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## Foreword

Equality, diversity and inclusion are central to our Social Responsibility agenda. Diversity is a huge strength of our institution and a source of great pride. However, we acknowledge there is still much to do to ensure we tackle all forms of discrimination and guarantee all staff and students are given opportunities to thrive. We have made progress - notably by every eligible School achieving, or in the process of applying for, an Athena SWAN award which recognises commitment to the career advancement of women; the Race Equality Charter Mark award which aims to improve the representation, progression and success of minority ethnic staff and students within higher education; and recognition from Stonewall for creating an inclusive workplace as a top 100 employer for LGBT colleagues - but we are also aware that there is still much to do. We will continue to embed our commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion across all our processes and this report is a great example of our continued work in this area.


## Professor James Thompson

Associate Vice-President Social Responsibility

The diversity of the students and staff at the University is, in my opinion, one of the most special things about
 Manchester and should be at the heart of everything we do. At the Union we hold liberation and diversity at our core and celebrate that it is our differences that make society special, but also clearly acknowledging that different groups of people face barriers. Considering Brexit and US Elections, 2016 has been a difficult year for minority groups. Therefore we have endeavoured even more to celebrate the diversity of our students and staff, support marginalised groups and empower them to make change. We look forward to working with the University to make sure every single person feels at home on campus and to also work to make society liberated.
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## 1. Introduction

The University of Manchester is Britain's largest single site University; it employs just over 11,000 staff and educates approximately 38,000 students. In addition to its main function of teaching and research, the University's portfolio includes student accommodation, libraries, a museum, visitor centres, conference facilities and an art gallery. The University is committed to promoting equality and providing an environment where all members of its community are treated with respect and dignity and are proud to employ a workforce that reflects the diverse community we serve.

The Equality Act (2010) places a general duty on all public sector organisations to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, victimisation and harassment, advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and foster good relations. The duty covers age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership (in relation to employment), pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief (including lack of belief), sex and sexual orientation. Consideration of these 'protected characteristics' must be given in relation to employment, education and service provision.

Data in the report all relates to the 2015/16 year, and has come from a variety of sources:

- Staff data, from the Annual Performance Review, is current and up-to-date as of $31^{\text {st }}$ July 2016.
- Student data, from the Planning and Support Office, is current and up-to-date as of $1^{\text {st }}$ December 2016.
- Disability data, for staff and students from the Disability Advisory and Support Service, is current and up-todate as of January 2017.
- Undergraduate and postgraduate data, from the HESA return, is current and up-to-date as of $31^{\text {st }}$ July 2016.


## 2. Equality Objectives

As a Higher Education Institution we have specific equality duties, as outlined by The Equality Act (2010). These require public authorities to tackle discrimination, victimisation and harassment, advance equality and foster good relations. It is also our responsibility to publish our equality information on an annual basis, and review and publish specific and measurable equality objectives every 4 years.

Based on extensive consultation, a new set of equality objectives was developed in April 2016:

1) Improve the representation of women and black, asian and minority ethnic (BAME) staff in senior leadership, academic and professional support positions.
2) Take action to further understand and improve the experience of disabled staff as indicated in the staff survey.
3) Take action to further understand and address any differential outcomes of undergraduate students in relation to access, retention, attainment and progression to a positive graduate destination in relation to disability, ethnicity, gender and socio-economic status.
4) Take action to understand and address any inequalities for researchers.
5) To better understand the challenges, obstacles and barriers faced by different groups at the University and to foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it.
6) Better understand the potential impact of University functions on certain groups by improving disclosure rates and reporting mechanisms for age, disability, ethnicity, caring responsibilities, religion or belief (including lack of belief) sexual orientation and gender reassignment.

Our new equality objectives will be published in April 2020. These objectives will be reviewed in April 2017.

