Peer Review of Athena SWAN Applications

Summary of Key Differences Between Australia and UK Processes*

SAGE - Australia

- 7 Panelists including chair
- Observers present, but do not participate
- Peer review training delivered face-to-face
- 5 applications per panel
- Applications received as pdf online - SAGE will not print copies
- Lead spokesperson selected for each application
- Panelists have ~6 weeks to review, score and prepare comments
- Comments and scores to be received from all panelists at least ~3 weeks prior to the meeting
- SAGE with Chair decides on order of applications for review - based on pre-meeting comments/scores
- Discussion and feedback is targeted to assessment criteria
- SAGE consolidates comments prior to meeting and secretary includes additional details from panel discussion for feedback report. Lead spokesperson and chair confirm details and moderators review to ensure consistency
- Moderator does not make a decision to have an application reassessed by another panel; only if an Appeal based on policy is upheld, may an application be reassessed

ECU - United Kingdom

- 5 Panelists including chair
- Observers present and can provide an opinion but only after a decision has been reached for each application
- Peer review training delivered via webinar
- 4 applications per panel
- Black and white copies of applications received by ECU and printed for panelists; if institutions want colour copies to be reviewed, they send the required number of hard-copies to the ECU
- No lead spokesperson
- Panelists have ~5 weeks to review and prepare comments
- No scores or comments submitted in advance of meeting
- ECU selects order of application discussion (applications are reviewed alphabetically)
- Discussion and feedback is targeted to the sections in the application, not the criteria
- ECU secretariat consolidates all comments from panel discussion for feedback report. Moderator reviews for consistency. Chair and panelists do not see the feedback
- Moderator can put application to another panel for reassessment if they disagree with outcome

*key differences were in response to Australian sector experience in peer review and feedback from consultation