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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

Vice-President Social Responsibility
Introduction

The University of Manchester is Britain’s largest single site University. We employ over 12,000 staff and educate approximately 40,000 students. The University is committed to promoting equality and providing an environment where all members of its community are treated with respect and dignity. We are proud to strive to employ a workforce and educate a student body that reflects the diverse community we serve.

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 our equality objectives were developed in April 2016 and are reviewed annually. Our objectives are to:

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.

Data in this report relates to the 2016/17 year and comes from a variety of sources:

- Staff data, from the Annual Performance Review as at 31st July 2017.
- Student data, from the Planning and Support Office as at 1st December 2017.
Staff Equality Information

Throughout this report the data is split by Academic staff and Professional Support Services (PSS) staff. Academic staff are split by Professor, Senior Lecturer, Reader and Lecturer. Research staff include Researchers, Research Fellows and Senior Research Fellows. When the term ‘Academic’ is used in this report it groups together both Academic and Research Staff. PSS staff are in a range of roles such as administration and technical roles graded 1 - 9.

Key Findings

Age: The age of staff at the University has increased since 2015, with the most common age bracket shifting from ‘26 to 35’ to ‘36 to 45’. 29% of all staff at the University in 2017 are aged 36 to 45, an increase of 1.5% since 2015 (see Figure 1). The data from 2017 shows that PSS staff and part-time staff are older than academic staff and full time staff with most being aged between 36 and 45 compared to 26 to 35 for academic staff and full time staff (see Figure 2 & 3).

Disability: 5.2% of staff at the University have disclosed their disability status on their staff record (see Figure 7). The proportion of disabled staff working at the University peaked in 2014 at 6.2% and has since declined until a small rise was seen in 2017 bringing it to 5.2% (see Figure 11). The most prevalent disability type declared by staff, accounting for 31.3% of all disabilities, is a long standing illness or health condition such as cancer, HIV, diabetes, chronic heart disease, or epilepsy (see Figure 8).

Ethnicity: The proportion of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) staff at the University was 14.9% in 2017 which is an increase from 12.7% in 2013 of 2.2% (see Figure 17). There has been a 3.1% increase in BAME academics and a 1.4% increase in BAME PSS staff since 2013. The largest represented ethnic group is Asian staff accounting for 60.1% of all BAME staff. However the difference between academic and PSS staff is significant with 70.4% of BAME academic staff being Asian (see Figure 15) compared with only 46.1% of BAME PSS staff (see Figure 14).

Gender: The proportion of female staff at the University was 49.8% in 2017 which is an increase from 48.9% in 2013 of 0.9% (see Figure 28). Between 2013 and 2017 there has been a 1.3% increase in female academics and a 0.2% increase in female PSS staff.

Recruitment: 39.4% of applications for core academic positions were sent by females and 35.56% by BAME Candidates in the period studied (see Table 1). 24.9% of applications for PSS (both Faculty-based and central) were sent by BAME candidates and 10.0% of BAME applications were successful in comparison to 17.1% of White candidates’ applications (see Table 3).
**Promotions:** In all promotions, a higher percentage of males applied for all roles compared to females, however females were more likely to be promoted to the role of Senior Lecturer/Senior Research Fellow. After applying to the role of Senior Lecturer/Research Fellow, 21.3% fewer BAME candidates were promoted than White candidates (see Figure 20). Note that there are small samples in some categories (see Figures 18-20 & Figures 31-32) which makes interpretation of results difficult.

**Leavers:** Overall the percentage of female and BAME staff leaving the University in the past year has increased by 4.7% (see Figure 34) and 0.2% (see Figure 23) respectively. On further analysis it was determined that the increase is driven by fixed term contracts ending as turnover rates for BAME academics have dropped by 0.7% between 2015 and 2017 (see Figure 24) and by 2.0% for BAME PSS staff between 2016 and 2017. Note that there are small samples in some categories (see Figure 23 & 34) which makes interpretation of results difficult.