## 3. Staff Equality Information

### 3.1 Age



The University has a wide range of ages of staff, with most staff at the University being aged from 26 to 35 $(28 \%)$ and between 36 to 45 -also $28 \%$ this year, which marks a rise from recent years. Full-time staff at the University tend to be aged from 29 to 37, whilst part-time staff tend to be aged 33 to 41. Academic staff ages show most academics are aged between 27 and 40 , in contrast to PSS who have an even distribution of ages across a working life.




Figure 5: Professional Support Staff by
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### 3.2 Disability



Figures from the Disability Advisory and Support Service (DASS) show 8.8\% of staff at the University as having declared a disability to the team, with the University providing advice and support for a wide range of disabilities. The kind of support offered depends on each case, but may consist of adjustments in the workplace, assistive equipment, support for travel and advice on disability-related support and benefits available at home.

Whilst figures from the DASS place the percentage of staff with disabilities at $8.8 \%$, just $5 \%$ of staff have disclosed their disability status on their staff record. The percentage of all staff disclosing a disability has more than doubled since the publication of the Equality Act, with staff in professional support roles being more likely to disclose a disability than academic staff. Holding the most complete and accurate information available enables the University to effectively tackle discrimination and equalise opportunity in its community.

| Table A: Disabled Staff at the University | 2011/12 |  | 2012/13 |  | 2013/14 |  | 2014/15 |  | 2015/16 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | UoM | HE Sector | UoM | HE Sector | UoM | HE Sector | UoM | HE Sector | UoM | HE Sector |
| \% Staff known to have disability* | 2.7\% |  | 3.0\% |  | 6.2\% |  | 5.3\% |  | 4.9\% |  |
| \% Academic staff known to have a disability* | 2.0\% |  | 2.3\% |  | 3.5\% |  | 3.0\% |  | 2.7\% |  |
| \% PSS Staff known to have a disability* | 3.5\% |  | 3.7\% |  | 8.2\% |  | 7.8\% |  | 6.8\% |  |


| Table B: Disabled People in the Greater Manchester Area | 2011/12 | 2013/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% aged 16-64 in Greater Manchester who are disabled (Disability Discrimination Act), ONS* | 22.40\% | NA | NA | NA |
| \% aged 16-64 in Greater Manchester who are EA core or work-limiting disabled (Equality Act), ONS* | NA | NA | 21.20\% | 21.60\% |

Figure 7: All Staff by Ethnicity



Figure 8: All Staff by Ethnicity and Nationality

'Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic' (BAME) is a term referring to those of non-White descent, and encompasses a wide range of different ethnicities irrespective of a person's origin or nationality. Of all staff of known ethnicity, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic staff make up $14.1 \%$ of our staff population (Figure 7).

BAME University staff from the UK represent 8\% of the staff population (Figure 8), comparable to the higher education average of $8.5 \%^{1}$. This can also be compared with the percentage of those living in the Greater Manchester area that are from a UK BAME background; for the Greater Manchester area this figure is $12.5 \% 2$, whilst for the United Kingdom this figure sits at $9.1 \%^{2}$.

The University employs many staff originating from outside the UK, with the majority of this group working as Academic staff (Figure 9). Non-UK staff make up 19\% of the staff population (Figure 8), 1.3\% more than the sector average of Non-UK staff at $18.3 \%^{1}$.
${ }^{1}$ Equality Challenge Unit Statistical Report 2016
${ }^{2} \%$ of population aged $16-64$ who are ethnic minority UK national, Annual Population Survey (ONS: Oct $14^{\prime}$ - Sep $15^{\prime}$ )

Figure 9: All Staff by University Function, Ethnicity and Nationality


Figure 10: Academic Staff Levels by Ethnicity

- White


Improving the representation of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic staff in senior academic and support positions has been one of the University's equality objectives over the past four years. Currently $8 \%$ of Professors are BAME, which is higher than the comparable sector averages of $7.7 \%^{1}$.
${ }^{1}$ Equality Challenge Unit Statistical Report 2016

Figure 11: Promotion to Position of Senior Lecturer by Ethnicity


Figure 12: Promotion to Position of Reader by Ethnicity



For applications for promotion to Senior Lecturer, a smaller fraction of potential BAME academics applied compared to the fraction of the potential White academics that applied ( $9 \%$ versus $5 \%$ ). For the position of Reader however, BAME academics were as likely to apply, and $4 \%$ more likely to apply for promotion to the role of Chair than White academics.

