



Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace

Compliance Report

2000/2001

Contents

Organisational details

Compliance report 2000/2001

	Introduction	1
1	Workplace profile 1999/2000	2
2	Analysis	3
3	Prioritising the issues	6
4	Actions	6
5	Evaluation	7
6	Future actions	7
7	Workplace profile 2000/2001	9

Appendices

1	Academic promotion statistics 1999 and 2000	
2	<i>Family responsibilities and flexible working arrangements: Guidelines for supervisors and staff</i>	
3	<i>Women and Leadership Biennial Report 1999-2000</i>	
4	<i>Women at work: a manager's guide to affirmative action planning</i>	
5	Bench-marking project plan	
6.1	Staff statistics 2000 University wide	
6.2	Staff statistics 2000 Resources Portfolio	
6.3	Staff statistics 2000 Research and International Portfolio	
6.4	Staff statistics 2000 Access and Learning Support Portfolio	
6.5	Staff statistics 2000 Equity and Development Portfolio	
6.6	Staff statistics 2000 Division of Education, Arts, and Social Sciences	
6.7	Staff statistics 2000 Division of Information Technology, Engineering, and the Environment	
6.8	Staff statistics 2000 Division of Business and Enterprise	
6.9	Staff statistics 2000 Division of Health Sciences	
6.10	Staff statistics 2000 Chancellery	

Introduction

Affirmative action is about eliminating direct and indirect discrimination and taking positive steps to overcome the current and historical lack of equal employment opportunity for women.

To establish an effective affirmative action program the University of South Australia has put good support systems in place to enable the analysis of statistics and the investigation of issues. The integration of affirmative action planning was mainstreamed into the University's strategic planning process in 1996. The University of South Australia develops a three-year equal opportunity for women in the workplace plan and reviews this annually. This plan is strongly supported at the senior management level. The overall responsibility for the development and implementation of the plan resides with the Pro Vice Chancellor: Equity and Development, Professor Eleanor Ramsay.

Day to day management of the plan and associated actions sits with the Equity, Diversity and Workforce Strategy Team in the Human Resources Unit. This team has responsibility for developing, implementing, monitoring, evaluating, and revising the University's equal opportunity, affirmative action, and management of diversity programs and policies.

In the past the University has received recognition for its affirmative action strategies. The University has been granted three best practice awards in accordance with the Affirmative Action (Equal Opportunity for Women Act) 1986. The first award in 1996 was from the Australian Chamber of Manufacturers for best report. In 1997 the second award was from the Australian Industry Group for best practice achievements, and in 1998 the third award was from the Affirmative Action Agency in recognition of industry best practice. The University was nominated as one of four organisations that had achieved the top rating.

The University has undergone significant restructuring in recent years. The current structure has existed since 1999 (see following page).

1. Workplace profile 1999-2000

University of South Australia Workplace profile for 31 March 2000

Occupational classifications	Continuing staff				Contract staff				Totals		
	Full time		Part time		Full time		Part time		Total		Grand Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
Vice Chancellor					1				1	0	1
Pro Vice Chancellors					2	5			2	5	7
Executive Directors					1				1	0	1
General Senior Executive (Level 10+)	8	19			6	5			14	24	38
Academic Staff (T&R) Level E	7	27				11	1	3	8	41	49
Academic Staff (T&R) Level D	11	32	1		8	16			20	48	68
Academic Staff (T&R) Level C	60	86	6		32	43	5	1	103	130	233
Academic Staff (T&R) Level B	99	107	18	10	20	23	7	3	144	143	287
Academic Staff (T&R) Level A	10	9	3		14	9	17	6	44	24	68
Academic staff (Research) Level E		2				5		1	0	8	8
Academic staff (Research) Level D					1	4			1	4	5
Academic staff (Research) Level C	2	4			5	6		2	7	12	19
Academic staff (Research) Level B	1				6	14	2	3	9	17	26
Academic staff (Research) Level A			1		26	31	11	6	38	37	75
General staff Level 9	14	15	2		3	8	1		20	23	43
General staff Level 8	29	16	3	4	10	14	3		45	34	79
General staff Level 7	46	33	4		13	12	3	1	66	46	112
General staff Level 6	43	53	11	1	27	16	8	3	89	73	162
General staff Level 5	57	46	9	1	31	12	6	1	103	60	163
General staff Level 4	135	60	35	5	60	26	9	2	239	93	332
General staff Level 3	56	66	34	1	17	3	8		115	70	185
General staff Level 2	1	1	12			4			13	5	18
General staff Trainee					1	1			1	1	2
TOTAL	579	576	139	22	284	268	81	32	1083	898	1981

