University of St Andrews Silver Athena Swan Application

Action Plan 2024-2028

Our Silver Action Plan is focussed on the five priority areas identified in our application:

1. Increasing Representation of Women in the Professoriate and Senior Roles
2. Supporting Professional Services Staff Career Pathways
3. Addressing Intersectional Inequalities
4. Ensuring Sustainable Workloads
5. Closing the Gender Pay Gap

A sixth section lists other actions, important in advancing gender equality but not falling within the priorities listed above (e.g. supporting women returning from maternity leave), while a final section focuses on actions which support the delivery of our action plan building on learning from our 2017 action plan.

Actions are designed to be SMART, however, we also recognise that some actions focus on necessary process or cultural changes which do not have an easily quantifiable outcome. While some actions may not be framed in gender-specific language, all address a gender-specific issue identified in the self-assessment process.

Our Silver Action Plan has been developed to align with and complement other strategic University action plans, including the People Strategy (PS23) and Diverse Action Plan (DAP). Where AS actions contribute towards achieving an action identified in either of these two strategic documents, we have provided a reference to the relevant plan and action in the first column of the table below. This alignment allows us to be ambitious with our actions while also ensuring a holistic, joined-up approach to delivery.

Priority 1: Increasing Representation of Women in the Professoriate and Senior Roles

Rationale: While progress has been made (Section 2.2), a minority of the professoriate are women (28.3%). This gender imbalance is particularly pronounced for BAME women who make up just 0.9% of Professors (Scotland 1.8%; UK 3.1%). There are few women Heads of School (4 of 18 Schools) – partly reflecting the lack of Grade 9 women – and in other senior roles such as Director of Research (27%) and no female (or male) BAME Heads of School.

Overall Success Measures:

By 2028 we will have:

- increased the proportion of women professors to 35% (Baseline 28.3% 2022) or the UK average (Baseline 29.5% 2022) (whichever is higher)
- increased the proportion of professors who are BAME women to 3% (Baseline 0.3% 2022) or the UK (currently 3.1%) or Scottish (currently 1.8%) figure (whichever is higher)
- increased the number of women undertaking the Head of School role at any one time to no fewer than 7 of 18 (Baseline 4 of 18 2023)
- increased the proportion of women Directors of Research to 40% (Baseline 27% 2023)

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
1	**Enhance recruitment materials and approach** to attract more applications from academic women for Grade 9 roles	▪ Women form a low proportion of applicants to G9 academic roles (28.8%F:65.7%M:5.5%unknown) resulting in fewer women than men being externally appointed to the Professoriate (8F:16M since 2016) ▪ Women are more successful than men in the recruitment process overall and at shortlisting stage for G9 posts (equal progression from shortlist to offer) ▪ Improving recruitment processes to encourage applications from women for G9 posts and remove any barriers is therefore central to increasing the proportion of women in the Professoriate	▪ Interview / survey G8 and G9 academic women to identify what they would see as the key facilitators and barriers to applying to St Andrews and how we can best promote the University ▪ Use these insights to create bespoke recruitment and application materials for G9 roles addressing key considerations for women applicants *Outputs:* ➢ Survey report ➢ New recruitment material targeted at G9 applicants	July 2024 - December 2025	Director of HR	○ Increase proportion of women applicants for G9 roles to 40% (Baseline 28.8% 2016-22)

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
2 [PS23: 1,2,3, 5]	**Revise recruitment process** to encourage more female applicants for academic roles at all levels	▪ The promotions process is proving a successful route to increasing the proportion of women in the Professoriate (Section 2.2) ▪ This highlights the importance of recruiting women at G7-8 to provide a pipeline of talent ▪ However, women form a lower proportion of applicants for academic roles than men (37.3%F 58.7%M; 4.1%unknown) particularly at G8 (23.4%F; 71.4%M; 5.2%unknown) and women are under-represented in G7 (45.6%F) and 8 (37.2%) academic roles	▪ Interview / survey G6 and G7 academic women to identify what they would see as the key facilitators and barriers to applying to St Andrews and how we can best promote the University ▪ Use these insights to revise online recruitment and application materials including our staff offer and how we articulate it ▪ Develop talking head videos of academic women working at the University including those with caring responsibilities ▪ Extend mandatory mixed gender shortlists for G9 roles to include G7 and G8 academic and PS roles ▪ Deliver actions in PS23 to modernise and streamline recruitment processes *Outputs:* ➢ Survey report ➢ Revised recruitment material ➢ Talking head videos	April 2024 – December 2027	Director of HR	○ Increase the proportion of women applicants for academic roles to 45% (Baseline 37.3% 2016-22) ○ Increase proportion of women applicants at G8 to 40% (Baseline 23.4% 2016-22) ○ Increase representation of women at G7 to 50% (Baseline 45.6% 2022) and at G8 to at least 45% (Baseline 37.2% 2022)

