

## **Changing the organisational balance of women's representation through a strategic cultural change approach.**

**“It's a long way to the top...”**

*Heather Cameron, Principal Adviser Equity, Diversity and Policy Implementation at Griffith University, Qld, Australia*

### **Abstract**

Griffith University has a history of long and sustained commitment to improving the representation of women in senior positions specifically, and throughout the organisation generally.

It has achieved this through embedding a focus on gender equality as a strategic priority in its planning and reporting processes for more than a decade. In doing so it has drawn on the theory and practice that underpins organisational cultural change and on strategic planning principles and practice. Through this process it has achieved an improvement in the percentage of women at all levels of the organisation, and most notably in the ranks of senior academics. This success is at odds with trends in other organisations, where data shows that the representation of women at senior levels – on boards, within executive ranks, and within the ranks of senior academic women – is either static or declining.

Consistent factors in the success of shifting gender equality from being a “special” consideration to one which is part of the normal planning, review and reporting processes has been the engagement of the senior executive, through the Vice Chancellor's ongoing and active commitment, and through the identification of a member of the senior executive group with specific responsibilities for gender equity. This has been maintained through restructures and reviews of executive portfolios, as well as organisational units, changes to personnel in senior positions, including the Vice Chancellor, and immense growth in the University.

This paper and presentation charts the sustained approach taken by Griffith University, and provides evidence of its achievement that make it truly an employer of choice for women. It focuses on the major events that shaped changes at corporate levels and how these translated into activities within operational units. It discusses the impact that effective policy implementation can have on changing organisational culture and practice, and shows how using change management approaches integrated into the business of the university brings about long term and sustained benefit to women.

### **Introduction**

Griffith University is a large university in Brisbane, Queensland. Spread across five campuses it has approximately 3600 staff and 38000 students. Established in 1971, and admitting its first students in 1975 Griffith's history as a university has always been one of being “a little bit different” and in its early years it had the status of being “the alternative” university in Brisbane, and indeed, South East Queensland. It

competes strongly with two other large Brisbane based universities, and within the region there are six public and one private universities.

Griffith has a strong commitment to equity and social justice, which is reflected in its mission and values statements. Successive Vice Chancellors have been actively committed to the advancement of women, evidenced largely through their endorsement of policies and programs that support this.

However, it is all very well to have the rhetoric, but what does the evidence show have been the outcomes of this longstanding commitment?

### **Trend Data**

In order to benchmark progress both internally and externally with other Australian universities the categories of Senior Academic (Professor and Associate Professor) and the differentiated levels of Professor, Associate Professor and Senior Administrative staff (Higher Education Worker levels 10 and above) are used throughout.

The data presented also shows the Senior Lecturer level, as this is seen to be the level which most academics can expect to reach during their academic career, and the overall average numbers of women in academic and general staff positions. (See Attachment 1)

The trend data collated over the past ten years shows consistent, albeit gradual, increase in the percentage of women at professorial levels. There has also been an increase in the percentage of women in Deans' roles<sup>1</sup>. There is a slight upward trend in the representation of women in senior administrative roles. However, this paper focuses on women in academic roles as this is the more difficult area in which to achieve, and sustain, growth.

In looking at the trend data the first question that needs to be asked is whether this trend is significant in any way, or is it simply a reflection of general progress across the board. Benchmarking against our major competitors, the other two large universities in Brisbane, shows that Griffith has increased its representation of women in senior academic roles by 8.5% since 2002. The sector average for the same period is 5.9%, and our competitors increased by 4% and 3% respectively.<sup>2</sup> So the increase in the representation of women at these levels at Griffith is probably not just a matter of chance or reflection of trends in the sector generally.

### **Major interventions and their impacts**

---

<sup>1</sup> Outside of the senior executive, Deans are seen to hold the more strategic and influential positions in the academic management structure.

<sup>2</sup> Selected inter-institutional gender equity statistics. Based on parameters from the AVCC Action Plans for Women in Australian Universities, 1999 - 2003 and 2006 – 2010 Australia-wide statistics 2007. Compiled by QUT.

