the United Kingdom now have at least one Athena SWAN rating. The scheme has been expanded in Britain to include the arts, humanities and social sciences, and has spread to Ireland and Australia, where the first 40 participating institutions will learn of their ratings in early 2018. There are also calls to launch similar schemes in India and Japan.

FUNDING INCENTIVE

A major reason for the scheme's rapid rise in the United Kingdom was its link to funding. In 2011 the UK government's chief medical officer, Sally Davies, made holding a silver award a requirement for receiving grants from a £816-million (US$1.1-billion) pot of government biomedical funding. But the scheme spread well beyond the institutions competing for that funding. This was motivated in part by "moral pressure" but also because some staff thought that future funding decisions could become linked to such ratings, says Athene Donald, a physicist at the University of Cambridge, UK. Major funders such as the UK Research Councils recommend that institutions seek accreditation, but have not made it a requirement.

Success in the United States may depend on a major funder such as the US National Science Foundation requiring certification as a prerequisite for funding, says Curt Rice, who is head of the Norway government's Committee on Gender Balance and Diversity in Research.

Evaluations of the British programme have been positive. In a 2016 survey of UK academics, almost 90% of respondents who were aware of Athena SWAN felt that the scheme's initiatives had a positive impact on the work environment. Some institutions saw particular success. Between the University of Liverpool receiving a bronze award in 2013 and a silver in 2016, the proportion of women promoted to professor posts increased from 28% to 50%. Other participating universities have made similar gains.

"Institutions struggling with diversity and inclusion likely have causative elements which they are unable to identify."

With thousands of public and private institutions in the United States, the pilot will have to adapt to the US higher-education system, says Malcom. Holding institutions accountable for every aspect of diversity will be impossible, she says, but examining data that they already collect will be a place to start. "My sense is that we really can't address the gender issues without looking at these other aspects" of diversity, she says. The AAAS hopes to expand the $200,000 pilot scheme to universities across the United States, but will need more funding.

SEA Change has the potential to succeed, says Renee Horton, president of the National Society of Black Physicists. But she cautions that deep-rooted, prevailing and often unconscious prejudices that underlie inequality in the United States could make it difficult for universities to assess themselves, which means oversight by the AAAS would be essential. "Institutions struggling with diversity and inclusion likely have causative elements which they are unable to identify," she says. ■

CORRECTION

The Editorial 'Made of stone' (*Nature* **549,** 5–6; 2017) appeared online with a poorly worded and offensive headline and standfirst. Taken together with some of the article's text, this implied that *Nature* supports retaining statues of historical figures whose work harmed others. This is not the case. As a result, the first sentence of the penultimate paragraph should have read "In cases where painful reminders are allowed to stand, they could be supplemented" instead of "Instead of removing painful reminders, perhaps these should be supplemented". Further discussion of this article can be found on page 160 and our apology appears online at go.nature.com/2xgh2j.