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
3 [PS23: 11]	**Undertake a review of promotion criteria and process** to ensure the journey to more senior roles is transparent and supports the emergence of a diverse cohort of future leaders across different career tracks	• EF and RF women are less likely to apply for promotion than E&R women (in 2022, 2.1% of eligible RF women and 9.1% eligible EF women vs. 16.6% eligible E&R women) • While the same pattern is seen for men, with a higher proportion of women in EF and RF roles (56.7% women compared with 44.7% men) this has gendered implications • EF staff are less satisfied with the promotions process (54%W:30%M negative response) than academic staff overall (29%W:23%M School Surveys 2022-3) although there is no statistically significant difference in success rates across career tracks • BAME women have lower promotion success rates than white women (63% vs 69% applicants 2015-2023)	▪ Review requirements for G7, G8, and G9 academic staff at to ensure clarity and parity between different career tracks ▪ Clarify and publicise pathways for moving between career tracks ▪ Run annual workshop on preparing for promotion, targeted at EF and RF women, including what makes for a strong application ▪ Develop bite-sized training for line managers on effective career development conversations across all career tracks ▪ Audit current School promotion support processes and map out good practice to inform guidance for Schools ▪ Report outcomes of each promotion round by a broader set of criteria including career track and gender/ethnicity intersectionality *Outputs:* ➢ Revised promotion process ➢ Annual workshop ➢ Good practice guidance for Schools ➢ Annual report to CEDI on promotion outcomes	July 2024 – June 2025	Master of the United College	○ Decrease gap in applications across career tracks to no more than +/- 3 percentage points over period 2024/5-2028/9 (Baseline 14 percentage points 2022) ○ Eliminate gap in satisfaction with promotion processes between EF and academic staff to no more than +/- 5 percentage points by 2028/9 (Baseline 25 percentage points) ○ Decrease promotions gap between BAME and white women to no more than +/- 2 percentage points over period 2024/5-2028/9 (Baseline 6 percentage points 2015-23)
4	**Evaluate impact of initiatives introduced since 2021 to support career development of Education-focused academic staff** to identify any further areas for attention	• Women form 56.3% of EF staff and are over-represented in these roles (28.2% academic women are in EF roles vs 15.6% academic men) which have a lower entry point (G6) than E&R roles (G7) and therefore a longer progression to G9 • A significant investment has been made in initiatives to support EF career development (Section 3.1) • We need to understand the impact of these new initiatives to determine whether further action is required to facilitate progression of EF staff	▪ Develop project specification ▪ Survey EF staff on key development needs / barriers to development as part of work *Outputs*: ➢ Evaluation report including recommendations for further action	April 2025 – June 2026	Vice-Principal Education (Proctor)	○ Recommendations from evaluation are acted upon

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
5	**Develop a diverse set of case studies showing career pathways to Professor** to give greater visibility to different trajectories to promotion	• Staff consultation on the action plan highlighted a desire for real life examples of different pathways to promotion • This is particularly important in the sciences where just 21.5% of Professors are women (UK 25.3%)	Work with staff to put together profiles which show the diversity of routes into the Professoriate with a particular focus on women working in the sciences ▪ Publicise profiles on University web pages and promote among EDI networks *Outputs*: ➢ Set of staff profiles	April 2024 – December 2024	Vice-Principal People and Diversity	○ Understanding of the range of pathways to the Professoriate (tested via focus groups for next self-assessment) ○ Increase the proportion of female professors in the Faculty of Science to 28% (Baseline 21.5% 2022) or the UK figure (Baseline 25.3% 2022) whichever is higher
6	**Undertake a review of Head of School (HoS) and Director of Research (DoR) role descriptions** to identify and action opportunities to reduce job load and build in flexibility (e.g. for job-share) and to support transition into the role	• Women are underrepresented in senior academic leadership roles (4/18 HoSs are women, and 27% of DoRs) • Women taking part in the Academic Leadership focus group perceived the HoS role to be larger than 1FTE, making the role difficult or undesirable particularly for those with caring responsibilities. Participants also noted a lack of understanding about what the HoS roles involve • Senior academic women also highlighted the negative impact of large leadership roles on research	▪ Interview G9 women who have declined to put themselves forward for HoS to further understand the deterrents ▪ Survey current and former role holders on challenges to job-load, flexibility etc. and identify where positive changes could be made to make roles more accessible ▪ Run workshops on demystifying the HoS role (to include opportunities of the role and support available) ▪ Trial different flexible working arrangements and assess impact on role holders and staff within Schools ▪ Ensure all HoS receive a minimum level of research leave on demitting the role *Outputs:* ➢ Revised role descriptions for HoS and DoR roles ➢ Evaluation report to PO on different working arrangements	October 2024 – September 2025	Master of the United College	○ Increase the number of women undertaking HoS to no fewer than 7 of 18 by 2028 (Baseline 4 of 18 2023) ○ Increase the proportion of women DoRs to 40% by 2028 (Baseline 27% 2023)

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
7	**Review the process for appointing Head of School (HoS)** to provide clarity on who can undertake Head of School roles, and understand how the current approach benefits or hinders women	• Women are underrepresented in HoS roles (4W; 14M) • Academic Leadership focus group highlighted a need to make the appointment process clearer • Reviewing the process for appointing HoS is important to understanding how the process might be changed to support greater gender balance	▪ Investigate different approaches to HoS recruitment in other Universities including processes aimed at increasing women role-holders ▪ Pilot different approaches to appointment and evaluate impact on gender diversity of candidates ▪ Pilot appointment of Deputy HoS position of a different gender and /or ethnicity to support a diverse pipeline and succession planning *Outputs:* ➢ Report on practice elsewhere ➢ Revised process(es) for appointing HoS	January 2025 – December 2025	Master of the United College	○ Increase the number of women undertaking HoS to no fewer than 7 of 18 by 2028 (Baseline 4 of 18 2023) ○ Increase the number of women expressing interest in the role (Baseline data to be gathered from 2024/5)

Priority 2: Supporting Professional Services Staff Career Pathways

Rationale: Professional Services (PS) women are over-represented in lower grades (55% of women at Grades 1-4, 46%M) and under-represented at higher grades (12% of women at Grades 7-9, 19%M).

Success Measure:

By 2028 we will have:

- Increased the proportion of women occupying PS roles at Grades 7-9 to match men (Baseline 12%F, 19%M)
- reduced the gender imbalance in applications for re-grading at each grade to no more than +/-- 5% (Baseline +/- 12%)