Achieving a sustained rate of progress, albeit one that is marked by small and incremental changes, rather than large leaps, has been a work in progress for a number of years. In order to understand the present situation at Griffith it is necessary to look back over the history of the University, and the major interventions that occurred along the way.

In the decade of the **mid 1980's to the mid 1990's** Griffith piloted an Affirmative Action program, which was the forerunner to the eventual *Affirmative Action (Equal Employment Opportunity for Women) Act 1986*. Under this Act all organisations with 100 or more employees were required to submit an annual report on their activities being taken to advance the status of women. In 1996 Griffith was named by the Affirmative Action Agency as the leading affirmative action employer in the higher education sector, recognising it as an organisation in which women's employment status was seriously considered and actions taken to improve it.

In 1994 a designated role of Pro Vice Chancellor Equity was created, only the second such position created in any university at the time. The portfolio was added to the role of the Pro Vice Chancellor Business, held at the time by Professor Margaret Gardner. Of significance was that the portfolio of equity was attached to a senior executive role, and also to a person who had considerable knowledge and expertise in the area. The equity portfolio has remained in the remit of a member of senior executive ever since, in comparison with other universities where, for most, the portfolio has been restructured out, or sits with a position outside the executive.

The University Equity Committee was established in 1993, replacing a number of committees, including the Affirmative Action committee. In 1996 Griffith also gained federal government funding to implement an Indigenous Australian Employment Strategy, which is still in place, now fully supported by the University. In 1994 it implemented a program designed to provide assistance to academics whose careers had been disrupted through "equity related" issues – most notably, having to take time off to have and care for children. The Academic Staff Equity Development Program provides support, such as teaching release for one semester, to enable the recipient to undertake dedicated research or other appropriate activities during that time. Eligibility is limited to early career academics who meet the criteria. Evaluated in 2003 the program continues, with some modifications to take account of changing circumstances.

So the foundations for ensuring that women were provided with equality of opportunity were set relatively early in the life of the University, which admitted its first students in 1975. Seen in the context of the wider community, the state of Queensland only enacted its Anti-Discrimination Act in 1991, while the precursor, the Commonwealth Sex Discrimination Act, was implemented in 1984.

**Mid 1990 to early 2000** saw more structured and strategic approaches being taken at Griffith, while still maintaining the programs implemented in the earlier decade. The first University Equal Employment Opportunity Plan was developed. A very detailed document, it targeted almost every area of EEO imaginable. A Disability Action Plan was also developed, and the Indigenous Australian Employment Strategy was in

place. As well as having a university wide Equity Committee, there was an expectation that each element would have its own equity sub-committee.

A mentoring program for general staff women was developed and implemented, and promotion of academic women became a focus, with information sessions specifically targeted at women held prior to each annual promotion round.

**The early 2000's** saw a significant uptake in strategic focus around increasing the percentage of women in senior academic roles.

The University Equity Strategic Plan was developed, with very clear goals, targets and strategies. This plan combined both staff and student equity targets and strategies into the one plan for the first time. Task groups were established by the University Equity Committee, to address issues raised that potentially caused disadvantage to women's career progression. The most significant of these was a project that looked at the reasons why women's progress in gaining senior academic levels was so slow. A comprehensive survey of academic staff, and subsequent follow up with focus group discussions resulted in a full report<sup>3</sup> with fourteen recommendations being taken to the University Executive Group. (Refer Attachment 2) Thirteen were endorsed, and the final one, of reverting to annual promotion rounds for all levels of promotion, was eventually endorsed as part of the collective bargaining process.

At the same time funding for a Women in Leadership program was requested from the Vice Chancellor, who agreed, and an initial \$60,000 was allocated to the program, which commenced in 2005.

