


# Cygnets 5

## Inconsistent Work Allocation Models

### Response to Reviewers' Comments

<b>Name of institution</b>	University of Newcastle
<b>Date of application</b>	31 October 2023
<b>Date of response</b>	11 December 2023
<b>Award Level</b>	Cygnets
<b>Date joined Athena SWAN</b>	Cohort One – January 2016
<b>Contact for application</b>	Professor Jennifer Milam, Pro-Vice Chancellor Academic Excellence
<b>Email</b>	<a href="mailto:Jennifer.Milam@newcastle.edu.au">Jennifer.Milam@newcastle.edu.au</a>
<b>Telephone</b>	+61 4 5090 1003

UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE: SAGE CYGNET 4		
BARRIER TYPE	CURRENT CYGNET	BARRIER
Mandatory Sub-group barrier		STEM Pipeline: Difficulty attracting and recruiting female students and academic staff into the College of Engineering, Science and Environment
Mandatory Institution-wide barrier		Career Development Support
Institution- wide barrier		Indigenous Cultural Competency
Institution- wide/Sub-group barrier		Supporting Carers
Institution- wide/Sub-group barrier		Inconsistent Work Allocation Models

## Contents

<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS &amp; ACRONYMS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Review Group’s Request for Additional Information Regarding Impact .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Characteristics of the 14 people included in this section including gender/intersectional characteristics .....</b>	<b>3</b>

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS & ACRONYMS

<b>SAGE</b>	Science Australia Gender Equity
<b>AWAM</b>	Academic Workload Allocation Model

## Review Group's Request for Additional Information Regarding Impact

The University of Newcastle remains committed to the principles of fairness and equity that underpin the institutional approach to academic work allocation. We are grateful for the review group's recognition of the progress the University has made through clearly outlined strategies in response to this institutional challenge, and their commendations related to our rounds of consultation and shared governance structure. We are mindful that ongoing assessment and reporting is required to ensure that the University is meeting its goals, specifically in relation to achieving equity.

With this in mind, the University welcomes the Review Group's request for additional information regarding **Impact**. It has allowed the University to return to the evidence collected from engagement with the intended beneficiaries of the action in the form of a **change to the self-reported lived experience of staff** as a result of **reducing the barriers to staff through work allocation**.

The Review Group requested the following *Additional Information*:

*Newcastle have provided some evidence of impact, providing qualitative data from 14 staff. However, there is a lack of detail around who these people were, other than their general titles and the pool seems limited, with 10 of these staff being implementers. The Group commended Newcastle on their use of an independent qualitative researcher.*

The Review Group request the following additional information is provided:

- *Characteristics of the 14 people included in this section including gender/intersectional characteristics?*

## Characteristics of the 15 people included in this section including gender/intersectional characteristics:

Table 1 provides an overview of characteristics for the 15 Participants. Please note that this sample now includes an additional participant (Academic Staff member) who was unable to complete interviews until after the Cygnet report was submitted to SAGE. The new data from this participant has not changed any impact outcomes, rather it has enhanced the findings. In the final sample, Participants were representative of a comprehensive range of disciplines, schools and departments within the University. Participants were primarily female (77%) and English first language (77%) with a median age of 50 years; however, this is not including characteristics data from two participants who chose not to disclose this information (Table 1).

At the start of each interview, we collected demographic information from participants; however, we provide this information only in an aggregated format to ensure participant confidentiality as per ethics criteria (the findings are the result of a qualitative project that was approved by the University of Newcastle Human Research Ethics Committee, Reference: H-2023-0355). Participants responded to demographic questions under the awareness that their information would be used to apply an intersectional lens to the analysis and would not be included with any of their quotes that were used in reporting.

Whilst the sample appears small (N=15), this is not a limitation of robust qualitative research that has followed robust sampling and data collection procedures [1-3], as we have done for this study. Our purposeful recruitment approach facilitated substantial heterogeneity in the final sample [2, 3] and a diverse range of perspectives and experiences, providing a comprehensive representation of views

from Implementers and Academic Staff at the University. Moreover, one ‘Implementer’ and two ‘Academic Staff’ had a dual-role (involved in both AWAM implementation and academic staff responsibilities) and were able to speak from both positions.

We also took several measures to support high-quality data collection. The interviewer is an experienced, qualitative researcher external to AWAM management, introduced as such, and took several steps to ensure participants felt comfortable to disclose freely. In addition, during interviews, participants were prompted (where necessary) to provide insight on the perspectives and experiences of fellow colleagues and staff members. For example, implementers reflected on how the AWAM was met by their staff and were then prompted to provide examples of successes or challenges. Similarly, Academic Staff shared stories of colleagues with similar or diverse experiences/ perceptions to their own. The final data set was significantly rich – providing high information power [1] – allowing us to proceed with a robust analysis and confidently report outcomes.

**Table 1.** Participant characteristics

Characteristic	Implementer N= 9	Academic Staff N= 6	All participants N=15
Parent/Carer responsibilities	N=7*		N=13*
• Yes	4 (57%)	5 (83%)	9 (69%)
• No	3 (43%)	1 (17%)	4 (31%)
Age	N=7*		N=13*
• Years (median ± SD)	55 ± 6.6	43.5 ± 6.7	50 ± 8.8
Gender	N=7*		N=13*
• Female	7 (100%)	3 (50%)	10 (77%)
• Male	0	3 (50%)	3 (23%)
Sexual Orientation	N=7*		N=13*
• Straight/Heterosexual	7 (100%)	6 (100%)	13 (100%)
English first language	N=7*		N=13*
• Yes	6 (86%)	4 (67%)	10 (77%)
• No	1 (14%)	2 (33%)	3 (23%)
Indigenous	N=7*		N=13*
• Yes	1 (14%)	2 (33%)	3 (23%)
• No	6 (86%)	4 (67%)	10 (77%)
Disability	N=7*		N=13*
• No	7 (100%)	6 (100%)	13 (100%)
*Characteristics data not disclosed from two participants			
Please note: This sample includes one participant (Academic Staff) who was unable to complete interviews until after report submission to SAGE. This participant has since been added to the sample; the new data has not changed any impact outcomes, rather it has enhanced the findings.			

## References

1. Malterud, K., V.D. Siersma, and A.D. Guassora, *Sample size in qualitative interview studies: guided by information power*. *Qualitative health research*, 2016. **26**(13): p. 1753-1760.
2. Lopez, V. and D. Whitehead, *Sampling data and data collection in qualitative research*. *Nursing & midwifery research: Methods and appraisal for evidence-based practice*, 2013. **123**: p. 140.

3. Patton, M.Q., *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* 4th ed. 2015, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.