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
8 [PS23: 9, 10, 23]	**Develop career pathways for professional services staff** to support progression opportunities and recognise excellent performance	• In contrast to academics, progression for PS staff requires role regrading or moving post (Section 3.2) • This was a source of notable dissatisfaction in both PSC and AS focus groups both in terms of the disparity between academic and PS roles and the ability to reward high performance • Women are more likely than men to progress at lower grades and less likely to progress at higher grades and all grades except 2 and 7, men are more likely than women to apply for regrading • PS women are less likely to agree that the University recognises good performance appropriately than PS men (29%W:39%M)	▪ Establish a working group to look at career pathways for PS staff and ways in which progression might be better supported (e.g. more opportunities for secondments and job swaps) ▪ Develop a competency framework detailing the skills required at different levels in different roles ▪ Explore different ways in which excellent performance can be recognised ▪ Establish a PS Forum to provide opportunities to network and provide a voice for PS staff within the University ▪ Develop a set of FAQs on the regrading process *Outputs:* ➢ Competency framework ➢ PS Forum ➢ Mechanisms to recognise excellent performance ➢ FAQs on regrading process	April 2026 – May 2027	Director of HR	○ Increase the percentage of PS women occupying G7-9 roles to 16% (Baseline 12% 2022) ○ Increase in PS women agreeing that the University recognises good performance appropriately (Baseline 29%) with no more than 2 percentage point difference between PS men and women.
9	**Extend eligibility for Aurora programme to Grade 5 professional services staff** to support women into higher grades and roles	• An in-house evaluation highlighted the value of Aurora in building confidence and supporting career progression • It also highlighted the value of completing the programme at earlier career stages • Extending participation in Aurora to G5 women aspiring to G6 and above will help develop a pipeline of diverse leaders	▪ Reserve 20% of places for PS G5 staff ▪ Hold annual 'Introduction to Aurora' session to promote benefits of participation to G5 staff *Outputs:* ➢ Annual Introduction to Aurora event	April 2025 – June 2025	Head of OSDS	○ At least 20% of places on the Aurora programme offered to PS G5 staff over period 2024/5-2028/9 ○ Enhanced development opportunities for G5 staff

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
10	**Increase mentoring provision for Grade 7 and above professional services women** to support women into more senior grades and enhance peer networks and support	• An in-house evaluation of Aurora indicated that some participants felt they were too advanced for the programme content • In addition, the PS Leadership focus group highlighted the lack of an equivalent scheme to the Elizabeth Garrett mentoring scheme for senior academic women for PS women • While the proportion of PS women at G9 have increased (from 33.3% in 2016 to 39.4% in 2022), focus groups highlighted a perceived gender hierarchy arising from informal networks that created barriers to inclusion and progression for women • The increase in women in the professoriate points to the effectiveness of mentoring and networks in supporting women's career development	▪ Review current mentoring provision for G7 and above PS staff to identify gaps ▪ Explore scope to extend Elizabeth Garrett to PS staff and the pros and cons of doing so ▪ Create and promote new / extended provision to support G7 and above PS staff *Outputs:* ➢ New / extended mentoring scheme	April 2025 – June 2026	Head of OSDS	○ Increase the percentage of PS women occupying G7-9 roles to 16% (Baseline 12.2% 2022) ○ At least 30% of PS G7-9 staff have participated in a mentoring scheme by 2028 (baseline data to be gathered)
11	**Revise the Review and Development Scheme (RDS) form and guidance** to facilitate a focused and recorded discussion of future career plans and aspirations (including progression and leadership roles)	• The RDS (annual appraisal for PS staff) provides a mechanism for a focused discussion on career plans and aspirations allowing line managers to both encourage and be aware of staff career ambitions • AS focus groups have revealed differential experiences of the RDS and completion • Reviewing the process and guidance along with training for line managers will help raise awareness of its importance among line managers • Central monitoring of completion rates will encourage uptake	▪ Establish short-life working group to determine how form and guidance might be improved ▪ Develop bite sized training for line managers on effective career development conversations ▪ Monitor RDS completion rates centrally *Outputs:* ➢ Revised form and guidance ➢ Bite size training provision	September 2025 – December 2026	Director of HR	○ 95% RDS completion by 2028 (baseline data to be gathered for 2024/25)

Priority 3: Addressing Intersectional Inequalities

Rationale: BAME women are under-represented in senior roles, over-represented in lower grades, and do less well in both recruitment and promotion processes than white women.

Success Measure:

By 2028 we will have:

- increased the proportion of BAME academic women at G7-9 to 50% (Baseline 40% 2022)
- increased the number of PS BAME women at G8-9 to at least 3 people (Baseline 0 2022)
- closed the recruitment progression gap with BAME women progressing to shortlisting and offer in line with their proportion of applicants
- closed the promotion success rate gap between BAME women and white women (Baseline 6 percentage points)

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
12 [PS23: 3]	**Evaluate current hiring policies and procedures** to ensure they are fair and fit for purpose and address any areas which may disadvantage BAME women	• There has been an increase in the proportion of female BAME applicants for both academic (from 8.8% to 17.5%) and PS (5.2% to 12.4%) roles between 2017-22 • However, BAME women were progressively less successful at each stage of the recruitment process for academic roles in four of the last six years and the proportion of BAME women progressing to shortlisting and offer for PS roles has increased only minimally (by less than 3%) widening the recruitment progression gap • Addressing any barriers or disadvantages in the application process is important to ensuring equality of outcomes	▪ Revise mandatory training for recruitment panels to specifically address unconscious bias in relation to ethnicity ▪ Pilot mixed ethnicity shortlists for a number of roles at G7-9 and evaluate implementation and impact ▪ Develop a pool of BAME staff willing to sit on recruitment panels with appropriate compensation for their time ▪ Convene a meeting of senior University leaders in Scotland to discuss and identify best practice to diversify recruitment and make progress as a sector ▪ Develop online recorded materials for potential applicants that explain how to apply and what to expect at interview *Outputs:* ➢ Revised recruitment panel training ➢ Pool of BAME panellists for recruitment exercises ➢ Additional material and guidance around recruitment process	July 2026 – December 2027	Director of HR	○ Close the recruitment progression gap with BAME women progressing to shortlisting and offer in line with their proportion at applicant stage ○ Better understanding of how BAME women (and men) may be disadvantaged in the recruitment process (tested via post training evaluation)

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
13	**Investigate initiatives that support the progression of BAME women into standard contracts** to reduce precarity	• 57.5% of BAME academic women in 2022 are on fixed term (FT) contracts compared to 31.2% of white academic women • This precarity is more pronounced at G6, and particularly in G6 RF roles, where BAME women are more likely to be FT than all other groups (83% vs 76% BAME men, 73% white women) • Initial analysis suggests that BAME academic women may be less likely to transition into standard contracts than white academic women (numbers are too small to draw firm conclusions) • The intersectionality focus group highlighted precarity as a key barrier to inclusion and belonging for BAME women	▪ Run focus groups with BAME women to better understand barriers to obtaining permanent positions at the University ▪ Investigate best practice across the sector for supporting RF staff, particularly BAME women (e.g., bridging funding, support for fellowship) ▪ Evaluate effectiveness of bridging funding policy and process in supporting transition to more secure employment ▪ Monitor progression from fixed term roles to standard contracts to allow robust analysis ▪ Work with RF staff to put together profiles which show the diversity of RF career trajectories, including crossing tracks, with a particular focus on BAME women *Outputs:* ➢ Best practice report ➢ Revised transition policies and support ➢ Set of RF staff profiles	July 2025 – December 2026	Director of HR; Vice-Principal Education (Proctor); Vice Principal Research, Collections & Innovation	○ Increase the proportion of BAME women on standard contracts to 69% to be in line with white women (Baseline 43% 2022) ○ Increase the proportion of BAME women progressing from fixed term to standard contracts (Baseline data to be gathered)