The impact of the report and recommendations were enduring. The requirement in the University's Recruitment Policy, that every shortlist must contain at least one woman, meant that selection panels had to pay much more attention to how they would attract suitable candidates to positions, especially those in which it had been traditionally difficult to attract women applicants. The Promotion Policy had specific clauses relating to equity enhanced, particularly in relation to those staff whose careers had been interrupted through carer responsibilities (largely women). Women were also being actively encouraged to seek promotion, and a target of achieving 18 women at professorial level was exceeded before the target date.

The impact went beyond the policy and program focus. The message was being given that this university was serious about wanting to encourage and support the recruitment, retention and development of women in academic roles. The implicit expectation was the senior staff would actively support this.

Other things were also happening at the same time. Diversity was adopted as a key component of the University's strategic plan, rather than just equity – the focus was thus on individuals, and their unique circumstances, as well as identified groups. Equity was a core criterion in element reviews – formal and comprehensive reviews of individual elements that took place every five years. In approving a rise in student fees the University's Council did so on the understanding that 10% of all revenue

---

<sup>3</sup> Women in Senior Academic Positions Task Group Report 2003

raised through this would be allocated to equity initiatives. The Employer of Choice Citation for organisations that demonstrated that they were actively pursuing strategies to improve the employment conditions of women was awarded for the first time in 2001, and Griffith was one of the first recipients. It has held the citation, awarded on an annual basis, ever since, one of only seventeen organisations (out of approximately 3000 reporting organisations) to do so.

Achievement of equity targets in relation to women became part of the key performance indicators (KPIs) for the senior executive and revision of academic staffing policies incorporated specific sections on equity, specifically spelling out that achievements were to be measured according to opportunities available, not some arbitrary measure of outcomes expected over a time span that did not take account of breaks, interruptions and differential workloads. The Collective Agreement negotiated at the time included generous paid parental leave provisions<sup>4</sup> and supplementation of salary of replacement staff on paid parental leave was centralised, removing any disadvantage to smaller elements, and thus potential disincentive to the employment of women. Flexibility became the hallmark of most employment environments, including the capacity to undertake part-time work for a period of up to five years with a guarantee to full time reversion at the end for the purpose of caring for dependants – an option used largely by women after giving birth and returning from parental leave.

The mid-2000s onwards became a time of consolidation of the range of policies and programs, still with the strong expectation that targets would be achieved, and that senior managers had the prime responsibility for leading these achievements.

### **Where are we now and how did we get here?**

As we near the end of the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century Griffith, a large organisation as well as a university, shows a trend against the norm in the global corporate world. It is steadily increasing the representation of women at its most senior levels, and is maintaining its policies and programs that have been implemented specifically to support women in the workplace. Anecdotally, this is not the case in a large number of similar organisations and universities, where the equity portfolio has been downgraded or totally restructured out of the organisational structure, and where programs have been limited in scope and importance.

So what makes Griffith different? There is no one single thing or group of things. Rather it is a combination of having three Vice Chancellors, all with different styles and strengths, but all with a commitment to furthering the equity agenda, and ensuring that women are supported, in practice, in their achievements; a Chancellor heading the University Council who is equally committed to actively monitoring the progress of the University in achieving its equity targets; strong and talented women taking on the equity portfolio at senior management levels; an Executive collectively supportive of policies and programs that work towards addressing disadvantage previously experienced by women in academia; and an organisational culture that has, over the years, been nurtured to expect that gender equity is the default position rather than the exception. Behind the scenes are a progressive Human Resources Director and an

---

<sup>4</sup> Griffith University Academic Staff Union Collective Agreement 2006 - 2008

Equity Policy Adviser role that has been maintained for a number of years. This role assists in shaping and influencing policy and strategy, largely through making sure that gender equity is consistently on the agenda of the senior executive. In 2007 the Employer of Choice for Women in the Workplace Agency, a national statutory body that administers the Employer of Choice for Women in the Workplace Act, awarded a Business Achievement Award for Leadership for the Advancement of Women to the Principal Adviser for Equity and Diversity at Griffith.

