation/information sessions were developed for mentees and mentors before commencing the mentoring arrangement. Eight sessions were held and participants were provided: an outline of the program; a participation agreement to sign; development plan template; and learning journal. Mentors and mentees were to undertake an initial meeting (to discuss the mentee’s completed development plan) and then up to four mentoring sessions before year end.
Process/cycle

Summary of participant evaluations – Individual mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Evaluation</th>
<th>1 Very Poor</th>
<th>2 Poor</th>
<th>3 Fair</th>
<th>4 Good</th>
<th>5 Very Good</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the mentoring program overall?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.63/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning and Growth</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I experienced learning and growth during the process.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.56/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuation of Project Element</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should be available to Women in STEM in future years.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.69/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant comments – Individual mentoring

“The mentoring program has been extremely useful for me. My mentor has gone far and beyond to help me achieve my goals and this has definitely made a big difference. I am more confident about what to do and I think this will have a positive impact in my career. The support I have received is just priceless.”

“The program put an official stamp on the mentor-mentee arrangement. I had wanted my mentor to mentor me before the STEM program started but it is difficult to just approach someone and ask if they are willing to mentor me. This program made it easier to establish.”

“The mentoring program gave me so much insight into my objective and goals for the period. My mentor was highly knowledgeable and generous in time and expertise. I have learnt more than I anticipated to.”
Participant comments – Individual mentoring (cont’d)

“This has been one of the most useful things I’ve been involved with at QUT.”

“I believe I would need additional sessions to gain from this mentorship program, although it was very useful to discuss about my career progress. There are additional sessions required to discuss the solutions to the hurdles. I think it takes time to nurture the mentee-mentor relationship and we are on the right track.”

“Both my mentor and I were very busy this semester so a longer period for mentoring would be good.”

Summary of participant evaluations – Facilitated group mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Evaluation</th>
<th>1 Very Poor</th>
<th>2 Poor</th>
<th>3 Fair</th>
<th>4 Good</th>
<th>5 Very Good</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the group mentoring program overall?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.50/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning and Growth</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I experienced learning and growth during the process.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.38/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuation of Project Element</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should be available to Women in STEM in future years.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.50/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant comments – Facilitated group mentoring

“Having group mentoring and academics of various levels allowed me to gain a better perspective in what lies ahead and ask questions that I have not thought of.”

“I learnt a lot from listening to peers with a shared contemporary experience in addition to the advice and perspectives of an experienced researcher.”

“Being in a group at a similar stage of career would be better.”

“I have a larger professional and support network compared to before I started in the program. I have gained more confidence as a researcher and feel better equipped to meet my career aspirations.”

“Definitely need longer running programs. It’s hard to achieve something truly meaningful and track success of plans within a few months.”

“It was an excellent experience for our group. Very supportive and helpful. But we had barely got going when it ended. It really needs to run for longer.”
2. Leadership shadowing/deputising

Program objectives
- Create a supportive community at senior leadership level
- Develop the leadership capabilities of female academics in STEM
- Foster the potential and confidence of Shadows to progress to senior leadership roles over time.

Opt-ins
- 10 opt-ins (2 did not proceed due to changed commitments – eg teaching new unit, recently returned from maternity leave – 8 shadow/leader pairings have been completed with direct lines of report avoided)

Mentees:
- By level: Level A – 1; Level C – 5; Level D – 2.
- By work area: SEF – 6; Health – 2.

Leaders:
- 7 females and 1 male (the two that did not proceed were with male leaders – leaders are not only from SEF, IFE, Health, IHBI but also Business, Creative Industries and Chancellery).