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
14	**Undertake a review of promotion support** to facilitate participation and success of BAME women in promotions process.	• 19.6% of white academic staff are employed at G9, compared with 4.4% of BAME staff and just 2.3% of BAME women • 39.8% of BAME academic women are at G7-9 compared with 60.0% white academic women • 73.6% BAME academic women are in RF or EF roles (compared 53.9% white women). While women in these career tracks are less likely to apply for promotion than those in E&R roles, application rates among BAME women in these roles is lower than for white women • While the success rate of BAME academic staff applying for promotion since 2015 mirrors that for white staff (at 65 and 66% respectively), BAME women have a slightly lower promotions success rate than white women (63% vs 69% applicants 2015-2023)	▪ Run focus groups with RF and EF BAME women across contract types to better understand experiences of promotions and barriers to applying ▪ Offer a senior academic buddy to support BAME women navigate the promotions process ▪ Run workshops on preparing for promotion including what makes for a strong application, targeted at BAME women ▪ Ensure School promotion review panels include diverse membership *Outputs:* ➢ Annual promotions workshop ➢ Network of academic buddies	January 2025 – December 2025	Master of the United College	○ Increase the proportion of eligible RF and EF BAME women applying for promotions to be in line with white women over period 2024/5-2028/9 ○ Increase the proportion of academic BAME women at G7-9 to 50% (Baseline 40% 2022) ○ Close the promotion success rate gap between BAME women and white women (Baseline -6 percentage points 2015-23)

Priority 4: Ensuring Sustainable Workloads

Rationale: Addressing concerns around workload is key to improving staff experience, work-life balances, and wellbeing. Our staff survey 2021 indicated that academic women felt less favourably than men about demands placed on them in their employment and that women with caring responsibilities were particularly unhappy with the work-life balance.

Success Measure:

By 2028 we will have:

- decreased the proportion of academic women who consider that their workload is not sustainable (Baseline 44%)
- reduced dissatisfaction with work-life balance among academic women to no more than 20% across all career tracks (Baseline E&R=44; EF=36%, RF=38%)
- decreased the proportion of women with caring responsibilities expressing dissatisfaction with work-life balance from 51% to 30%

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
15	**Develop new tools** to support sustainable workloads	• Academic staff, and academic women in particular, expressed least satisfaction in staff survey 2021 on workloads and work-life balance • Seeking ways to streamline delivery of administration and teaching activities, without negatively impacting quality is central to maintaining student experience whilst ensuring realistic workloads for academic women, particularly those with caring responsibilities	▪ Undertake a survey of staff in Schools to identify opportunities to streamline the delivery and administration of teaching (combined with survey in Action 16) ▪ Pilot a workload impact assessment (WIA) for substantive education policy changes and new service leadership roles to better understand the resource implications ▪ Develop a workload reduction toolkit for Schools to identify opportunities to streamline working practices and free up academics' time ▪ Review and update flexiquette guidance to include email etiquette, office hours, core working hours and uninterrupted time *Outputs:* ➢ WIA toolkit ➢ Workload reduction toolkit ➢ Revised flexiquette guidance	July 2026 – June 2027	Vice-Principal Education (Proctor); Vice-Principal People and Diversity	○ Increase the percentage of academic women who view their workload as sustainable to at least 55% (Baseline 43% 2021), with men and women equally satisfied (+/-2 percentage points, baseline -11 percentage points)

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
16 [PS23: 31]	**Evaluate implementation of academic workload allocation model** to assess how it is working in practice and enhance oversight	• Women are significantly less likely than men to feel that the workload allocation model is transparent (42.9%W:60.4%M) or that their roles are appropriately recognised in the model 37.5%W:59.5%M (overall 48.7%) • Workload models were introduced across all Schools in 2021, and while all Schools log their finalised models centrally on an annual basis there is currently no formal monitoring of how workload guidance is applied	▪ Undertake a survey of staff on workload models and their application to identify opportunities for enhancement (combined with survey in Action 15) ▪ Develop revised / refreshed model or guidance (depending on outcomes of survey) ▪ Produce annual report to Academic Monitoring Group and CEDI on Schools' workload allocations broken down by gender and ethnicity ▪ Follow up with Schools as required to address any disparities within schools to ensure workloads can be redistributed fairly *Outputs:* ➢ Refreshed workload allocation model / guidance ➢ Annual report on workload allocations	July 2024 – June 2025	Master of the United College	○ Increase the percentage of women expressing agreement that the workload allocation model appropriately recognises their role to 60% (Baseline 37.5%) ○ Men and women are equally satisfied that the workload allocation model appropriately recognises their roles (+/- 2 percentage points) (Baseline -22 percentage points) ○ Increase the percentage of women expressing agreement that the workload allocation model is transparent to 60% (Baseline 42.9%) ○ Men and women are equally satisfied that the workload allocation model is transparent (+/- 2 percentage points) (Baseline -17.5 percentage points)