With all of the trends pointing in the right direction one must ask the question, is this progress sustainable? Change management theory tells us that while there are leaders who support the current state and while there are champions in positions that have influence then the current trend should be sustainable. Change to any one of the factors identified above could have an impact, but the more likely scenario is that the other factors would be strong enough to maintain the status quo. However change to a number of the factors, particularly occurring at the same time, may well result in gradual change to the supportive organisational culture that currently exists.

### **Senior colleagues' insights**

Comments were sought from several senior colleagues to test out the above somewhat quantitative analysis. Six academics and one senior manager from a support area were interviewed, and their aggregated answers are summarised below.

Broadly, the response to seeking insight into what it is about the University that makes one pay attention to gender equity resulted in the following:

- University policies, particularly requirements in the recruitment and promotion policies, but every document you look at has an explicit clause which is a trigger for action.
- The language of the University is such that one is constantly reminded.
- Discussions at many levels – committees, School staff, colleagues whose research supports gender equity.
- It relates to one's work, and is, in some senses, embedded in the culture – “over time, the consciousness of making sure that women are in leadership roles has grown.”
- Frameworks, policies, procedures, etc, all set up the game plan to enable fairness to prevail – they create a fair, equitable, accountable transparent work place.
- Legitimation for those who are driving the culture to enhance “right action” and contribute to that action.
- The rhetoric is there, and there is an informal reward system that goes with that.
- It's a business imperative – we need to attract and retain women students, we need to access a good pool of staff, there we must have women staff at all levels.

When asked what would be the consequences, if any, of ignoring gender equity issues, the responses were as follows:

- We'd be missing out on valuable staff, and this would eventually impact on senior management radar – there would be potential for industry links to dry up.

- It creates an unhealthy workplace, and reduces morale
- Cost to the organisation – not good business
- Collegial disdain!
- Probably not much unless research or teaching were suffering
- It could become a performance management issue
- Pro Vice Chancellors do convey the message to Heads of Department, but when pressure arises this (equity) would not take priority
- Consequences are sub-optimal – ignoring equity is not necessarily detrimental in the first instance

The age and backgrounds of the managers interviewed varied, and the responses to the question of when such awareness began were reflective of this diversity.

- Only when coming into a senior (Head of Department) role
- Always had it, but understanding was enhanced through actively seeking to get more women RHD students, and seeing what barriers they faced
- Family/social upbringing meant awareness was there, and it was enhanced through working in organisations with women colleagues
- Early career influences, working in countries and cultures where gender equity issues are strong

The senior staff interviewed are a very small sample of senior staff, and were not randomly selected. They were chosen because they are known to be supportive of equality and diversity. The implicit impression gained from the honest, and unflinching polite responses, was that while gender equity is on the agenda of most managers, it varies in importance and is not a top priority in the whole scheme of things. It could easily slip off that agenda. This position is best summarised by one response, “A bullying culture is still prevalent in some organisations, and still lingers in Griffith – a cultural shift is still needed in Australia.” The need for conscious diligence in keeping it firmly on the agenda is constant.

## **Summary**

Against national and international trends Griffith University reflects an environment where women, especially women in academia, can not only survive but can develop their academic careers. Limitations on achieving professional success, whether that be joining the professoriate, attaining an academic leadership position, or leading one of the many decision-making committees are more related to individual personal circumstance and perceptions of what is and is not possible than to organisational barriers.

A combination of wise appointments to key roles, subsequent and ongoing policy changes and programs initiated to address inequities, expectations that managers will be accountable for achievement of equity goals and the gradual but persistent growth of an organisational culture which not only supports but encourages women’s equality and thus professional growth has led to the position that we now hold.

Of course this is not reflected equally across the University. There are areas in which women are not thriving, reflected in their numbers and in the organisational culture of that area. There are other areas where women are doing more than surviving, but

where with a little effort and sustained and focused action they could develop faster and much more fully. And there are areas in which women are nurtured, supported, and recognised and rewarded as high achievers.

Organisations across the globe do not have a strong history of sustaining such changes over time when one or more of the critical supporting factors is removed. The challenge for Griffith is to maintain, and even improve, on its current position, regardless of what positional changes occur, or what external pressures (economic, societal, political) may come to be exerted.