Process/cycle
Shadows were sent an initiation questionnaire to identify the area they would most like to develop their career (eg leader, manager, researcher, etc). Shadows were also asked: if they were interested in just observing or being more actively involved; whether they wanted to shadow within their own area/school or outside it (and if so, what areas in the university were of interest); and also who or what role/s they would like to shadow. This was then worked through with the shadow and a suitable leader approached to participate. Orientation/information sessions were developed for shadows and leaders to attend together before commencing the leadership shadowing arrangement. Six sessions were held and participants were provided: an outline of the program; a participation agreement to sign; profile and goal sheet; and learning journal. Leaders and shadows were to undertake an initial meeting (to discuss the shadow’s completed profile and goal sheet) and then up to four half days of shadowing before year end.
**Summary of participant evaluations – Leadership shadowing/deputising**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Evaluation</th>
<th>1 Very Poor</th>
<th>2 Poor</th>
<th>3 Fair</th>
<th>4 Good</th>
<th>5 Very Good</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the leadership shadow program overall?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.67/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence to Progress</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I increased my confidence to progress in my career.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.50/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuation of Project Element</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should be available to Women in STEM in future years.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.83/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participant comments – Leadership shadowing/deputising**

“I have a better knowledge and understanding of more senior roles and processes in the university and more insight into how to position myself to be considered for leadership roles.”

“My main shadowing activity was to attend research-focused meetings and I found this very useful. I had difficulty meeting the time commitment for the program – but this is likely a problem on my part, not the part of the program and having to factor in travel time between GP and KG.”

“I gained insight into the complexities and nuances of high level leadership decision making. It was an incredibly helpful and valuable experience and I appreciate the huge effort this was to coordinate.”

“This experience was very timely in showing me what is possible and I look forward to emulating this in my own career.”

“I think leadership shadowing is an excellent program and I certainly gained a lot from it.”

“I liked the flexibility provided by the program so that it can be tailored to suit the leader and shadow involved and I really liked the opportunity to shadow someone outside the faculty.”

“The program was great but only gave me a short glimpse into the role of the leader – it would be better to follow for longer.”
3. Deep dive workshops

3a. Residential writing retreat

**Expression of Interest process**
Details of the writing retreat were included in the opt-in process, but it was noted that a separate Expression of Interest process would be followed for this activity because two additional writing retreats were also being offered for academic women university-wide. Having the details and dates for all three writing retreats allowed those interested to select the most suitable timing. The Women in STEM Project writing retreat was offered as a residential opportunity.

Selection criteria for the writing retreats are primarily based on readiness to produce an outcome. Applicants need to provide the following to be considered for the opportunity:

i) a brief statement (max 200 words) outlining:
   a. why they would like to participate in the writing retreat
   b. what they plan to write
   c. which publication they are targeting
   d. what their timeframe is for doing this

ii) a statement of support from their supervisor to participate (max 200 words).

**Participants**
There were 16 successful applicants for the inaugural Women in STEM Project residential writing retreat (one applicant cancelled due to illness).

The makeup of participants was:
- Level: Level A – 5; Level B – 6; Level C – 4.
- Work area: SEF – 10; Health – 4; Law – 1 (this candidate was accepted for a uni-wide retreat, but due to a conflict joined the Women in STEM).

**Planning and retreat**
Karyn Gonano and Sophie Abel, Academic Language and Learning Educators, were engaged as the facilitators. A planning workshop was held with participants prior to attending the retreat which outlined writing tips, article templates and allowed participants to work on documenting their individual goals and work plan for the retreat. The retreats aim to enable participants to write more effectively and efficiently and reflect on good writing practice. The Women in STEM Project writing retreat was held at Mercure Clear Mountain Thursday 7 July and Friday 8 July. A networking dinner was included on the Thursday night.

**Summary of participant evaluations – Residential writing retreat**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what degree were your expectations of this retreat met?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.46/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant comments – Residential writing retreat

“I would have liked to experience a writing circle before the retreat so I knew what it actually was. Perhaps the planning workshop could involve a writing circle.”

“I didn’t get through everything I planned to but made solid progress on the piece of writing I brought to the retreat. It’s progress I wouldn’t have made if I was in the office, dealing with everyday responsibilities.”

“I learnt more about writing and did more writing than I had all year.”