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
17	**Undertake targeted measures to better support women with caring responsibilities and improve their experiences of workload**	• Workload pressures were felt particularly acutely by academic women with caring responsibilities: over half (51%) disagreed that they were happy with their work-life balance compared with 35% academic men with caring responsibilities, and 34% of academic women without caring responsibilities • Focus groups highlighted differential experiences of workload across Schools (both positive and negative) relating to maternity, paternity, and shared parental leave • Clarifying workload expectations for those returning from periods of leave will support parity of experience across Schools and support positive work-life balance	▪ Hold focus groups with women with caring responsibilities to examine particular issues with regard to workload and mitigating actions ▪ Revise workload allocation guidance around supporting staff returning from family leave ▪ Revise policy wording on family leave, in consultation with Staff Parents and Carers Network, to minimise line manager discretion and be clearer about norms and expectations *Outputs:* ➢ Amended workload allocation guidance and policy wording on family leave ➢ Recommendations paper to PO setting out actions to support women with caring responsibilities	January 2025 – December 2025	Head of EDI	○ Academic women with caring responsibilities are more positive about work life balance (Baseline 51% negative, 34% positive vs M50%) ○ Reduce the percentage of women with caring responsibilities who feel that their workload is not sustainable to no more than 25% (Baseline 49%) ○ The University has a better understanding of the barriers and challenges faced by women with caring responsibilities

Priority 5: Closing the Gender Pay Gap

Rationale: The gender pay gap is lower than in 2017 with the median falling to 15% in 2022 (from 19%) and the mean to 18%. (from 23%) However, the overall pay gap remains high (Scottish HE GPG median 16.2%, mean 15.2%*) and the pay gap at Grade 9 has widened from 6.7% to 12.2%

* Noting that different methodologies for calculating the gender pay gap along with different operating models (e.g. the extent to which services are contracted out) means comparisons of gender pay gaps need treated with caution.

Success Measure:

By 2028 we will have:

- reduced the mean and median GPG to no more than 10% for the University as a whole (Baseline 17.6% 2022) and no more than +/-2% for G1-8.
- reduced the mean GPG at G9 to 7% (Baseline 12.2% 2022)
- reduced the mean GPG for PS staff to 15% (Baseline 24.6% 2022)
- increased women's engagement in the professorial salary review process to 66% (Baseline 53%F 2022) and in the senior (PS) salary review process to 90% (Baseline 83% 2022)
- increased the proportion of women at G9B and 9C from 33% to 40% (in line with proportion of men in these Bands)

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
18	**Develop comprehensive report on use of pay levers over last 5 years** to ensure there are no inconsistencies that may contribute to the GPG	• Under University policy, staff new to a grade start at the bottom pay point. However, there are a number of circumstances in which a higher salary can be granted • At the same time, pay policy allows for the awarding of discretionary points • While there have been one-off reviews of these pay levers in the past, a comprehensive analysis has not been undertaken to assess equality impacts or impact on GPG • Understanding any gender (and other imbalances) and potential policy implications will enable us to identify and address any ways in which these levers are contributing to the GPG	▪ Analysis of starting salaries and discretionary points by grade, gender and gender/race intersection and production of report outlining key findings ▪ Discussion of findings at GPG working group and development of recommendations to PO of actions required to address any inequalities identified ▪ Annual equality analysis and report to CEDI on discretionary points and starting salaries *Outputs:* ➢ Report on starting salaries and discretionary points ➢ Recommendations for action to PO	January 2025 – June 2025	Vice-Principal People and Diversity	○ Fair approach to starting salaries and awarding of discretionary points with any significant gender differences investigated and acted upon

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
19	**Model impact of different interventions on gender pay gap and associated costs** to identify concrete mechanisms to drive progress and support a business case to the Principal's Office	• The GPG is lower than in 2017 but the overall pay gap remains high, highlighting the need for continued focused effort and targeted interventions to reduce the gap • At the same time, we need to avoid undertaking measures which reduce the gap but have negative (and often gendered) implications for lower paid staff (e.g. contracting out cleaning services) • While different interventions have been modelled periodically in the past this has not been translated into costed proposals to reduce the GPG. This is particularly important in a context of financial pressures on the sector	▪ Research key levers for addressing the GPG and model impact of different interventions and associated costs ▪ Convene meeting of senior University leaders in Scotland to discuss effective mechanisms for reducing GPG and making progress as a sector ▪ Develop recommendations and supporting business case to put to PO (with Action 18 above) *Outputs:* ➢ Evidenced business case for effective interventions to address the GPG	July 2025 – December 2026	Vice-Principal People and Diversity	○ Mean G9 pay gap reduced to 7% (Baseline 12.2% 2022) ○ Costed proposal developed to address GPG

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
20	**Review criteria and provide greater clarity around distinction between banding of Grade 9 roles and purpose of Professorial and Senior Salary Reviews** to support transparency and understanding	• While the GPG is lower than in 2017, the mean GPG at G9 has widened from 6.7% in 2017 to 12.2% in 2022 and is a major driver of the overall pay gap • Analysis also shows that women are concentrated in the lower pay band at G9 partly reflecting the success in promoting more women into the Professoriate • One of the main levers for addressing pay at this level for existing staff is through Professorial and Senior Salary Reviews • While academic women are more likely to put in for a review than men (53% of eligible women, 49% eligible men) and there is no significant difference in participation between PS women and men, given this is the main lever for varying pay for individuals at G9 participation needs to be maximised and outcomes assessed for equality impacts including on the GPG • PS Leadership focus groups also revealed that the process is not well understood	▪ Develop competency framework setting out expectation at each band for G9 academic and PS staff ▪ Review requirements for salary reviews and develop guidance on process including assessment criteria ▪ Run workshops for G9 women in advance of the reviews to improve understanding of the process and provide access to peer support ▪ Review outcomes of reviews after each round to identify any gender (or other) inequalities for reporting to CEDI *Outputs:* ➢ Competency framework for G9 staff ➢ New / revised guidance on salary review processes ➢ Annual report to CEDI on equality outcomes of salary reviews	January 2026 – December 2026	Director of HR	○ Mean G9 pay gap reduced to 7% (Baseline 12.2% 2022) ○ Mean G9 academic pay gap reduced to 6% (Baseline 10.0% 2022) ○ Mean G9 PS pay gap reduced to 18% (Baseline 24.6% 2022) by 2028 and to 8% by 2033 ○ Increase women's engagement in the professorial salary review process to 66% (Baseline 53% 2022) ○ Increase women's engagement in senior salary review process to 90% (Baseline 83% 2022)

Actions to address gender equality which fall outside the priority areas 1-5 outlined above