BAME academics were less successful in promotions across all roles this past academic year. After applying to the role of Senior Lecturer, $8 \%$ fewer BAME candidates were promoted than White candidates. Significantly, for Readers 21\% fewer BAME candidates were promoted, and for Chairs and Professors White academics were $26 \%$ more likely to be successful upon interview.

The University is rolling out Unconscious Bias training across the institution to tackle any implicit bias that may be present in recruitment and promotion decisions.

Figure 14: Professional Support Staff Grades by Ethnicity
■ White


Within Professional Support Staff roles at the University, $8 \%$ of roles at grade 6 and above are held by BAME staff members. Improving the representation of BAME staff in senior support positions has been part of the University's equality objectives over the past four years.

Figure 15: Leavers during 2015/16 by Ethnicity


Of those 1331 staff who left the University over the year, ethnicity information was available for 1255 of these leavers ( $94.3 \%$ ). Of this group, $19 \%$ of leavers were from a BAME background and $81 \%$ were White.

### 3.3.1 Unknown Ethnicity Information

Personal information that staff or students provide to the University help us to produce anonymous statistical reports. These allow us to make sure we are directing time and resources in the places that will make the most positive differences for everyone. The information provided is kept securely and access to this information is restricted. When there are gaps in information, this data is excluded and the statistics given are based on the known information.

Currently, ethnicity data is not known for 3.5\% of University staff, but in reality this figure is varied across each faculty. For example, in Engineering \& Physical Sciences unknown ethnicity data is 5.3\%, whereas in Professional Support Services the figure is currently $1.9 \%$.


## $3.5 \%$ still unknown

3.4 Gender

Figure 16: All Staff by Gender


Figure 17: Academic Staff by Gender
Figure 18: Professional Support Staff by
Gender


There are similar proportions of male and female staff working at the University. However, when analysed in terms of their functions at University, there are $16 \%$ more male academic staff compared with female. This trend is reversed within the PSS, where there are $12 \%$ more PSS female staff than male.

This reflects the state of the higher education sector, where $55 \%{ }^{1}$ of academics are male compared with $45 \%$ female. In support roles this again reverses, with $62.7 \%{ }^{1}$ of support staff being female compared to $36.3 \%$ of support staff being male.
${ }^{1}$ Equality Challenge Unit Statistical Report 2016

Figure 19: Academic Staff Levels by Gender

$\mathbf{2 4 \%}$ of Professors at the University are female, compared with $76 \%$ being male. These figures mirror the higher education sector, where $23.1 \%^{1}$ of Professors are female and $76.9 \%$ being male.
${ }^{1}$ Equality Challenge Unit Statistical Report 2015

Figure 20: Promotion to Position of Senior Lecturer by Gender


Figure 21: Promotion to Position of Reader by Gender


Figure 22: Promotion to Position of Chair


In all promotions, similar fractions of the potential applicant pool applied from both sexes, although consistently slightly higher proportions of females applied.

In terms of success rates, female applicants were considerably more likely to be successful in promotion across all promotion pathways apart from Chairs, which men were 7\% more successful in this year. In the role of Reader a substantial $100 \%$ of females were successful, compared to half that of men.

Figure 23: Professional Support Staff Grades by Gender


[^0]Figure 24: Leavers during 2015-2016 by Gender


Of the 1331 staff who left the University over the year, the male proportion was $6 \%$ greater than those who were female.

## 4. Student Equality Information

### 4.1 Age

Figure 25: All Students by Age


Figure 26: Undergraduate Students by


Figure 27: Postgraduate Students by Age


Whilst most students (71\%) are aged between 18 and 22 , there is a wide range of ages of students studying at the University.