NOTE: Casual staff are currently not included in the statistics. However a Casual Administration System will be implemented before the end of 2001. This will allow us to provide data and analysis about casual staff in the future.

2. Analysis

The issues for women in the workplace were identified through the following:

- Review of the workplace profile. Two profiles are used in the analysis, based on statistical snapshots seven months apart, 31 March 2000, page 2, and 1 November 2000, in Appendix 6. As requested a third workplace profile as at 31 March 2001 is included on page 9.
- Review of the academic promotion statistics and Equity officers participation in the academic promotion rounds at every level (Levels B to E).
- Review of the staff attitude survey. This survey was undertaken in October 1999 and surveyed all staff across the University on a number of issues. The results of the survey were analysed by an external behavioural research group. From this survey a gender analysis was undertaken and there were not significant differences between the attitudes of women and men.
- Feedback from Senior Management Group as they monitor the implementation of University initiatives.
- Review of staff gender ratios. The Corporate Plan includes only 10 Key Performance Indicators, one of which is staff gender ratios for academic and general women staff. This Key Performance Indicator includes targets for the following three years. These targets are interrogated and reviewed annually by the senior management group and the University Council. These ratios are an indicator of the number of women as a percentage of total staff, and as a percentage of staff at the senior levels; that is at Level D and above for academic staff, and Level 10 and above for general staff.
- Consultation with women across the organisation through the University Women's Consultative Committee (UWCC). This group meets regularly and has representation from all academic Divisions and supporting Portfolios.
- Issues identified by the equity officers from information collected through the complaint handling process.
- Information collected by equity officers through committee work across the University.

Consideration of the seven employment matters

1. Recruitment and Selection procedures (from Workplace profile, page 2)

- Although women comprise 44% of the total number of academic staff, only 25% are at Level D and above; women comprise 62% of the total number of general staff, but only 37% of the number of general staff at Level 10 and above.

2. Promotion, transfer and termination of employment

- In the case of academic promotion, it is apparent by analysing statistics, committee participation, and anecdotally, that women have difficulty in gaining the requisite skills and standing, particularly for promotion to Level C and above. This is evident in the academic promotion statistics for 1999 and 2000 at Appendix 1.

- Staff (general and academic) identified ten factors for improvement by means of the Staff Attitude Survey conducted late in 1999, and the seventh was in the area of providing career opportunities.

3. Training and development

- Although there is no significant difference in the numbers of women and men accessing Professional Experience Program (PEP), women are not accessing PEP leave for interstate and overseas opportunities at the same rate as men. In 1994/95 a research project was undertaken to provide data and to identify reasons for the difference in access to PEP funding. This project demonstrates that there was a differential in accessing PEP funding for travel, confirming that women were not travelling nationally or internationally at the same rate as men. The research indicated that the reasons were mainly due to family responsibilities. Women staff reported that not only did they miss valuable opportunities to become known at the national or international levels, but they also were often re-called from PEP leave to assist with teaching and administrative duties. Women consistently reported that the benefit they derived from PEP was significantly lower than was reported by staff who had been able to travel and have an uninterrupted experience of PEP. As a result of these findings it was recommended that the support allowance claims associated with PEP funding should be broadened to include dependent care of aged parents and children. (See Future Actions, page 8).
- The University has a very successful Women and Leadership program in place. This program offers a range of elements: workshops, mentoring, and collegial groups. Around 300 women currently participate in the program, with a steady rise in the number of participants since the inception of the program in 1996. (See appendix 3). In addition, the Australian Technology Network Women's Executive Development (ATN WEXDEV) program offers senior women a range of opportunities including national seminars, mentoring, inter-institutional visits, and senior executive placements.

