Preamble: The 2018 Department of Physics and Astronomy culture (climate) survey was conducted using the Qualtrics online platform; questions were formulated by the MQ Workplace Equity and Diversity Manager (Jo Hatton) and MQ Workplace Diversity and Inclusion Consultant (Harriet Jones) in consultation with the Department Head, Department Manager and the Department EDC. Subsets of questions were worded appropriately for target audiences of academic, professional, HDR student and honorary cohorts. The survey comprised between 45 and 65 questions (depending upon cohort selected by the respondent). There were 172 people in the target audience and 104 responses were received by the official closing date of the survey. The survey was open for 10 days from Wed 19 Sept to Fri 28 Sept. The target audience were notified of the survey by email, in person at department meetings and by word of mouth.

To ensure security and privacy of responses no names were captured or recorded with the data; the data was held by the MQ Workplace Diversity and Inclusion office and accessed only by their team; the MQ Workplace Diversity and Inclusion office staff were responsible for analysis of the data and provision of the results summary; and information where individuals might be identified was not released to department or included in the results summary.

Summary: Response rate was 60%; 22 respondents identified as female, 52 as male, and 29 chose ‘prefer not to say’ (PNS). The survey offered other options for gender identity, but the OWED has not provided any results against other gender identities, likely because reporting against these options would threaten anonymity. We expect further insights in this area when the University-wide survey is conducted next year and would expect a significant cohort of respondents of non-binary gender.

We have received a preliminary analysis of the results, which examines the responses according to identified gender and/or role (academic staff, professional staff, student). More work is required to determine the statistical significance of differences in responses from these cohorts, which will allow us to prioritise responses. Overall, responses from the PNS cohort are somewhat less positive than responses from those identifying as male or female.

A large range of issues were addressed including awareness of mechanisms for career advancement, manager support and mentoring, availability of training, and impact of parenting, caring or part-time work; fairness in allocation of resources and workloads, and manageability of workloads; perception of the Department’s and its leadership’s performance on equity, diversion and inclusion issues; experiencing or witnessing negative behaviours ranging from undermining work to sexual harassment; staff perception of management responses to reports of misconduct and potential impacts on a staff member or student of making a report.
Key positive insights from the initial analysis include:

- Most staff felt supported in seeking training and development opportunities (9% disagreed) and most staff felt able to discuss career progression with their manager (9% disagreed).
- There was strong support for the proposition that staff are treated fairly and equally in relation to a range of areas including recruitment, promotion, pay and workload allocation (at most 18% disagreement in any area).
- All but 12% of academic staff understood what was required to be successful in promotion. The female-identifying cohort was uniformly positive in this respect.
- There was strong support from all groups that there is a clear commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion at all levels in the University (less than 20% disagreement in any category).
- Reports of having witnessed or experienced sexual harassment in the previous 12 months were generally very low. However, as detailed below there was a concerning level of incidents in two categories: suggestive comments or jokes, and inappropriate staring or leering.

Negative insights or issues from the initial analysis that will require action include:

- Professional staff, particularly male staff, report both poorer understanding of how to progress at Macquarie, and lower belief in opportunities for advancement than academic staff. Furthermore, 75% of male professional staff disagreed that their workload was manageable, a result we had not anticipated.
- Few female students (25%) agreed that casual work opportunities are distributed fairly. We are surprised by this clear result as we already have strong and effective monitoring of equity in the allocation of laboratory demonstration roles. We will investigate whether there may be inequity in recruitment of other categories: tutors and research assistants.
- Female students perceived a much weaker commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion from senior levels of the University. The University Executive has been very active in this area in the last 18 months, but this work may not be as visible to students as to engaged staff. We will share this finding with the University leadership.
- While 81% of male HDR students found Department social events welcoming and inclusive, only 26% of female students did. We will address this by inviting suggestions from our female student cohort, anonymously and through focus groups.
- There are a number of areas of concern regarding workplace comfort and behaviour:
  - Almost 60% of the female and PNS cohorts reported occasionally having witnessed work being devalued or undermined in the previous 12 months; 40% had occasionally witnessed someone being shouted at.
  - 28% of the male, and about 50% of the female and PNS cohorts reported occasionally having been ignored or excluded in the previous 12 months.
  - 35% of male and 40% of female respondents reported having witnessed suggestive comments or jokes, and 15% of female respondents reported having experienced inappropriate staring or leering.

These are issues on which we already frequently communicate expectations through a range of channels, but clearly more work is required. This will need detailed thought, but our initial response will include discussions with the University staff and student equity offices around training seminars and other resources.
**Action plan and timeline:**

By mid October 2018: We expect the OWED to complete the **statistical analysis** of the survey, which will be shared with the full Department by email and targeted lunchtime meeting.

By mid November 2018: The EDC will **categorise the results** in terms of areas of low, medium and high concern; and **propose potential responses** for each area. Depending on the category, these responses may include better availability and visibility of data, staff/student mentoring, clearer statements and promotion of expectations, and voluntary or compulsory formal training seminars.

By mid December 2018: The EDC will use this categorisation to **develop a plan** prioritising areas to address. We will emphasise both the most serious areas of concern, and areas that may be quickly addressed. This will allow us to demonstrate early positive outcomes from the survey while also placing focus on the most important areas. The issues of concern listed above will certainly be highly prioritised in this process. The plan will also describe formal and informal methods of monitoring progress consistent with our overall Pleiades strategy. This plan will be circulated for feedback from all Department members and then adopted formally.

January-June 2019: **Initial implementation phase.** The actions identified in the plan will be overseen by the HoD and Department Manager with strong support from the EDC.

July 2019-July 2020: **Ongoing implementation and monitoring** phase, with regular analysis by EDC and partnership with the University equity offices.

August 2020: We will run a **new round of the workplace culture survey** and compare the outcome against present results. This analysis will be included as part of our 2020 Pleiades application.