Undergraduate programmes tend to have students aged between 18 and 19 (79\%), however postgraduate students tend to be aged between 21 and 26. The numbers of postgraduate students of a given age depreciates slowly, with considerable numbers of students on postgraduate courses up to 40 years old.
4.2 Disability

Figure 28: Disabled Students

$\begin{array}{ll}\square \text { Autistic/Asperger Syndrome } & \square \text { Blind/partial sight } \\ \square \text { Deaf/partial hearing } & \square \text { Learning difficulty } \\ \square \text { Mental health } & \square \text { Multiple disabilities } \\ \square \text { Other disability } & \square \text { Unseen disability } \\ \square \text { Wheelchair/mobility } & \end{array}$

Similar to staff, the DASS supports a range of disabilities with personalised provisions. Figures from DASS show that $7.5 \%$ of students at the University have registered with them, involving a range of different types of disabilities. The most common disability experienced by students is a learning difficulty ( $26.8 \%$ of total students).

Figure 29: 'Good Degree' Attainment of Home Students by Disability from 2011/12


The attainment of students with and without disabilities has been consistent across the previous five academic years. Medical and unclassified degrees have not been included.

Note: A 'good' degree is an attainment of 2:1 or higher

### 4.3 Ethnicity

Figure 30: All Students by Ethnicity \& Nationality


The University has seen a gradual increase in the representation of BAME students over the past five years, with 1098 more BAME current students as compared with 2012/13.

The University has also admitted more students of non-UK origin, with this group representing $4 \%$ more of the total population than in 2012/13.

Figure 31: ‘Good Degree’ Attainment of Home Students by Ethnicity 2011/12 2015/16


Within the higher education sector, a significant gap has existed between the attainment of BAME students compared with their White peers. This led to the formulation of one of our equality objectives in 2012 to try and close this gap by further increasing our understanding of possible barriers and instigating targeted programmes of support. The gap had declined over the years, reaching $8 \%$ last year. This year the gap has increased to $12 \%$. The gap is lower than the UK-wide attainment gap at $15.2 \%$.

### 4.4 Gender

Figure 32: All Students by Gender


The student population has historically included more female students than male students, with the approximate ratio of $53 \%$ to $47 \%$ sustaining over the past five years. This trend of $6 \%$ more female students continues.

Figure 33: 'Good Degree' Attainment of Home Students by Gender from 2011/12 to


The figures for gender attainment mirror that of the wider sector, showing that females historically have been more likely to attain an upper second-class honours degree or higher. This year that gap has widened to $5 \%$.

## Appendix

Table 1: All Staff by University Function, Ethnicity and Gender

|  | Ethnicity | Female | Male | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Count | Count | Count | \% |
| Academic Staff | White | 1632 | 2184 | 3816 | 79\% |
|  | BME | 310 | 490 | 800 | 17\% |
|  | Unknown | 85 | 142 | 227 | 5\% |
|  | Count | 2027 | 2816 | 4843 |  |
|  | \% | 43\% | 57\% |  |  |
| Professional Support Services Staff | White | 2748 | 2146 | 4894 | 86\% |
|  | BME | 355 | 275 | 630 | 11\% |
|  | Unknown | 70 | 72 | 142 | 3\% |
|  | Count | 3173 | 2493 | 5666 |  |
|  | \% | 56\% | 44\% |  |  |