**Age**

![Figure 1: All Staff by Age](image)

2015 2016 2017
The University has a wide range of ages of staff, with most staff at the University being aged from 36 to 45 (29%), which marks a rise from recent years. Full time staff at the University tend to be aged from 26 to 35 while part time staff tend to be aged from 36 to 45 (Figure 2). Academic staff ages show most academics are aged between 26 and 35, while most PSS staff are aged from 36 to 45 (Figure 3).
The percentage of staff working full-time at the University increases as age decreases, with the exception of the age bracket 36-45 (Figure 4). Academics from age 26 to 35 are most likely to be working full time (Figure 5), whereas PSS staff aged under 25 are most likely to be working full time (Figure 6). A higher percentage of academic staff work full time compared with academic staff for all age groups with the exception of age brackets ‘25 and under’ and ‘66 and over’.
Disability

5.2% of staff at the University 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 PSS being more likely to disclose a disability than academic staff. Holding the most complete and accurate information enables the University to effectively tackle discrimination and equalise opportunity in its community.

The most prevalent disability type declared by staff is a long standing illness or health condition such as cancer, diabetes, chronic heart disease, or epilepsy. This accounts for almost one third of all disabilities declared (Figure 8).
Figure 8: Breakdown of Disabilities 2017

- A long standing illness or health condition such as cancer, HIV, diabetes, chronic heart disease, or epilepsy: 31.3%
- A specific learning difficulty such as dyslexia, dyspraxia or AD(H)D: 16.3%
- A physical impairment or mobility issues, such as difficulty using arms or using a wheelchair or crutches: 15.9%
- A mental health condition, such as depression, schizophrenia or anxiety disorder: 14.6%
- A disability, impairment or medical condition that is not listed above: 14.5%
- Deaf or serious hearing impairment: 4.0%
- Two or more impairments and/or disabling medical conditions: 1.1%
- A social/communication impairment such as Asperger’s syndrome/other autistic spectrum disorder: 1.1%
- Blind or a serious visual impairment uncorrected by glasses: 0.7%
- General learning disability (such as Down’s syndrome): 0.5%

Figure 9: Disability by Gender 2017

- Yes - has a disability: 58.6% Female, 41.4% Male
- Not known to be disabled: 49.4% Female, 50.6% Male
- Prefer not to say: 37.8% Female, 62.2% Male

Figure 10: Disability by Ethnicity 2017

- Yes - has a disability: 90.6% White, 9.2% BAME, 0.2% Information unknown or refused
- Not known to be disabled: 82.2% White, 15.2% BAME, 2.5% Information unknown or refused
- Prefer not to say: 80.5% White, 12.2% BAME, 7.3% Information unknown or refused
17.2% more females disclosed a disability than males and a much larger percentage of males (62.2%) chose ‘Prefer not to say’ compared with females (Figure 9).

For the past five years the percentage of PSS staff declaring a disability is consistently higher than the percentage of academic staff (Figure 11). Between 2016 and 2017 there has been a 0.3% increase in the percentage of all staff declaring a disability.
Ethnicity

Figure 12: **All Staff by Ethnicity 2017**

- **White**: 82.7%
- **BAME**: 14.9%
- **Information unknown or refused**: 2.5%

‘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 respondents, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic staff make up 14.9% of our staff population (Figure 12).

Figure 13: **BAME Staff by Ethnicity 2017**

- **Asian**: 60.1%
- **Black**: 15.5%
- **Mixed**: 14.0%
- **Other**: 10.3%
Of all BAME staff working at the university 60.1% are Asian (Figure 13). However, when analysed in terms of their functions at University, there is a significant difference in the proportion of Asian staff in academic posts when compared with PSS. 70.4% of BAME academic staff are Asian (Figure 15) compared with 46.1% of BAME PSS staff (Figure 14).

Black staff are the second highest represented ethnic group within all BAME staff at 15.5% (Figure 13). However only 5.8% of academic staff are black (Figure 15) compared with 28.8% of PSS staff (Figure 14).

There are 2.3% more White females working at the University than White males, however there are 1.8% more Asian males than Asian females (Figure 16).
The percentage of BAME staff in academic roles has been consistently higher than the percentage in PSS roles over the past five years (Figure 17). Since 2013 there has been a 2.2% increase of BAME staff across the university with a 3.1% increase in BAME academics and a 1.4% increase in BAME PSS staff.