4. Work organisation

- Of the 1981 academic and general staff, (Workplace profile, page 2), 55% are women, and 45% are men. There are higher numbers of women in the more traditionally female discipline and professional areas - in the divisions of Health Sciences, 64% (Appendix 6.9), Education, Arts, and Social Sciences, 62% (Appendix 6.6), Business and Enterprise, 54% (Appendix 6.8), the Portfolios of Access and Learning support, 67% (Appendix 6.4), and Equity and Development 74%, (Appendix 6.5), and in Chancellery, 81% (Appendix 6.10). However there remains the ongoing issue of low numbers of women in non-traditional areas - in the Division of Information Technology, Engineering, and the Environment, 31%, (Appendix 6.7), and the Portfolios of Research and International, 30%, (Appendix 6.3), and Resources, 36%, (Appendix 6.2).
- There are still low numbers of women at the senior levels. Of the 47 staff at the executive level (Workplace profile, page 2), only 37% are women. In particular, of the 130 academic staff at Levels D and E, only 22% are women (Workplace profile, page 2). In the female dominated Division of Health Sciences although women make up 62% of the academic staff, at Levels D and above only 43% are women (Appendix 6.9). In the traditionally male dominated Division of Information Technology, Engineering and the Environment, 19% of academic staff are women, but there are still no women at Level D and above (Appendix 6.7).

- There are low numbers of women with doctoral degrees in comparison to men. Of the 301 academic staff members in the University with doctoral degrees, only 29% are women whereas 71% are men (Appendix 6.1). Higher numbers of women with doctoral degrees are generally found in the social science areas. In the Division of Education, Arts, and Social Sciences and the Portfolio of Access and Learning Support, the numbers of women and men academic staff with doctoral degrees is roughly the same – 42% and 44 % are women respectively. However in the Division of Business and Enterprise, 23% are women; in the Portfolio of Research and International 15% are women; and in the Division of Information Technology, Engineering and the Environment only 10% are women. In the Division of Health Sciences, only 44% of academic women staff with doctoral degrees are women, yet women make up 62% of the academic staff. (See appendix 6).

5. Conditions of service

- From the results of the staff survey conducted late in 1999, the ten factors in which staff indicated the University was performing best were primarily those to do with the University's commitment to equity for staff and students. The top ten highest performing factors are as follows, in descending order:
 - Harassment-free working environment
 - UniSA's commitment to reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people
 - Providing a safe work environment
 - UniSA's commitment to equity for students
 - UniSA's commitment to affirmative action
 - Having access to flexible working arrangements
 - Achieving my work area's goals/objectives
 - Producing quality outcomes and quality services
 - Understanding where my work area fits into UniSA
 - Having the person to whom I report listen and respond to me
- Further analysis of data in relation to flexible working arrangements indicates that although there is a slow pick up rate in the 48/52 work option, women are accessing this working option at five times the rate of men.
- The University is highlighted in a case study as a best practice organisation in relation to family friendly work options in *Learn from the Leaders: Case studies in HR Best practice – 2000*. (HRM Consulting Pty Ltd, Toowong Qld).
- The University has produced guidelines for supervisors and staff on *Family responsibilities and flexible working arrangements: Guidelines for supervisors and staff*. A copy is included at Appendix 2.

6. Arrangements for dealing with sex-based harassment

- The results of the staff survey indicate that staff feel that the University is performing well in providing a safe and harassment-free working environment. The low number of complaints in relation to sexual harassment also supports this. The harassment policy is currently being reviewed to ensure that it continues to address current issues.

7. Arrangements for dealing with pregnancy, potentially pregnant employees and employees who are breastfeeding

- During the enterprise bargaining process there was agreement that the University's family friendly policies should be formalised. One of the stated intentions of the Enterprise Bargaining agreement is that it enables employees with family

responsibilities to participate in the University, by developing and extending employment and support options which recognise issues affecting such employees, and by encouraging and supporting varied work arrangements.

3. Prioritising the issues

The following two areas have been identified as priorities

1. Relatively low numbers of women at the senior levels, in particular at Level D and E for academic staff, and Level 10 and above for general staff.