Table 2: Academic Staff Levels by Ethnicity and Gender

|  | Ethnicity | Female | Male | Tota |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Count | Count | Count | \% |
| Lecturer | White | 356 | 438 | 794 | 79\% |
|  | BME | 71 | 95 | 166 | 16\% |
|  | Unknown | 19 | 29 | 48 | 5\% |
|  | Count | 446 | 562 | 1008 |  |
|  | \% | 45\% | 55\% |  |  |
| Senior Lecturer/Reader | White | 267 | 416 | 683 | 87\% |
|  | BME | 24 | 69 | 93 | 12\% |
|  | Unknown | 2 | 6 | 8 | 1\% |
|  | Count | 293 | 491 | 784 |  |
|  | \% | 39\% | 61\% |  |  |
| Professor | White | 177 | 562 | 739 | 90\% |
|  | BME | 15 | 53 | 68 | 8\% |
|  | Unknown | 4 | 7 | 11 | 1\% |
|  | Count | 196 | 622 | 818 |  |
|  | \% | 24\% | 76\% |  |  |
| ALL CORE ACADEMIC STAFF | White | 800 | 1416 | 2216 | 85\% |
|  | BME | 110 | 217 | 327 | 13\% |
|  | Unknown | 25 | 42 | 67 | 3\% |
|  | Count | 935 | 1675 | 2610 |  |
|  | \% | 36\% | 64\% |  |  |
| Research and Other Academics | White | 832 | 768 | 1600 | 72\% |
|  | BME | 200 | 273 | 473 | 21\% |
|  | Unknown | 60 | 100 | 160 | 7\% |
|  | Count | 1092 | 1141 | 2233 |  |
|  | \% | 52\% | 48\% |  |  |

Table 3: BAME Academic Staff by Level Over Previous Three Years

|  | $2013 / 14$ | $2014 / 15$ | $2015 / 16$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lecturer | $15 \%(134)$ | $16 \%(148)$ | $17 \%(166)$ |
| Senior Lecturer/Reader | $12 \%(84)$ | $12 \%(91)$ | $12 \%(93)$ |
| Professor | $8 \%(62)$ | $8 \%(64)$ | $8 \%(68)$ |
| Research and Other Academics | $20 \%(413)$ | $22 \%(476)$ | $23 \%(473)$ |

Table 4: Female Academic Staff by Level Over Previous Three Years

|  | $2013 / 14$ | $2014 / 15$ | $2015 / 16$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lecturer | $44 \%(409)$ | $45 \%(435)$ | $44 \%(446)$ |
| Senior Lecturer/Reader | $35 \%(250)$ | $36 \%(275)$ | $37 \%(293)$ |
| Professor | $22 \%(176)$ | $23 \%(186)$ | $24 \%(196)$ |
| Research and Other Academics | $48 \%(1040)$ | $48 \%(1096)$ | $49 \%(1092)$ |

Table 5: Professional Support Staff Grades by Ethnicity and Gender

|  | Ethnicity | Female | Male | Tota |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Count | Count | Count | \% |
|  | White | 1659 | 1239 | 2898 | 84\% |
|  | BME | 268 | 183 | 451 | 13\% |
| Grades 1-5 | Unknown | 51 | 40 | 91 | 3\% |
|  | Count | 1978 | 1462 | 3440 |  |
|  | \% | 57\% | 43\% |  |  |
|  | White | 816 | 701 | 1517 | 90\% |
|  | BME | 66 | 69 | 135 | 8\% |
| Grades 6-7 | Unknown | 11 | 22 | 33 | 2\% |
|  | Count | 893 | 792 | 1685 |  |
|  | \% | 54\% | 46\% |  |  |
|  | White | 128 | 107 | 235 | 92\% |
|  | BME | 6 | 9 | 15 | 6\% |
| Grades 8-9 | Unknown | 1 | 5 | 6 | 2\% |
|  | Count | 135 | 121 | 256 |  |
|  | \% | 54\% | 46\% |  |  |
|  | White | 145 | 99 | 244 | 86\% |
|  | BME | 15 | 14 | 29 | 10\% |
| Other Grades | Unknown | 7 | 5 | 12 | 4\% |
|  | Count | 167 | 118 | 285 |  |
|  | \% | 59\% | 41\% |  |  |

Table 6: BAME Professional Support Staff by Grade Band over Previous Three Years

|  |  |  | $2014 / 15$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $2015 / 16$ |  |
| Grades 1-5 | $12 \%(381)$ | $12 \%(411)$ | $13 \%(451)$ |
| Grades 6-7 | $7 \%(121)$ | $9 \%(143)$ | $8 \%(135)$ |
| Grades 8-9 | $6 \%(14)$ | $6 \%(15)$ | $6 \%(15)$ |