Between 2014 and 2017 there has been a year on year increase in the percentage of BAME staff in both academic and PSS roles.
Figure 18: Promotion to Chair by Ethnicity 2017

Figure 19: Promotion to Reader by Ethnicity 2017

Figure 20: Promotion to Senior Lecturer/Senior Researcher by Ethnicity 2017
For applications for promotion to Senior Lecturer/Senior Research Fellow, almost three times more potential White academics applied compared with potential BAME academics that applied over the same reporting period (Figure 20). For the position of Chair, however, BAME academics were more than twice as likely to apply (Figure 18), and similarly more likely to apply for promotion to the role of Reader (Figure 19).

After applying to the role of Senior Lecturer/Research Fellow, 21.3% fewer BAME candidates were promoted than White candidates (Figure 20). Similarly, 10.9% fewer BAME candidates were promoted than White in promotions to the level of Chair (Figure 18). This is in contrast with promotions to the role of Reader where BAME academics are 17.7% more likely to be promoted (Figure 19).

Figure 21: BAME PSS Staff by Grade

Between 2013 and 2017 overall there is an increase in the percentage of BAME PSS staff across all grades with the exception of Grades 8-9 which has seen a decrease of 1.4% (Figure 21).

Between 2013 and 2017 there has been an increase in BAME staff across all academic job levels with the exception of Professor which has seen a 1.1% decrease in that period. Researchers have seen the largest increase of 5.5%.
Between 2014 and 2017 the percentage of BAME leavers at the University has decreased by 1.0%. With the percentage of BAME academics leaving the University increasing by 0.4% and the percentage of PSS staff falling by 1.4%. However, the turnover rate for academic staff on permanent contracts has dropped by 0.7% between 2015 and 2017 (Figure 24) suggesting that the rise seen in BAME leavers is due to staff on fixed term contracts leaving the University. Similarly a drop in turnover rate for PSS staff on permanent contracts was seen between 2016 and 2017 (Figure 25).

The average turnover rate for the last three years for academics is 4.7% and for PSS staff is 6.9%.
Figure 24: Turnover rates for ethnic groups of Academic staff on permanent contracts per year

Academics Turnover rate-3 years average: 4.7%  
White: 4.4% (95)  
BAME: 5.6% (17)

White: 4.5% (100)  
BAME: 4.6% (15)

White: 4.9% (110)  
BAME: 4.9% (17)

2015 2016 2017

Figure 25: Turnover rates for ethnic groups of PSS staff on permanent contracts per year

PSS Turnover rate-3 years average: 6.9%  
White: 5.6% (231)  
BAME: 6.4% (314)

White: 7.5% (314)  
BAME: 8.8% (45)

White: 7.3% (307)  
BAME: 6.8% (35)

2015 2016 2017
There are similar proportions of male and female staff working at the University (Figure 26). However, when analysed in terms of their functions at University, there are 15.2% more male academic staff compared with female. This trend is reversed within PSS, where there are 12% more female staff than male.

Of all BAME staff at the University only 46.2% are female compared with 50.7% of White staff being female (Figure 27).
Figure 28: Female Staff by Role Type

Figure 29: Female Academic Staff Levels

Please note: y axis does not start at 0
The percentage of female staff at the University increased by 0.9% between 2013 and 2017 (Figure 28). In that period there has been a 1.3% increase in female academics and a 0.2% increase in female PSS staff.

The percentage of females in all academic roles has increased with the exception of lecturers where the percentage of females had dropped by 1.6% (Figure 29).

The percentage of female PSS staff at Grades 5-6 and Grade 7 has increased year on year between 2013 and 2017, with Grades 5-6 experiencing a 2.6% increase and Grade 7 experiencing a 3.7% increase in that period. Between 2013 and 2017 the percentage of female staff in Grades 1-4 has decreased by 2.2% and in Grades 8-9 by 2.9% (Figure 30).