“One of the most important things for me was the energy in the room at the retreat. It was good to be surrounded by people who were all doing the same thing, and who were all really keen to make the most of the opportunity.”

“The facilitators were excellent with providing feedback on my writing and strategies for improvement.”

“The residential aspect was important – not having to commute, to cook, to go home and deal with real life... this made a big difference.”

“The overnight stay was a great experience to bond with other women and develop a support network.”

“I think the writing retreat was the best development activity I’ve been involved in for years.”

The additional deep dive workshops addressed two key themes: being time poor; and being better equipped to lead. Workshops in these areas were already being delivered in programs like QWIL and MCAD and were rated highly by the participants, so there was an opportunity to utilise existing external contacts and extend these successful workshops to a broader audience.

3b. Time management workshop

The workshop was delivered by Hugh Kearns. Hugh is recognised internationally as a public speaker, educator and researcher. He regularly lectures at universities across the world. The workshop showed participants how to guarantee spending quality time on teaching and research outputs and participants were assisted with developing action plans for taking more control of their time. The workshop was held Thursday 11 August, 10.30am-2.00pm (including a networking lunch).

Participants

There were 30 initial opt-ins – the makeup of final participants was:
- Level:
  - Level A – 7; Level B – 11; Level C – 8; Level D - 2.
- Work area:
  - SEF – 16; Health – 10; IFE – 1; IHBI – 1.

Summary of participant evaluations – Time management workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Evaluation</th>
<th>1 Very Poor</th>
<th>2 Poor</th>
<th>3 Fair</th>
<th>4 Good</th>
<th>5 Very Good</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the time management workshop overall?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.75/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant comments – Time management workshop

“The workshop provided strategies that are both viable and easy to implement.”

“After attending the workshop, I was mindful of everyday time wasters and I learnt practical and useful strategies to help me structure my time in a meaningful manner. It has enhanced my productivity and I am achieving more through the day!”

“I came back and gave the handouts to my team and other colleagues in my area. We are all trying to use the tips and promote a positive work/life culture with each other. It is difficult though if other people in your team/area don’t support or encourage more balance at work between work responsibilities and also work/life balance.”

“The workshop was more about research-focused academics, but it would be useful to also look at the time management challenges faced by teaching-focused academics.”

“Slightly longer time for discussion would have been good – the presenter was excellent, but it was great to hear other colleagues’ strategies and I would have liked more of this.”

3c. Leading self and others workshop

The workshop was delivered by Liz Mellish. Liz has an Ed.D in Strategic Leadership, is a Graduate of the Australian Institute of Company Directors and has worked extensively with government and higher education clients. Her workshop is designed to assist aspiring leaders through Appreciative Inquiry (AI) - an approach that offers the process and potential to explore, imagine, design and commit to moving forward as an effective leader. The workshop was held Tuesday 18 October, 9.30am-2.00pm (including a networking lunch).

Participants

There were 31 initial opt-ins – the makeup of final participants was:
- Level: Level A – 3; Level B – 10; Level C – 3; Level D - 1.

Summary of participant evaluations – Leading self and others workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Evaluation</th>
<th>1 - Below Avg</th>
<th>2 - Average</th>
<th>3 - Good</th>
<th>4 - Very Good</th>
<th>5 - Excellent</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the leadership workshop overall?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.31/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant comments – Leading self and others workshop

“I was impressed with the lively presentation and the concrete examples of all the concepts presented.”

“I really enjoyed the workshop, but it could be an all day workshop.”
Participant comments – Leading self and others workshop (cont’d)

“In both my research leadership and administrative leadership roles I will be applying the learnings from today!”

“I think the workshop would benefit from less content and more examples/scenarios from the uni setting."

“It was a bit rushed at the end – maybe we could have all tackled a single problem, more slowly and deliberately.”