Shared activity with the REC

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
21	**Continue to hold regular joint meetings of Athena Swan and REC leads**, further to submission of applications, to support common cause and collaborative working on shared priority areas	• AS and the REC have identified a number of shared areas for attention including around recruitment, promotion and belonging • Continued dialogue and joint working allow common cause to be built across the University and the same drivers of inequalities to be tackled simultaneously benefiting both women and BAME staff and making best use of resources (including staff time)	▪ Map AS and REC action plans against each other to highlight areas for collaborative working ▪ Monthly meetings ASIG Chair and REC Chair and at least annual joint meeting of respective implementation groups *Outputs:* ➢ Agreed approach to collaboration including schedule of future meetings	April 2024 – June 2024	Vice-Principal People and Diversity	○ Joint delivery of actions ○ Intersectionality is a key consideration when monitoring and evaluating progress
22	**Support participation of BAME women in mentoring and leadership programmes** to support career development and create a diverse pipeline of leaders	• BAME women are less likely to participate in Aurora and Elizabeth Garrett than would be expected from staff numbers • Of the 149 staff taking Aurora between 2014 and 2022, 7 identified as 'BAME' (c 8% of BAME women in G6-8) and 133 as white (c 20% of white G6-8 women) • The participation rates for Elizabeth Garrett are high but, similarly BAME women participate at a lower rate (37%) than white women (55%) • Leadership programmes and mentoring support have proved successful in supporting women into more senior roles • Encouraging and improving participation in these schemes can support progress of BAME women into senior roles and help create a diverse pipeline of leaders	▪ Gather feedback from BAME participants in Aurora and Diversifying Leadership programmes on engagement in these schemes and any perceived challenges to participating ▪ Establish a list of eligible candidates for Aurora, Diversifying leadership, and Elizabeth Garrett, and actively reach out to individuals to encourage applications ▪ Research other leadership programmes aimed at BAME women / BAME staff and fund opportunities to attend and provide feedback ▪ Set up a BAME leadership fund to support attendance on leadership courses ▪ Develop feedback form to support utilisation of skills post-leadership training *Outputs:* ➢ Summary of relevant mentoring and leadership programmes and target audience on University website	July 2025 – June 2026	Head of OSDS	○ Increase the proportion of eligible BAME women participating in Aurora to be in line with white women ○ Increase the proportion of eligible BAME women participating in Elizabeth Garett be in line with white women ○ All G7-8 BAME staff offered an opportunity to take part in a leadership programme over the period of the award with an initial focus in the first two years on BAME women

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
23 [DAP 12]	**Support BAME Staff Network** to develop as a source of peer support and advocacy	• The AS intersectionality focus group highlighted the important role of the Staff BAME Network in fostering inclusion and belonging for BAME women • While network membership has increased since its inception (19 members in 2019 to 35 in 2023 – the majority of whom are women) this represents only 13% of BAME staff • An in-house evaluation of staff networks revealed that improving network leadership and momentum may help improve engagement	▪ Develop staff network policy including outline terms of reference for staff networks detailing central support available ▪ Work with network members to help build the network ▪ Relaunch BAME Staff Network and publicise widely *Outputs:* ➢ Staff network policy	October 2024 – September 2025	Head of EDI	○ Increase membership of staff network to 30% of total BAME headcount (Baseline 13% 2023)
24 [PS23: 18]	**Recruit staff with intersectional characteristics to the staff panel being developed as part of the People Strategy** to ensure University policy and practice is informed by a wide diversity of voices	• The AS intersectionality focus group highlighted a need to develop fora that gave voice to BAME staff, where concerns could be raised and, importantly, acted upon • A roundtable with MGI staff highlighted the need for improved policy support to improve feelings of belonging among Trans and non-binary staff	• Develop a recruitment strategy for the staff panel with particular attention to how intersectionality will be represented *Outputs:* ➢ Recruitment strategy for staff panel developed	April 2025 – June 2025	Head of OSDS	○ Increase the percentage of staff who feel able to influence University policy and practice. (Baseline 27%W:32%M BAME Women 42% 2021) ○ Increase percentage of MGI staff who feel able to influence University policy and practice to minimum 50% (Baseline 17% 2021) ○ University decision making, policies and practice is informed by a diversity of voices

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
25 [DAP 1 & 4]	**Roll out active bystander training across the University** to empower staff and students to challenge inappropriate behaviours	• The Race Equality Survey 2023 identified that BAME women were more likely than BAME men and women overall to have witnessed or been the victim of racial discrimination (BAME staff 26%W:11%M, White staff 8%W:9%M) • Active bystander training provides staff with a framework for addressing sub-optimal behaviours, and also helps articulate behavioural expectations at St Andrews. This can help empower staff to speak out against racial discrimination	▪ Develop plan for systematic rollout of staff active bystander training in Schools and Units with associated central financial support ▪ Include core tenets of active bystander training within revised mandatory EDI training for staff (mandatory EDI training for students revised 2023 and covers this) *Outputs:* ➢ Revised mandatory EDI training for staff	July 2024 – June 2025	Heads of OSDS; Head of EDI	○ All Schools / Units offered training session by 2028 (Baseline 4 2023) ○ Greater understanding of how to challenge inappropriate behaviours (assessed via post-training evaluation)
26 [DAP 4]	**Run a campaign to build trust in Report and Support** as a mechanism for raising concerns about behaviours to support greater use of the system	• Feedback from students suggests that trust in reporting could be improved • In addition, anecdotal evidence suggests that some staff, and particularly those on fixed term contracts, are concerned about repercussions from speaking out	▪ Develop anonymised case studies showing how reports have been responded to ('you said, we did') to feed into campaign ▪ Set up a group of student champions to promote use of R&S ▪ Develop system to systematically gather feedback on individuals' engagement and satisfaction with the R&S tool ▪ Develop promotional materials that clearly outline reporting routes and the implications of reporting anonymously or not *Outputs:* ➢ Campaign material ➢ Network of student champions recruited and trained	January 2024 – June 2025	Head of Wellbeing and Mediation	○ Staff and students report greater trust in Report and Support (assessed at annual R&S Forum and in focus groups for 2029 AS application) ○ Increase in named reporting to 66% (Baseline 59% 2021-22)