![Figure 30: Female PSS Staff Grade](image)

Please note: y axis does not start at 0
In all promotions, a higher percentage of males that were eligible applied for all roles compared to females that were eligible. A higher percentage of males were successful for the roles of Chair and Reader (Figure 31 & 32), whereas a higher percentage of females were successful for the role of Senior Lecturer/Senior Research Fellow (Figure 33).
Figure 34: Female Leavers

- PSS
- Academic
- Overall

2014: 57.4%
2015: 55.7%
2016: 54.0%
2017: 57.9%

2014: 44.6%
2015: 46.3%
2016: 40.8%
2017: 46.9%
Recruitment

Table 1: Recruitment stages of core academic positions (Professorships, senior lectureships and lectureships) split by gender and ethnicity, 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>All Applications</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Shortlisted</th>
<th>%-All</th>
<th>As % of applications</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>%-All</th>
<th>As % of shortlisted</th>
<th>As % of applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3019</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5187</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender: Only 39.4% of applications for core academic positions were sent by Females in the period studied. However, Females seem to be more successful during the shortlisting as well as interview stages which results in nearly equal proportion of Males and Females among successful candidates-48.2% and 48.8% respectively.

Ethnicity: Only 35.56% of applications for core academic positions were sent by BAME Candidates. In addition, BAME candidates are underrepresented among shortlisted (25.5% of shortlisted candidates were BAME) as well as successful candidates (18.2% of successful candidates were BAME).

Table 2: Recruitment stages of Researchers and other academics (Senior Research Fellows, Research Fellows, Researchers and others) split by gender and ethnicity, 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>All Applications</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Shortlisted</th>
<th>%-All</th>
<th>As % of applications</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>%-All</th>
<th>As % of shortlisted</th>
<th>As % of applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>12982</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5187</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender: Only 39.4% of applications for core academic positions were sent by Females in the period studied. However, Females seem to be more successful during the shortlisting as well as interview stages which results in nearly equal proportion of Males and Females among successful candidates-48.2% and 48.8% respectively.

Ethnicity: Only 35.56% of applications for core academic positions were sent by BAME Candidates. In addition, BAME candidates are underrepresented among shortlisted (25.5% of shortlisted candidates were BAME) as well as successful candidates (18.2% of successful candidates were BAME).
Gender: 41.8% of applications for research academic positions were sent by Females in the period studied. The proportion of Females increases among shortlisted candidates to 42.3% but then it decreases again to 39.2% among successful candidates.

Ethnicity: 47.2%, of applications for research academic positions were sent by BAME candidates. The proportion of BAME candidates decreased to 33.8% among shortlisted and again to 30.3% among successful candidates. It seems that shortlisting provides particular challenge for BAME candidates- only 9.6% of BAME applications were successful in comparison to 16.9% of White candidates’ applications.

Table 3: Recruitment stages of Professional Support Services split by gender and ethnicity, 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>All Applications</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Shortlisted</th>
<th>%-All</th>
<th>As % of applications</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>%-All</th>
<th>As % of shortlisted</th>
<th>As % of applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11819</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8845</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21655</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3395</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>All Applications</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Shortlisted</th>
<th>%-All</th>
<th>As % of applications</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>%-All</th>
<th>As % of shortlisted</th>
<th>As % of applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15201</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>2604</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME</td>
<td>5385</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21655</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3395</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender: 54.6% of applications for PSS (both Faculty-based and central) positions were sent by Females in the period studied. The proportion of Females increases among shortlisted candidates to 57.2% but then it decreases again to 53.7% among successful candidates.

Ethnicity: 24.9% of applications for PSS (both Faculty-based and central) were sent by BAME candidates. The proportion of BAME candidates decreases to 15.8% among shortlisted and again to 13.4% among successful candidates. It seems that shortlisting provides particular challenge for BAME candidates- only 10.0% of BAME applications were successful in comparison to 17.1% of White candidates’ applications.
53.1% of staff at the University disclosed their sexual orientation, of these 83.9% are heterosexual (Figure 35).

There is much work to do to improve the response rate; however different campaigns have helped improve the data. Some notable ones:

- The Faculty of Science and Engineering ran a campaign ‘Don’t be an unknown’.
- The month of August is dedicated to data collection on the Diversity Calendar.
- The library have an ambitious target of 100% data completion by the end of 2018.
- A blog was produced explaining why data collection is so important and encouraged people to complete their own data. [https://uomequalityanddiversity.wordpress.com/2017/08/03/data-collection/](https://uomequalityanddiversity.wordpress.com/2017/08/03/data-collection/)
- There is a permanent place on HR pages about data collection and MyView. [http://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/human-resources/current-staff/pay-conditions/online-payslip/](http://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/human-resources/current-staff/pay-conditions/online-payslip/)
### Table 4: Gender Identity (see footnote below)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were originally assigned at birth?</th>
<th>Academic Staff</th>
<th>Professional Support Services Staff</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) This data is pulled from our HR system and based on the information that people submit either as a new starter or through the self-service system MyView.

