THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

Submission for Athena SWAN Bronze Award

Annex B(iii). Commentary on Statistics

I.   Baseline staff gender data, July 2006: University and SET Faculties (*Figs 1 – 4*)

1a.   *Fig. 1* shows 3976 academic and research staff in the University in 2006—38% women and 62% men.

1b.   50% were on fixed-term contracts, with sharply different percentages for men and women: 44% and 61% respectively, a difference of 17 percentage points.

2a.   In the three SET Faculties, the equivalent figures were 2877 staff—38% women and 62% men (*Figs 2 – 4*), so the split between men and women was the same in SET as for the University overall.

2b.   59% of SET staff were on fixed-term contracts. It is not surprising that this percentage is higher than for the University because more research staff are employed for each permanent SET academic than in the Humanities. 52% of male and 70% of female SET staff were on fixed-term contracts, a difference of 18 percentage points, which is very similar to the 17 points for the University.

3a.   *Figs 2 – 4* show that the proportions of women in the three SET Faculties differed greatly, with 17% in EPS, 41% in LS and 55% in MHS.

3b.   The proportions of staff on fixed-term contracts varied by Faculty from 52% to 69%. These different proportions largely reflect success in winning research contracts. What is important in data analysis, however, is the difference between men and women. In EPS and MHS the difference was 15 and 16 percentage points respectively, whereas in LS it was 25 points (84% of women and 59% of men).

II.   Staff gender data, July 2007: University and SET Faculties (*Figs 1 – 4*)

4a.   In 2007, the University had 4289 academic and research staff, 38% women 62% men. So, with a net increase of 313 staff, the proportions of men and women remained the same.

4b.   49% of staff were on fixed-term contracts: 44% of men (as in 2006) and 56% of women, a narrowing of the gap by 5 percentage points.

5a.   In the SET Faculties there were 3156 academic and research staff: 37% women and 63% men.

5b.   56% of SET staff were on fixed-term contracts: 65% of the women and 51% of the men, giving a difference of 14 percentage points—a 4-point improvement on the previous year.

6a.   The proportions of women in the three Faculties were: EPS 19%, LS 39% and MHS 55%.

6b.   In LS, the difference between the proportions of men and women on fixed-term contracts (83% and 63%) improved by reducing by 5 percentage points.

III.   Staff gender data, July 2007: role distributions in SET Faculties (*Figs 5 – 7*)

*Figs 5 – 7 show the percentages of male and female staff in five roles in the three Faculties. The denominator in each percentage is the number of male or female academic and research staff in that Faculty (**not** the number of staff in that role). This methodology facilitates a comparison of progress across career transition points, regardless of absolute numbers.*

7.   Although in all three Faculties, the percentage of men and women in contract research posts was markedly different, the percentage in lectureships was quite close, even though the absolute numbers were very different. But the percentages then diverged through the higher grades, with the percentage of women who were professors being: EPS 3%, LS 3% and MHS 5%, compared with men: EPS 18%, LS 12% and MHS 20%.

IV.   Staff gender data, July 2007: University and SET Schools (*Fig. 8*)

8.   The percentage of women ranged from 11% in MACE to 75% in Nursing, and in Psychological Sciences. The nine EPS Schools have lower figures than the University average of 38%, with the single-school Faculty of Life Sciences having 40%, and the five Schools in MHS ranging from 40% to 75%. The extent of the spread highlights the value of presenting the data by School as well as Faculty.

V.   Student gender data, July 2007: University and SET Schools (*Figs. 9 - 11*)

9.   Across the University, 56% of ug students and 45% of pgr students were female. In the SET Schools the ug percentage was the same and the pgr percentage was 41%.

10.   Despite the normal downward trend between ug and pgr, nearly half the SET Schools had higher proportions of female students at pgr than at ug levels: MACE, EEE, Physics, Computer Science, CEAS, EAES, and Nursing. Notably, this includes the three Engineering Schools.

11.   There was a steep reduction between ug and pgr in Materials (80% to 36%) and Maths (44% to 29%).

12.   The ratio of female SET pgr students to female academic and research staff was 1:0.84. Schools with markedly lower ratios were Maths (0.48), and CEAS (0.54). Ratios were higher in Medicine (0.93), Computer Science (0.95) and Psychological Sciences (1.06).