Actions to support return from maternity leave

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
27	**Develop returning from maternity leave guide** (flexible working, childcare, breastfeeding/expressing facilities, key questions to ask etc) to support a successful return to work	• In AS focus groups, parents, both men and women, reported differential experiences of workload planning when returning from periods of maternity/paternity/shared parental leave, both positive and negative • In addition, the Parental Leave focus groups highlighted the return to work following maternity leave as a stressful period for women • Augmenting support for return from leave will help women (and parents more broadly) to understand their entitlements and to feel more supported upon their return	▪ Use insights from AS focus group on key concerns or barriers faced by women returning from maternity leave to inform the guide and associated manager training ▪ Send the guide to women returning from maternity / other family leave, and their line manager, when they confirm their return to work ▪ Pilot three month return to work pulse survey to identify any concerns/issues *Outputs:* ➢ Return from leave guide ➢ Return to work pulse survey	January 2025 – June 2025	Director of HR	○ Women feel supported and well informed on transitioning back to work (assessed via return-to-work survey) ○ Women are aware of the support available to them and are informed about issues they may wish to discuss with their line manager (assessed via return-to-work survey)
28	**Provide bite sized training for line managers** to ensure they have a good understanding of how best to support staff with caring responsibilities and relevant policies	• AS focus groups highlighted that line manager support for various types of parental leave and working arrangements differed across Schools and Units • Equipping line managers with knowledge of key policies and how they can be implemented is key to fostering a positive experience for parents and carers • The format of bite-sized training on specific HR policies has been well-received as a time efficient mechanism for upskilling line managers	▪ Develop bite-sized training on supporting staff in preparing for, during and, returning from family leave ▪ Develop bite-sized training on part-time working, flexible working, job shares and hybrid working ▪ Gather case studies of staff working flexibly in different ways for publicising on web and sharing with line managers ▪ Develop FAQs for line managers on support for staff with caring responsibilities *Outputs:* ➢ Suite of case studies ➢ Enhanced training and FAQs	July 2025 – June 2026	Director of HR	○ Managers have greater clarity on their role and the expectations on them as line managers (assessed via post-training evaluation) ○ Enhanced visibility of different working patterns and arrangements

Actions to support Trans and Non-Binary Staff

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
29 [DAP 1]	**Improve gender inclusive language and enhance pronoun guidance** to support belonging and inclusion.	• A roundtable with trans and MGI staff in 2023 highlighted that feelings of belonging were hindered by incorrect use of pronouns and challenges in using University systems to record names changes / pronouns	▪ Promote existing training on gender inclusive language and work with LGBTQIA+ staff network to enhance mandatory EDI training for staff ▪ Provide mechanisms for optional inclusion of pronouns in corporate templates (e.g. for email signatures, business cards) ▪ Identify a named contact within IT who MGI staff can approach to help navigate the staff personal record systems *Outputs:* ➢ Clear mechanism and support for name changes ➢ Updated training and guidance	October 2024 – March 2025	Head of OSDS	○ Increase percentage of MGI staff expressing a strong sense of belonging to the University to 60% (Baseline 45.8% compared with 66.0%W:64.9%M 2021) ○ Increased hits on pronoun guidance (accessed >600 times in 2022)
30	**Develop transitioning at work guidance for staff and line managers** with signposting to external resources and expert advice	• A roundtable with trans and MGI staff in 2023 highlighted that University policy and processes to support transitioning was more comprehensive for students than for staff • Improving guidance and processes for staff transitioning at work is one way that staff identified that could improve feelings of belonging and inclusion	▪ Work with LGBTQIA+ Staff Network on developing the guidance ▪ Identify named contact within HR for staff who transitioning staff can contact for HR advice *Outputs:* ➢ Transitioning at work guidance	July 2025 – December 2025	Head of EDI	○ Improved feelings of belonging among trans staff (assessed in focus groups for next award)

Actions to support mainstreaming of EDI

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
31	**Improve Equality Impact Assessment toolkit and checklist** to support mainstreaming of equalities and more effective consideration of intersectional inequalities	• Staff (outside of those with direct EDI responsibility) have reported challenges navigating the current EIA toolkit and how to go about identifying areas of impact • At the same time, the process currently looks at impacts through a singular lens of individual protected characteristics • As we work to take a more holistic approach to EDI and embed EDI across all aspects of university business, it is important we have user-friendly toolkit and a clear process for recording and reporting EIAs	▪ Establish a working group to review current approach, research practice elsewhere and develop a revised process and toolkit ▪ Make EIA training mandatory for all policy owners ▪ Develop portal for submission and storage of EIAs ▪ Provide annual report to CEDI on EIAs completed, any cross-cutting issues identified, and how EIAs have informed policy / practice *Outputs:* ➢ Revised toolkit and associated guidance available for use ➢ Annual report published and available on internal webpages	September 2024 – September 2025	Head of EDI	○ Enhanced mainstreaming of EDI across the University ○ Enhanced capability in undertaking EIAs (assessed via post-training evaluation)
32 [DAP 11]	**Develop a series of EDI Awards** to give visible recognition and celebration of staff and student contributions to advancing equality including gender equality	• While we have embedded recognising individual's EDI activity into various processes (Section 1.3), establishing awards for EDI, as we do for other areas of excellence, will further raise the profile of EDI work, both on the part of individuals and of teams, and ensure that staff not in formal EDI roles in Schools and Units can be recognised in other ways for their contributions	▪ Determine the different categories, the nomination and selection process, and the administration of a series of awards ▪ Plan an annual ceremony highlighting contributions and progress in advancing EDI *Outputs:* ➢ Suite of EDI awards ➢ Annual awards ceremony	April 2024 – September 2025	Vice-Principal People and Diversity	○ Engagement in awards including year on year increase in nominations