Whilst we have a very high completion of this field, the low numbers from such a high volume of staff (12,000) do give a 0% return on the gender identity field.

We know however that those who answered no to question about gender identity is higher than 0% simply because the recent staff survey indicated that numbers were less than 0.1%
Student Equality Information

Key Findings

Undergraduate

Age: In 2017/18 9.1% of all undergraduate students were considered ‘mature’. This is a 0.5% decrease since 2016/17 and a 3.8% decrease in the past five years (see Figure 2).

Disability: 9.0% of all undergraduate students have a disability (see Figure 3) of which 60.3% are female (see Figure 5) and 20.2% are BAME (see Figure 6).

Ethnicity: The percentage of UK domicile BAME students at the University has increased by 2.3% in the past year to 30.2% in 2017/18 (see Figure 8).

Domicile: In 2017/18 the percentage of UK domicile students dropped by 2.6% to 67.6% which is the first time this figure has fallen below 70%. There has been a 2.2% rise in overseas students and a 0.5% rise in EU domicile students between 2016/17 and 2017/18 (see Figure 10).

Gender: In 2017/18 the percentage of female undergraduate students dropped for the first time in five years by 1.1% to 53.4% (see Figure 11). There are 1.1% more BAME females compared with white female students at the University (see Figure 12).

Attainment

Ethnicity: Good degree attainment has increased to 89.2% for White students and 76.3% for BAME students in 2016/17. Since 2009 White students have consistently outperformed Non-white students and in 2016/17 the attainment gap of students obtaining good degrees (2.1 or above) has increased to 12.9% (see Figure 15).

Gender: In 2016/17 84.9% of female students obtained good degrees compared with 79.6 % of males. The attainment gap between male and female students decreased between 2009/10 and 2012/13. However, it has increased to 5.2% in 2016/17 (see Figure 18).

Disability: Students with no known disability consistently outperform students with a disability. The attainment gap has decreased in 2016/17 to 1.5% (see Figure 20).

Domicile: In 2016/17 86.1% of UK, 80.2% of EU and 70.8% of International domicile students obtained good degrees. The attainment gap between International and UK students has decreased to 15.3% in 2016/17 (see Figure 22).
Retention

Ethnicity: In 2014/15 White students retention was 94.5% compared with 93.7% of BAME students. White students have higher retention than BAME students between 2009/10 and 2014/15 with the exception of 2012/13. The retention gap between White and BAME students has remained at 0.8% in 2014/15 (see Figure 24).

Gender: In 2014/15 female student retention was 94.9% compared with 93.6% for male students. This increased the retention gap to 1.3% (see Figure 26).

Disability: Students with no known disability have consistently had better retention than those without a disability. Disabled student retention increased to 94.1% in 2014/15 reducing the retention gap between disabled and non-disabled students to 0.2% (see Figure 25).

Postgraduate

Domicile: In 2017/18 51.7% of postgraduate students come from overseas (Non-EU). The proportion of postgraduate students domiciled in the UK has increased to 42.3% in 2017/18 and the proportion of EU domiciled students has decreased to 6.0% (see Figure 28).

Ethnicity: In 2017/18 the proportion of BAME students on postgraduate taught courses increased to 22.9%. The percentage of students on postgraduate research courses dropped to 14.7% in 2017/18 and the percentage of postgraduate taught students increased to 22.9% (see Figure 29).

Gender: The proportion of female postgraduate students increased to 58.9% in 2017/18. The percentage of female postgraduate taught students rose to 61.1% and female postgraduate research students to 46.7% (see Figure 33).
The most common age to start an undergraduate course at the University is 18, with 50.0% of all undergraduates starting in 2017/18 of that age (Figure 1).

Undergraduate students can be divided into two categories; young and mature. Young students are those aged under 21 on the start date of the term in which their course commences. Mature students are 21 or over by this date.