4. Short workshops

The short workshops were all derived from topics that were raised as being of specific interest in the pre-program survey: Engaging with industry and seeking funding; Grant application planning and development; and Preparing and applying for a promotion. The workshops have been delivered by senior academic staff and included a keynote presentation followed by a Q&A panel. An ‘open invitation’ process was used closer to the timing of the workshops, as conflicts arose for some of the women in STEM who had opted-in to attend. Those who could still attend (from the original opt-ins) were given the opportunity to pre-submit questions for the panel.

4a. Engaging with industry and seeking funding workshop

Approximately 40 women in STEM attended. Bronwyn Harch delivered the keynote presentation and was then joined by Mark Gibbs, Peter Grace, Cynthia Cliff and Troy Farrell on a Q&A panel. The workshop was held Wednesday 31 August, 12-2pm (including a networking lunch).

Summary of participant evaluations – Engaging with industry and seeking funding workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you rate the workshop overall?</th>
<th>1 Very Poor</th>
<th>2 Poor</th>
<th>3 Fair</th>
<th>4 Good</th>
<th>5 Very Good</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.64/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant comments – Engaging with industry and seeking funding workshop

“I found it extremely useful to hear about the emotional intelligence skills required in negotiations and the exposure to the language of business that as a scientist I was unfamiliar with.”

“This was one of the best workshops I’ve attended.”

“I think some more time should be spent talking about ways to start engaging with industry when you have no connections (especially for early academics).”

“If the panel could include someone from industry or government sectors, that probably can give us some direct feedback from partners’ viewpoints. I appreciate the viewpoints from experienced and successful academics.”
4b. Grant application planning and development workshop

Approximately 40 women in STEM attended. Gordon Wyeth delivered the keynote presentation and was then joined by Margot Brereton, Adrian Herington on a Q&A panel. The workshop was held Friday 23 September, 12-2pm (including a networking lunch).

Summary of participant evaluations – Grant application planning and development workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Evaluation</th>
<th>1 Very Poor</th>
<th>2 Poor</th>
<th>3 Fair</th>
<th>4 Good</th>
<th>5 Very Good</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the workshop overall?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.40/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant comments – Grant application planning and development workshop

“Interactive, thought provoking and practical information. Best session on grant writing strategy I have been to in a very long time.”

“Everything discussed in this workshop was really useful. I have only helped prepare one ARC Discovery grant so far, so I really needed some pieces of advice to be able to improve the quality of the application.”

“I would like to see a balanced focus on ARC and NHMRC. It would also be very useful to look at alternative options to Cat 1 grants like the philanthropic – these may be better suited to more junior researchers.”

“It might also be good to hear from younger researchers that have been successful in getting grants that are not necessarily from competitive government schemes.”

4c. Preparing and applying for a promotion workshop

A range of women Levels A-C expressed interest in attending a ‘Preparing and applying for a promotion’ workshop as part of the opt-in process. Due to reviews of the promotion process – Level A→B, Level B→C, the workshop was postponed to run once review outcomes were determined. The Level C women who expressed an interest were matched with a suitable senior academic to provide one-on-one guidance on the Level C→D promotion process. This will form a trial for review and possible broader offering during 2017.
5. Improving organisational culture workshops

5a. Unconscious bias

Working with the Human Resources Organisational Development area, Jennifer Whelan (Psynapse) was engaged to run the workshops. Five unconscious bias workshops have been held to date for the Women in STEM Project with a total of 69 senior SEF/IFE/Health/IHBI staff attending. Additional workshops are being discussed for 2017 as well as ‘town hall’ style training to accommodate larger groups.

Workshop objectives
The aim for the workshops is for participants to:

- Understand:
  - What unconscious bias is
  - The role it plays in workplace decisions
  - The implications for organisations and QUT in particular
  - The link between diversity/inclusiveness and business/organisational benefits.
- Develop bias awareness and inclusive leadership skills through strategies and practical steps to identify, address and mitigate bias in everyday work situations – meetings, decision making, recruitment, team interactions, workload distribution, performance management, etc.