Table 7: Academic Promotions by Level and Ethnicity

| Promotion to | \% that applied out of <br> potential applicants |  | Distribution of <br> applicants |  | \% of successful <br> applications |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | White | BAME | White | BAME | White | BAME |
| Senior Lecturer | $9 \%(916)$ | $5 \%(174)$ | $88 \%(84)$ | $9 \%(9)$ | $75 \%(63)$ | $67 \%(6)$ |
| Reader | $6 \%(569)$ | $6 \%(78)$ | $86 \%(32)$ | $14 \%(5)$ | $81 \%(26)$ | $60 \%(3)$ |
| Chair | $7 \%(657)$ | $11 \%(93)$ | $82 \%(47)$ | $18 \%(10)$ | $66 \%(31)$ | $40 \%(4)$ |
| All promotions | $9 \%(1270)$ | $8 \%(227)$ | $84 \%(114)$ | $13 \%(18)$ | $72 \%(82)$ | $44 \%(8)$ |

Table 8: Academic Promotions by Level and Gender

| Promotion to | \% that applied out of <br> potential applicants |  | Distribution of <br> applicants |  | \% of successful <br> applications |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male |
| Senior Lecturer | $8 \%(487)$ | $9 \%(657)$ | $40 \%(38)$ | $60 \%(58)$ | $68 \%(26)$ | $78 \%(45)$ |
| Reader | $8 \%(100)$ | $18 \%(158)$ | $22 \%(8)$ | $78 \%(29)$ | $100 \%(8)$ | $72 \%(21)$ |
| Chair | $9 \%(285)$ | $6 \%(508)$ | $46 \%(26)$ | $54 \%(31)$ | $42 \%(11)$ | $77 \%(24)$ |
| All promotions | $7 \%(571)$ | $10 \%(985)$ | $30 \%(41)$ | $70 \%(94)$ | $63 \%(23)$ | $70 \%(66)$ |

Table 9: 'Good Degree’ Attainment of Students by Ethnicity Over Previous Four Years

|  | $2012 / 13$ | $2013 / 14$ | $2014 / 15$ | $2015 / 16$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| White | $79 \%(3490)$ | $82 \%(3390)$ | $83 \%(2888)$ | $86 \%(3080)$ |
| BAME | $67 \%(696)$ | $72 \%(708)$ | $75 \%(726)$ | $74 \%(694)$ |

Table 10: Disabled Staff

| Not known to be disabled |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Known* to have a disability | $92.2 \%(9582)$ |

[^1]Table 11: Staff Disability Breakdown

|  |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| Blind/partial sight | $2.5 \%(27)$ |
| Deaf/partial hearing | $3.6 \%(38)$ |
| Learning difficulty | $7.9 \%(84)$ |
| Mental health | $19.6 \%(209)$ |
| Other disability | $1.6 \%$ (17) |
| Unseen disability | $33.5 \%(357)$ |
| Wheelchair/mobility | $31.4 \%(335)$ |

Table 12: Disabled Students

| Not known to be disabled | $92.5 \%(13107)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Known* to have a disability | $7.5 \%(1056)$ |

Table 13: Student Disability Breakdown

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Autism/Asperger | $2.3 \%(85)$ |
| Blind/partial sight | $1.4 \%(51)$ |
| Deaf/partial hearing | $1.5 \%(56)$ |
| Learning difficulty | $36.6 \%(1353)$ |
| Mental health | $26.8 \%$ (991) |
| Multiple disability | $4.6 \%$ (172) |
| Other disability | $16.6 \%(616)$ |
| Unseen disability | $8.9 \%(331)$ |
| Wheelchair/mobility | $1.2 \%(45)$ |

Please note: tables with 'not known' ethnicity have included staff with unknown data for completeness; all other statistics are based on the known population.


[^0]:    Within Professional Support Services, there are consistently slightly more female staff than male at each grade level. This is particularly true of lower grades, with grades 1 through 5 employing $15 \%$ more women.

[^1]:    * Data gathered from DASS