At the time of writing this paper the University's Vice Chancellor and Council had just made three senior appointments; the Pro Vice Chancellor of the Science, Environment, Engineering and Technology Group, and two Deputy Vice Chancellor positions, one of which has the portfolio of social inclusion, encompassing staff and student equity. All three appointments are women, bringing the percentage of women on the University's Executive group to 45%. For the moment the future of women at Griffith looks promising.

## Equity Trend Data – 2001-2009

(All figures are taken from census date – 31 March each year, and show equity group as **percentage** of total staff population – excludes casual appointments)

Staff	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999
<b>Women in senior positions</b>											
- Senior Academic (D&E)	30	28	29	28	24	25	22	21	16	19	17
- Academic E	28	27	28	27	21	19	14	12	9	11	14
- Academic D	33	29	30	30	28	32	31	31	25	25	20
- Academic C	44	43	43	41	41	35	32	33	33	32	33
- General (Level 10 & above)	50	45	39	41	39	38	41	41	50	39	30
- Executive Group	36	36	33	40	45	36	30	30	12.5	25	25
<b>Female Staff</b>											
- Academic	45	44	44	42	42	40	38	42	44	36	35
- General	69	67	68	68	67	67	67	64	63	60	62
<b>Key milestones</b>			<i>University Equity &amp; Diversity Plan published</i>	<i>Annual promotion rounds for all levels implemented</i>	<i>Women in Leadership program implemented</i>	<i>Implementation of recruitment and promotion policy changes</i>	<i>Task group report endorsed by Executive</i>		<i>First University Equity Plan published</i>		

<b>% of women in senior academic roles</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Faculty Deans</b>	60%	60%	60%	25%	30%
<b>Portfolio Deans</b>	50%	47%	44%	67%	45%
<b>Heads of School/Department</b>	44%	36%	36%	43%	26%
<b>Research Centre Directors</b>	10%	N/A	24%	19%	16%

## **Women in Senior Academic Positions**

### **Task Group Report**

#### **Introduction**

During 2002 the Equity Committee established a task group to look specifically at one of the identified high priority areas of the University equity strategy, that of increasing the representation of women in senior academic positions. The task group, consisting of Ms Janice Rickards, Professor Rosemary Hunter, Dr Liz Jones, Associate Professor Gillian Bushell, Dr Linda Conrad, Dr Lyn Stockhausen, Ms Daina Garklavs, Professor David Moss, Ms Janine Walker, Dr Ian Holland and Ms Heather Cameron, met on several occasions to determine the parameters of the work to be undertaken, and to set tasks.

#### **Issues Considered**

The task group considered a range of factors that might influence the slow progress towards the targets set in the Equity Strategy. In terms of meeting the outcome, of improvement in the number of women securing senior academic positions (Levels C – E), it was deemed useful to separate the two issues of recruitment and promotion, as strategies relating to improvements differ.

- Some recruitment statistics were obtained, but were not comprehensive enough to indicate whether women were applying for academic vacancies in numbers comparable to men, nor whether they were being short-listed or appointed on a representative basis. Anecdotal evidence suggests that women may be underrepresented in applicant pools, shortlists and appointments to vacancies, particularly at more senior levels.

The task group discussed ways in which women might be attracted to vacancies and retained in senior positions.

- Qualifications of academic staff were collated and analysed, looking at whether there were significant differences between male and female PhD attainments. While it became apparent that there were differences between the percentage of female academics who had PhDs, depending on the area or faculty in which they worked, there were no obvious gender differences within faculties or discipline areas. (*See attachment 1a*)

- Statistical data relating to the success ratios in recent promotion rounds were analysed. From this analysis it is apparent that, with the exception of promotion for women from level A to level B, women are successful in gaining promotion at rates that compare favourably with their male counterparts. I.e., when women apply, they are as successful as males, however they are not applying at the same rate as males. *(See attachment 1b)*

The task group determined that greater in-depth probing and analysis of factors affecting women's opportunities and attitudes towards senior academic positions was required. It decided to do this by surveying all academic staff, both females and males.