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
33	**Produce and publish an annual EDI report covering representation, progression and promotion and pay gaps** to raise awareness of significant gender (and other) inequalities and inform decision-making at School, Unit and University level	• As part of our journey in engaging with the Athena Swan Charter since 2013 and more latterly the REC, we have seen the power of providing data on the make-up of our staff and student populations (and showing where the equality gaps are) as a driver for engaging our community in EDI work • While >80% of women and men consider EDI is a priority within their School, fewer think it is a priority within the University with a difference between men (79.8%) and women (71.7%) • It is also important that there is accountability and transparency in showing the progress made and where we have more to do	▪ Scope out content of report, level of disaggregation and associated data requirements ▪ Ensure processes are in place to allow effective and efficient data collection ▪ Develop a communication and engagement plan to support use of report to raise visibility and drive change in Units and Schools (e.g. report discussed at School Council meetings) *Outputs:* ➢ Annual report ➢ School and Unit core EDI data sets	July 2025 – June 2026	Head of EDI; Director of Planning	○ Increase proportion of staff who view EDI as a priority within the University to at least 80%

Actions to support implementation of the Action Plan

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
34	**Establish an Athena Swan Implementation Group (ASIG) reporting into CEDI** to take forward implementation and monitoring of the action plan	• A key learning from delivery of AP17 was the importance of having clear governance structures and the benefit of taking a project management approach over the lifetime of the award • Setting up an ASIG will provide a vehicle to support delivery of the action plan over the lifetime of the award • Appointing a Chair and Deputy Chair will mean that Athena Swan is well resourced, as well as building in resilience should staff changes occur	▪ Recruit a Chair and Deputy Chair to drive the work of the ASIG forward and lead development of 2029 AS Application SAT ▪ Develop terms of reference including ways of working and reporting arrangements ▪ Appoint a project manager to support delivery of the plan ▪ Create an action plan dashboard visible to ASIG members ▪ Produce an annual report which reviews progress against the previous year and sets out plans for the next year of delivery *Outputs:* ➢ ASIG with ToR ➢ Annual report ➢ Action plan dashboard	April 2024 – October 2024	Vice-Principal People and Diversity	○ ASIG established with clear ToR and full membership by Sept 2024
35	**Establish appropriate workload recognition for AS Chair, Deputy Chair, and ASIG working group chairs** to ensure staff are compensated for their contributions	• While we have embedded recognition of EDI roles into various processes (Section 1.3), wider EDI work often falls to women, and is often done on a voluntary basis • Ensuring that AS work is appropriately recognised across all PS and academic roles is key to addressing this issue and ensuring staff have the time to contribute	▪ Agree buy-out arrangements for Chair and Deputy ▪ Develop role descriptions for SAT members and key roles such as working group chair ▪ Estimate time commitments and identify how that workload should be recognised *Outputs:* ➢ Agreed buy out arrangements	April 2024 – Sept 2024	Vice-Principal People and Diversity	○ Contributions to AS formally recognised ○ ASIG members have time to contribute and feel supported to do so
36	**Develop a data collection and analysis strategy for** to ensure delivery and impact can be measured easily and effectively	• A key learning from delivery of AP17 was the importance of ensuring the necessary infrastructure and processes were in place from commencement of the award to gather the required data to monitor delivery of all AS actions and their impact	▪ Audit data needs for , with particular focus on what data is required to assess impact ▪ Develop a data and analysis strategy setting out what data will be collected and how *Outputs:* ➢ Data strategy	July 2024 – December 2024	ASIG Chair; Director of Planning	○ Clear arrangements for gathering data and analysing impact ○ Comprehensive and comparable data across the lifetime of the AS award

No.	Action & Objective	Rationale	Activities & Output	Timescale	Responsi-bility	Outcomes
37	**Review staff survey** to enable analysis of change in staff perceptions over time	• Revisions to the questions in staff survey 2021 and the introduction of a neutral response option made it difficult to draw comparison with previous surveys • Reviewing the survey provides an opportunity to insert additional questions that will help monitor impact of and ensure consistent and comparable data across the lifetime of the AS award	▪ Collate existing School and Unit surveys and other relevant surveys (e.g. Advance HE REC and AS culture surveys) and use data audit (Action 36) to inform survey development ▪ Consult on revised survey and pilot with a group of staff ▪ Run culture survey at University level to provide baseline data for the application and allow Schools to see how they compare with the University *Outputs:* ➢ Revised staff survey run biennially	October 2024 – June 2025	Head of OSDS	○ Comprehensive and comparable data on staff perceptions across the lifetime of the AS award
38	**Maintain an accessible database of School level AS actions** to better facilitate the sharing of gender equality work and identification of shared issues for institutional attention	• All Schools have an Athena Swan award at Bronze level or higher • There is scope to build on existing links with Schools / Units and information-sharing to make better use of this collective knowledge and understanding and support a more coordinated approach to advancing gender equality across the University	▪ Formalise process for collation of AS material across Schools ▪ Analyse material at least annually to identify areas for University-level action ▪ Hold an annual School AS leads and DoEDI away day to share experiences and best practice in gender-equality work *Outputs:* ➢ Up-to-date database of School AS priorities and actions ➢ Annual away day for AS leads and DoEDIs	July 2024 – June 2025	EDI Faculty Leads	○ Greater visibility of AS priorities and actions across Schools and scope for joined up approach
39	**Develop a joint delivery plan organised around common themes across Athena Swan, REC, DAP and PS23** to support collaborative working on shared priorities	• identifies a number of actions in areas also variously addressed through the DAP, People Strategy and REC with several shared or connected actions • A joint delivery plan will ensure that shared actions can be implemented effectively and efficiently making best use of people's time and supporting a holistic approach to EDI	▪ Develop combined delivery plan and monitoring arrangements *Outputs:* ➢ Combined plan	July 2024 to December 2024	People and Diversity Executive Officer	○ Joint delivery of actions where appropriate ○ Holistic approach to EDI

Strategic alignment of actions with Diverse Action Plan (DAP) and People Strategy (PS) themes

Theme	DAP: Community Approach	DAP: Visibility	DAP: Institutional Commitment & Leadership	DAP: Data & Analytical Capability	DAP: People Enabling
PS: Attracting our People			**12**		**1, 2**
PS: Developing our People	**29, 30**	**5**	**13, 14, 22**		**3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 20**
PS: Valuing our People		**23, 32**	**24**		
PS: Supporting our People	**25, 26, 28**				**15, 16, 17, 27**
PS: Leading & Planning for our People			**21, 34, 35, 39**	**18, 19, 31, 33, 36, 37, 38**	