Over the past five years there has been a 3.8% decrease in mature students, with a 0.5% decrease in the past year (Figure 2).
Disability

9.0% of all undergraduate students have a disability (Figure 3). This is an increase of 0.7% since 2016/17 (Figure 4). Of those that have a disability 60.3% are female (Figure 5) and 20.2% are BAME (Figure 6).

Please note: y axis does not start at 0
Figure 5: Disability by Gender Undergraduate Students 2017/18

- No known disability: 52.7% Female, 47.3% Male
- Known disability: 60.3% Female, 39.7% Male

Figure 6: Disability by Ethnicity for UK Undergraduate Students 2017/18

- No known disability: 68.2% White, 31.6% BAME (0.2% Not Known)
- Known disability: 79.3% White, 20.2% BAME (0.5% Not Known)
30.2% of UK domicile undergraduate students at the University are Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) students. This is an increase of 2.3% since 2016/17 and an increase of 7.2% in the last five years (Figure 8).

The largest represented BAME group is Asian representing 18.9% of the undergraduate student population. 4.3% of UK domicile students are Black making it the least represented ethnic group (Figure 7).
For both genders the proportions of each ethnicity are reasonably similar. 70.2% of male students are White compared with 69.2% of female students being White (Figure 9).
In 2017/18 the percentage of UK domicile students dropped by 2.6% to 67.6%, the lowest it has been within the period considered. There has been a steady increase in EU students between 2013/14 and 2017/18 with a 0.5% rise in the last year. There has been a 2.2% rise in overseas students between 2016/17 and 2017/18 (Figure 10).
Gender

Figure 11: Undergraduate Student by Gender

The undergraduate student population consists of 53.4% female and 46.6% male students in 2017/18. There has been a decrease of 1.1% since 2016/17. In the last five years there have consistently been more undergraduate female students than male students. 2017/18 is the first year there has been a drop in female undergraduate students at the University (Figure 11).

Figure 12: Gender by Ethnicity for UK Domicile Students 2017/18

A slightly higher percentage of BAME students are female compared with the percentage of White students that are female. UK domicile Black students contain the largest proportion of females (Figure 12).
The response rate for religion of UK domicile full-time students was 99.9%. Of those that responded 48.1% have no religion and 6.5% refused to give any religious information. Christian and Muslim are the highest represented religions with 23.7% and 13.6% respectively (Figure 13).

Figure 13: Religion of UK Full-time Undergraduate Students 2017
The response rate for sexual orientation of UK domicile full-time students was 99.8%. Of those that responded 83.8% are heterosexual and 8.5% of students refused to disclose their sexual orientation (Figure 14).

Table 1: Gender Identity of UK Full-time Undergraduate Students 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is your Gender the same as assigned at birth?</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Refused</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good degree attainment has increased to 89.2% for White students and 76.3% for BAME students in 2016/17 which has caused an increase in the attainment gap to 12.9% (Figure 15).
White students have consistently achieved a higher percentage of good degrees compared with other UK ethnic groups. In 2016/17 there has been a 10.5% increase in the number of Black students obtaining good degrees compared with the previous year. Asian students continue to obtain the highest proportion of good degrees out of BAME students with a 1.5% increase in good degree achievement between 2016/17 and 2017/18 (Figure 16).

Note that data should be treated with caution as fluctuations can be explained by the small counts for Black (118), Asian (527) and Other (225) compared with White students (3355). Numbers displayed in parentheses are for 2016/17.
In 2016/17 34.9% of White students achieved a first class degree. White students are more likely to achieve first class degrees than other ethnic groups; with Black students the least likely group to achieve first class degrees. There has been a 15.6% increase in first class degrees attained by White students between 2009/10 and 2016/17 compared with 17.3% for Other students, 11.2% for Asian students and 12.7% for Black students (Figure 17).

Note that data should be treated with caution as fluctuations are due to small data counts for Black (29), Asian (144) and Other (86) compared with White students (1312). Numbers displayed in parentheses are for 2016/17.
Consistently a higher percentage of female students attain good degrees compared with males. The attainment gap seemed to decrease between 2009/10 and 2012/13, however it has increased to 5.2% in 2016/17 (Figure 18).