### **Identifying Encouragers and Inhibitors**

Focus group discussions for academics were conducted on Nathan and Gold Coast campuses. Separate female and male groups were facilitated, discussing the general questions of what things encouraged and inhibited people from applying for promotion and academic management positions. Participants were also asked to nominate the most significant factors from the lists generated.

The information from the focus group discussions was collated and developed into a survey form that was distributed to all academics (excluding sessional and research only staff). 920 surveys were distributed and 330 returned in time for analyses. *(See attachment 1c)*

### **Survey Results**

The report of the survey results considers both quantitative and qualitative analyses. Most of the questions in the survey asked respondents to indicate their agreement or otherwise to a series of statements using a five-point rating scale. In two sections of the survey respondents were invited to make suggestions about what might improve the situation, and almost all respondents took this opportunity to make comment.

Demographic data has also been analysed in the quantitative analysis *(See attachment 1d)*

There are some clear statements and indicators for action that go beyond gender/equity parameters. Many respondents, both male and female, made statements that have implications for human resource management per se. Other issues clearly relate to gender inequities.

It should be noted that while a focus on policies is important, the influence of individuals cannot be underestimated. In interpreting the results of the survey, and developing recommendations for action, the two should not be separated in importance. The results are reported under three headings; those that were clearly the major issues in terms of the number of responses; the most significant issues relating to promotion, and the most significant issues relating to undertaking managerial positions.

The Equity Committee will take some of these issues up. Others have wider implications, and have been highlighted in the section on “HR Issues”. These need to be addressed through avenues beyond the province of the Equity Committee.

### *1. Key Issues Overall*

- The impact of personal interaction, through coaching, Head of School encouragement, mentoring, etc, as a significant encourager for women was highlighted.
- The value of the teaching portfolio, in relation to promotion applications, was queried.
- The lack of reward and recognition for taking managerial positions, and the impact they have on research was a common theme.

### *2. Promotion Related Issues*

- Both male and female academics thought that a transparent process would be a significant encourager.
- Mentoring, support, encouragement, coaching, etc, was a more significant encourager for women than for men. A supportive Head of School was cited as a more significant factor for women than for men.
- Not feeling ready or confident inhibits women more than men, with the corollary that active encouragement through the Professional Development Program and academic supervisor would counteract this – ie, someone telling women that they are ready for promotion would be an encourager.
- Women perceived that their teaching responsibilities and pastoral care roles were inhibitors.
- Women felt that promotion committees disregarded equity issues, and that there is a culture that resists advancement of women.

### 3. *Management Related Issues*

- The need to reconceptualize academic leadership was considered important, with women placing more importance than men on this as an encourager.
- Opportunities to get to know the system better, through involvement in decision-making forums, shadowing opportunities, leadership development programs, etc, were important encouragers for women.
- The perceived futility of applying to be in a “closed club, or “boys’ club” was highlighted, with comment that only particular people (ie, those who fit the mould) may apply. Men and women shared this perception.
- The fact that women are under-represented in the higher academic levels, and therefore these women spend more time on committees, etc, (to provide gender representation) was an important inhibitor for women.

#### **Implications for HR**

Many of the issues identified are applicable to both women and men, and as such have broad HR implications. The need to review roles, policies and processes on a University wide basis is implicit in these issues.

- Many people believed that the promotion process lacked transparency and consistency, both within and between areas.
- There is a perception that teaching is not viewed as important in promotion processes. Data obtained from 2002 promotion processes neither supports nor refutes this perception.
- The impact of career breaks for family responsibilities, particularly related to caring for children is significant. The issue of career breaks and undertaking of part-time work for women, and the consequential implications on research output is an unresolved policy issue. Promotion policies do not specifically refer to this as an equity issue, and it needs to be addressed.

The data on promotion rates demonstrates this, in the difference in success rates for female and male academics seeking promotion to Lecturer B. This is the time at which career breaks would generally have the most impact on women.