➔ This issue was prioritised as it has continued to be an ongoing concern in our institution, as well as in the higher education sector. This is an issue because the number of women at the senior levels does not reflect the number of women in the organisation, both general and academic, and because it results in a loss of skills and knowledge from a significant section of the workforce as role models, mentors, and leaders who are able to contribute their experiences and skills to the development of the University.

2. Low numbers of women with doctoral degrees.

➔ This was seen as important as a doctoral degree is normally required for academic promotion beyond Level B. Many women have not had the opportunity to undertake higher degrees due to a number of factors, including career breaks. This factor also makes the case for equivalence harder to argue and sustain. Also a number of disciplines in which women are dominant have only recently implemented doctoral programs, for example Medical Radiations, Occupational Therapy, Physiotherapy, Pharmacy, and Adult Education.

4. Actions

Priority Issue 1: Low numbers of women at the senior levels, in particular at Level D and E for academic staff, and Level 10 and above for general staff.

Actions taken	Completion date
Workshops on academic promotion are offered to women only	Annually
Women and Leadership program offered to all academic and general women staff, including workshop and mentoring program. The report for 1999-2000 is included at Appendix 3	Ongoing
Flexible work practices	Ongoing
Recruitment procedures emphasise that the University is an equal opportunity employer	Ongoing
<i>Women at work: a manager's guide to affirmative action planning</i> produced to assist managers in affirmative action planning and reporting against these strategies – see Appendix 4	August 2000
The Equity and Diversity Unit has merged with the Human Resources Unit ensuring equity is embedded into HR processes, practices, and policies	January 2001
Review of organisational learning/staff development opportunities	2000
Implementation of performance management across the University ensuring this is a developmental process with a staff development component for all employees	2000
Participation in the National Equity Best Practice Benchmarking Project. This benchmarking project focuses on the number of women in senior academic and general positions. The participating Universities include: Griffith University, University of NSW, University of Technology Sydney, Deakin University, Queensland University	2001

of Technology, University of South Australia and Curtin University. Plan included at Appendix 5	
The Women on Committees policy was reviewed in 2000. Statistics of women on committees across the University continues to be collected and analysed annually	2000

Priority issue 2: Low numbers of women with doctoral degrees.

Actions taken	Completion date
PEP leave – Schools are encouraged to make higher degrees for women a priority for PEP programs and research is being undertaken in relation to providing for childcare and family responsibilities as part of PEP program support	Ongoing
Researching methods to remove the barriers to women accessing PEP leave for interstate and overseas opportunities	2001
The <i>Women at Work</i> document was produced to assist managers to identify strategies to support women to manage work/study/home life. See Appendix 4	August 2000

5. Evaluation – how effective were the actions?

Priority Issue 1: Low numbers of women at the senior levels, in particular at Level D and E for academic staff, and Level 10 for general staff.

- From 2000 to 2001 there was a slight improvement in the number of women as a percentage of total staff at the senior levels as measured by the Key Performance Indicators in the Corporate Plan. The percentage of academic women staff at Level D and above increased from 22% to 23% and the percentage of women general staff at Level 10 and above increased from 37% to 38%. There was an increase of 2% in the percentage of academic women staff at all levels from 41% to 43%. (From Corporate Plan 2001).

Priority issue 2: Low numbers of women with doctoral degrees.

- Within an analysis period of 12 months from November 1999 to November 2000 there was an increase from 62 to 86 academic women staff with doctoral degrees (in percentage terms, an increase from 23% to 29%). Any significant increase, as a result of recent actions taken, in the numbers of academic women with doctoral degrees, will not be evident for several years as it can take as long as 6 to 8 years to complete a doctoral degree part time.

6. Future Actions

- Develop an EOWA survey. Work has been undertaken in collaboration with Flinders University and The University of Adelaide to develop a survey to consult with staff across the organisation. This survey is based around the seven employment areas and brings in aspects of diversity so that extrapolation can be done on whether women are experiencing higher incidents of discrimination in the 7 employment areas outlined by the Agency. By having a survey that is common to all three universities in the State we will be able to benchmark against each other and find ways for cross-institutional endeavours.
- Reviewing arrangements for managing pregnancy, potentially pregnant employees, employees who are breast-feeding, and those with child-care responsibilities. The University has recognised that this is a priority to address in the near future. Funds have been set aside to develop a brochure to provide advice for pregnant and breastfeeding staff.