Participant comments

“It has raised my awareness about my bias and I hope that I can improve my unconscious perceptions.”

“This is very relevant to me as a decision maker. Understanding my possible unconscious bias’ will allow me to be more mindful when making decisions. I will attempt to slow my thought processes when making key decisions.”

“There were a lot of new insights for me in the workshop. The biggest take away was that diversity and inclusion are two quite separate notions, and that diversity without inclusion is a wasted opportunity. I have my own specific actions which I am now quite motivated to follow through on.”

“I would like to see more discussion on strategies to overcome our unconscious bias. I felt like we only touched on this and more information and skills should be useful.”

5b. Using power and influence to make a difference

This is a completely new workshop that will run as a follow up to the unconscious bias training. Its purpose is to inspire and empower senior staff to use their influence for gender equity and to be champions in their spheres of influence.

The workshop is in the final stages of design and will be trialed for rollout in 2017.
**Moving forward – 2017**

In 2016, the scope for the Women in STEM Project included ongoing and fixed term female academic staff in SEF, IFE, IHBI and the School of Biomedical Sciences in the Faculty of Health – a group of approximately 200.

Due to pre-dating the Athena SWAN (SAGE) pilot, the current project scope is not as extensive as the pilot. The major change for the Women in STEM Project for 2017 will be one of scale in making the project congruent with the broader scope of the Athena SWAN (SAGE) pilot – this will double the target audience by taking in more of the Faculty of Health and areas in Creative Industries.

As the evaluation and accreditation framework for the Athena SWAN SAGE pilot addresses the improvement of gender equity policies and practices in the Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematic and Medicine (STEMM) sector, moving forward the project will be referred to as the Women in STEMM Project.

Feedback indicates that the current programs and activities are on the right track.

“I am really happy that I took part in this project and that QUT is making an effort in changing the work culture. This program has a real capability to make a difference in the lives of many women.”

Keeping the same program elements in broad terms is recommended for 2017. Additional topics will be considered and elements may need to be adjusted to reflect any changes in public policy in the area of research excellence. Feedback from participants in terms of suggested improvements will also be considered. Doubling the target audience in 2017 will prompt consideration of delivering program elements like workshops more than once.

There is a strong desire for longer duration programs and this will be accommodated with an earlier release of the programs and activities in 2017.

Report compiled by Tracy Straughan, Project Officer, Women in STEM Project.

February 2017.

Contact:

Email: tracy.straughan@qut.edu.au

Phone: +61 7 3138 1584
Appendix A

Opt-in survey results – Employment classification

Out of the 62 opt-ins, approximately 65% came from Levels A and B, with Level C making up the bulk of the remainder. In terms of the full target audience (N=221: Level A 66; Level B 80; Level C 38; Level D 20; Level E 15; SSG 2) those at Level C opted-in at the highest rate with 45% of the total pool of women at Level C opting-in. Opt-in rates for the other academic levels were: Level A 21%; Level B 33%; and Level D 25%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment classification</th>
<th>Answered: 62</th>
<th>Skipped: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer Choices | Responses |
----------------|------------|
Level A         | 22.88%     | 14         |
Level B         | 41.94%     | 26         |
Level C         | 27.42%     | 17         |
Level D         | 8.06%      | 5          |
Level E         | 0.00%      | 0          |
SSG             | 0.00%      | 0          |
Total           |            | 62         |
Appendix A

Opt-in survey results – Work area

Out of the 62 opt-ins, almost half the responses came from three work areas. In order they were: SEF/School of Chemistry, Physics and Mechanical Engineering; Health/School of Biomedical Sciences; and IHBI. In terms of the full target audience, the majority of work areas opted-in at levels around 25-30%. Three work areas had opt-in rates higher than this: the Centre for Tropical Crops and Biocommodities had four out of the seven women in the area opt-in; SEF/School of Civil Engineering and Built Environment had 7 out of the 17 women opt-in (41%); and SEF/School of Information Systems had 5 out of the 14 women in the area opt-in (36%).