2016/17 was the first year to see a decrease in good degree attainment for male students, with a drop of 0.4% since 2015/16.
In 2016/17 1.8% more male students received first class degrees compared with female students. Each year since 2012/13 a higher percentage of male students have achieved a first class degree compared with female students. The proportion of female students attaining a first class degree has increased steadily between 2009/10 and 2016/17 (Figure 19).

Note that fluctuations in the data may be due to small counts.
Students with no known disability consistently outperform those with a disability. The attainment gap has decreased in 2016/17 to 1.5% (Figure 20).

Note that fluctuations in Figure 20 may be due to small data counts and so trends should be treated with caution.
The first class degree attainment gap between disabled students and students with no known disability has decreased in 2016/17 to 4.9% (Figure 21).

Note that fluctuations in Figure 21 may be due to small data counts and so trends should be treated with caution.
Consistently a higher proportion of both UK and EU domicile students attain good degrees compared with the international domicile students (Figure 22).

Good degree attainment of International students has increased rapidly between 2014/15 and 2016/17 with an increase of 11% across those three years. This has decreased the attainment gap between International and UK students to 15.3% in 2016/17. Good degree attainment of EU students has decreased by 1.6% in 2016/17 which is the first year a drop has been seen since 2010/11.
Good degree attainment of female students is highest for White students with Black female students receiving the lowest number of good degrees in each year (Figure 23).
In 2014/15 93.7% of the 7,215 BAME students and 94.5% of the 25,368 white students continued their studies giving a retention gap of 0.8%. The retention of White students was higher than BAME students across all years excluding 2012/13 (Figure 24).
In 2014/15 the retention gap between students with and without a disability decreased to 0.2%, the smallest difference seen in the period considered (Figure 25).

Figure 26: Retention by Gender

Please note: y axis does not start at 0
In 2014/15 female student retention is 1.3% higher than male retention in 2014/15. The retention of female students has consistently been higher than male students from 2010/11 onwards (Figure 26).

Figure 27: Retention of Female UK White and BAME Students

BAME female students have better retention than white female students between 2012/13 and 2014/15. In 2014/15 there was 0.8% higher retention for BAME female students in 2014/15 compared with White female students (Figure 27).
Postgraduate

Students completing postgraduate study can be divided into those on postgraduate taught courses and those on postgraduate research courses. Postgraduate research can be further broken down into doctoral training and masters degrees.

Postgraduate research masters degrees include MSc by Research, Master of Enterprise (MEnt) and Master of Philosophy.

Doctoral Training results in different degree types. These can include Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Doctor of Medicine (MD), Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD), Education (EdD), Educational Psychology (DEdPsy), Educational and Child Psychology (DEdChPsychol), Engineering (EngD), Enterprise (EntD), Counselling Psychology (DCounsPsych), Doctor of Business Administration (DBA), Doctor of Professional Studies (DProf) and Doctor of Clinical Science (DClinSci).

In 2017/18 93.0% of postgraduate research students are completing doctoral training and 7.0% are completing research masters.

In 2017/18 51.7% of postgraduate students come from outside of the EU. The proportion of postgraduate students domiciled in the UK has increased 0.2% to 42.3% in 2017/18 and the proportion of EU domiciled students has decreased by 0.2% to 6.0% (Figure 28).
In 2017/18 the proportion of BAME students on postgraduate taught courses increased to 22.9%. The percentage of students on postgraduate research courses has decreased year on year since 2014/15 and dropped to 14.7% in 2017/18 (Figure 29).

Postgraduate taught courses have a much higher percentage of BAME students compared with postgraduate research courses across the period considered and increased to 22.9% in 2017/18.

Figure 30: Postgraduate Students by Ethnicity 2017/18
In 2017/18 85.3% of postgraduate research students are White (Figure 32) compared with only 77.1% of postgraduate taught students (Figure 31). Asian students are the next largest ethnic group for postgraduate study with 9.3% of postgraduate research students and 14.1% of postgraduate taught programs being Asian.
The proportion of female postgraduates increased in 2017/18 to 58.9%. This was driven by a 0.9% rise in female students doing postgraduate taught programs and a 2.2% rise in female students on research programs (Figure 33).

58.1% of white and BAME postgraduate students were female. However Other (including mixed) students have slightly more female students at 60.9%, whereas 55.6% of Black postgraduate students are female (Figure 34).