- Expand workforce strategy and planning activities to collect and analyse information about the barriers to increasing the number of women at senior levels, and develop strategies to target these barriers.
- The University's visionary document *Blueprint 2005* includes significant changes to the physical aspects of campuses to improve the working and learning environment of students and staff. In 2001 the Equity, Diversity, and Workforce Strategy Team was given specific oversight of a particular aspect of the University's *Blueprint 2005* with a focus on ensuring that childcare facilities are sufficient and appropriate on all campuses as a result of the consolidation of staff and students on four rather than five metropolitan campuses.
- The Division of Information Technology, Engineering, and the Environment has initiated a scholarship to assist women in professional isolation to complete their doctoral degree. This scholarship is in addition to PEP leave provisions, and is to 'buy out' teaching time to allow women to complete a doctoral degree. In this division 19% of academic staff are women, but make up only 10% of the academic staff with doctoral degrees.
- Academic promotion workshops for women targeted to specific academic levels in 2001, (Level B; Level C; and Levels D&E) with academic women presenters as role models for those applying for promotion.
- Exploration of how to make PEP leave more attractive to women, including provisions for staff with family responsibilities and assistance with payment for childcare.
- Ongoing research to ascertain why women are not progressing more rapidly to the senior levels, for example conducting exit interviews, and analysis of retrenchments and resignations, consultation through the University Women's Consultative Committee and reviewing national research in this area.
- Continue to extend the Women and Leadership program and focus on issues relating to leadership, research, and scholarship.
- Promote the Australian Technology Network Women's Executive Development (ATN WEXDEV) activities, for example the SPIRT grant research project on Organisational Cultures. A WEXDEV participant from UniSA is one of the principal researchers involved in this project.
- Ongoing equity training for panels and chairs of selection committees and academic promotion panels.
- Promoting doctoral programs that are more suited to women's study patterns due to family responsibilities, for example professional doctorates which provide flexible delivery and alternative modes of assessment.
- Review of strategies designed to promote on the job learning within the University's organisational learning framework.

7. Workplace profile 2000-2001

University of South Australia Workplace profile for 31 March 2001

Occupational classifications	Continuing staff				Contract staff				Totals		
	Full time		Part time		Full time		Part time		Total		Grand Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
Vice Chancellor					1				1	0	1
Pro Vice Chancellors					2	5			2	5	7
Executive Directors						1			0	1	1
Academic Senior Administrators		2			1	3			1	5	6
General Senior Administrators		4			1	5			1	9	10
General Senior Managers	8	8			3	6			11	14	25
Academic Staff (T&R) Level E	6	23			2	12	1	4	9	39	48
Academic Staff (T&R) Level D	13	34	1		6	8			20	42	62
Academic Staff (T&R) Level C	63	87	1	1	34	54	8	8	106	150	256
Academic Staff (T&R) Level B	95	90	14	6	24	17	17	4	150	117	267
Academic Staff (T&R) Level A	11	8	2	2	21	13	23	9	57	32	89
Academic staff (Research) Level E						2		2	0	4	4
Academic staff (Research) Level D		1				6			0	7	7
Academic staff (Research) Level C	3	6			3	2		3	6	11	17
Academic staff (Research) Level B	1			1	7	15	2	8	10	24	34
Academic staff (Research) Level A	1	2			15	31	19	11	35	44	79
General staff Level 10								1	0	1	1
General staff Level 9	13	14	3		5	8	1	1	22	23	45
General staff Level 8	23	20	2	2	17	15	6	1	48	38	86
General staff Level 7	43	32	4		17	11	6	1	70	44	114
General staff Level 6	55	50	11		36	20	5	4	107	74	181
General staff Level 5	64	45	10		31	22	16	2	121	69	190
General staff Level 4	110	51	28	4	61	27	27	4	226	86	312
General staff Level 3	48	63	28		28	15	18	1	122	79	201
General staff Level 2	1		9		2	2			12	2	14
TOTAL	558	540	113	16	317	300	149	64	1137	920	2057