- The role of the Head of School, in terms of general management capabilities, and rewards and compensation for undertaking the position, requires attention.

## **Recommendations**

All information collated by the task group was taken into account in formulating a set of recommendations. These have been grouped under three main headings of Policy Changes; Role Clarification; and Selection Processes.

### **I Policy Changes**

Recruitment of suitable women applicants, particularly to academic levels D and E, requires particular focus. More rigorous and creative search processes prior to applications closing will be encouraged through the recommendation that:

*R1. The University's Recruitment Policy be amended to include the statement that all shortlists for positions should contain at least one woman. Where an extensive search process has been unsuccessful the Group PVC, in consultation with the PVC (E & CP) and the DHRM may waive this requirement.*

To support more equitable application of promotion criteria the Promotion of Academic Staff Policy should be amended to more explicitly address the issue of career breaks and part-time employment often experienced by people with carer responsibilities.

*R2. The section "Criteria for Promotion" in the Promotion of Academic Staff Policy be amended to "Non-traditional patterns of achievement, such as may be demonstrated by women, Indigenous Australians, people with disabilities and people from non-English speaking backgrounds will be taken into account. Particular consideration will be given to the impact that career breaks and part-time employment have had on applicants with carer responsibilities, and accomplishments determined relative to opportunities provided, rather than solely on a quantitative basis."*

### **II Role Clarification**

The role of Deans and Heads of School is critical to the provision of academic leadership, support and development for individual academics. With the adoption of a new academic management structure in the University, and an academic career-profiling project underway, the following actions are recommended.

*R3. The role of Head of School be clarified and redescribed, and selection for future Heads of School be based on criteria that require demonstrated ability to provide academic leadership and support, and on demonstrated potential to successfully manage and develop people.*

*R4. A range of incentives for attracting suitable people to undertake academic management roles such as Head of School be explored and incorporated into role statements and Promotion Policy as appropriate. Such incentives may include recognition and credit for successfully performance in the role and a broader range of compensations.*

- R5. *Orientation and ongoing development programs for Heads of School, Research Centre Directors and academic supervisors be developed and implemented to ensure the roles actively support individual and personalised academic development through personal development plans, mentoring and coaching.*
- R6. *A program of orientation activities for Deans and ongoing discussions for Academic Group Management Teams be developed and implemented to ensure that responsibility for equity and diversity is clarified and actioned appropriately.*
- R7. *A Leadership Development Program for Women be developed and implemented as part of a University wide Leadership Development Program.*
- R8. *Guidelines clarifying what constitutes “outstanding teaching” and the explicit role of pastoral care in the teaching and learning environment be developed for staff committees and incorporated into the Promotion of Academic Staff Policy.*

### **III Selection Processes**

Geographic mobility and family responsibilities are sometimes seen as barriers to securing the attraction of desirable candidates to key positions, including women to senior positions. These barriers may be diminished if they are actively addressed through the recruitment process.

- R9. *The University clearly indicate in search processes that it will provide support to resolve issues that may impede employment, such as partner employment, family education and other associated concerns.*

The application of promotion criteria needs to be consistent and equitable within the parameters described in the Promotion of Academic Staff Policy.

- R10. *Prior to the commencement of each promotion round information sessions for eligible staff be more widely promoted and all staff committees and senior selection committees hold information sessions relating specifically to equity and diversity issues.*
- R11. *Staff committees articulate and promulgate the explicit standards used for promotion within that faculty, and against which individual academic development plans and feedback may be established.*
- R12. *That following the academic career profiling outcomes the variability in teaching workloads across and within Schools and Faculties is explicitly acknowledged and taken into account in promotion processes.*
- R13. *The University returns to annual promotion rounds for all levels and the Promotion of Academic Staff Policy be amended accordingly.*
- R14. *Copies of the survey responses and findings be provided to all PVCs, Deans, Directors and Heads of Schools, and to be made widely available to the University community via a website, to be advertised in a VC email.*

