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## An Introduction from the Vice-Chancellor

I am pleased to introduce the 2018-19 Diversity and Inclusion (D\&I) Report for the University of Reading, prepared by colleagues across Human Resources and Student Services, with the support of our Dean for Diversity and Inclusion and our Planning and Support Office.

This report summarises D\&I-related actions and activities over the last year and priorities for the current academic year 2019-20. It also reports on progress against the D\&I priorities that our University Executive Board adopted in 2015.

Much of the work that we do on D\&I is about raising awareness and embedding D\&। work across the institution. The report notes much progress in establishing D\&I leadership and D\&I teams across our academic Schools and an increasing number of our professional Functions. I am delighted that the School of Agriculture, Policy and Development (SAPD) received a Bronze Athena SWAN Award, and the School of Chemistry, Food \& Pharmacy (SCFP) rose from Bronze to Silver, in recognition of their work on gender equality.

Over the last year, a Race Equality Action team (RE-ACT) has been in place to lead work on the University's Race Equality Charter (REC) Action Plan. The key focus has been to conduct research to identify inequalities in provision across the student journey with a focus on access to education, continuation, attainment and progression. We have set ambitious targets to address the diversity differentials in 5 years and an Access and Participation Plan has been agreed with the Office for Students (OfS) with a target to narrow the attainment gap between our Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) and White undergraduate students to $5 \%$ by 2025/26.

We have focused on community engagement and developed partnerships with local employers such as Oracle, Thames Water and Berkshire NHS Trust to set up the Thames Valley Race Equity and Cultural Harmony (REACH) Network. The network brings together over 30 companies from the Thames Valley region that have committed to working together to attract, progress and retain diverse BAME talent at every level across their businesses, by ensuring that workplace cultures are inclusive for people from diverse backgrounds.
We are starting to see progress against a number of the other targets we adopted in 2015. In no small part, this is related to the substantial work that we have undertaken on revising procedures and criteria for academic promotion, and I am encouraged by the fact that the percentage of female professors at the University has increased from 30\% in 2015 to 35.08\% at the end of 2018-19 (compared to a national figure of 25.5\%). We have also increased our ranking to 80 in the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index 2019 across all employers.
Evidently, there is no room for complacency and important D\&I-related work continues to be undertaken across the University, illustrated by these three examples:

- a review of Grade 9 pay and grading structures has been completed. We will continue to monitor the impact of this review on the gender pay gap in the longer term.
- a project identifying further actions to address undergraduate attainment gaps, involving the University and RUSU;
- the \#NeverOK campaign that has been launched jointly by RUSU and the University to highlight our values of respect, tolerance and inclusivity for all.

I hope you will find the following report of interest. The report provides an account of where we are in progress against our targets and demonstrates the substantial effort by colleagues and students across the University of Reading, to create an environment where all staff and students, whatever their background, feel included and enabled to be themselves and achieve their best.


Professor Robert Van de Noort Vice-Chancellor

## Section 1 -Overview

At the University of Reading, we have a proud history of diversity and inclusion. Reading was the first English university to appoint a female professor (Edith Morley, 1908) and one of our former Vice-Chancellors (Lord Wolfenden) played a key role in decriminalising homosexuality in England and Wales.

We recognise that embracing diversity and inclusion is critical to the success of the University. We believe that we can only achieve our vision of being a world-class, forward-looking, confident and ambitious university by recruiting, supporting and developing staff from the widest variety of backgrounds.

We want to be the place where everyone can fulfil their full potential. We believe that supporting diversity and inclusion leads to an ability to attract and retain high-quality staff and students, as well as higher achievements in students from a broader range of backgrounds. This is evident in our ongoing projects, which a) aim to reduce differential attainment outcomes and b) improve student experience. When this is coupled with the simple moral argument that no one should experience inequality as a result of who they are, the case for supporting and promoting diversity and inclusion becomes imperative.

We know that real change does not happen overnight. It requires cultural and operational change and takes all of us working together. A lot of this is about making small changes that deliver a big impact. For staff, the University has continued its commitment to support flexible working, job sharing and parental leave, and a transparent and inclusive recognition and reward process. For students, 2018/19 saw the introduction of the Student Welfare team as well as the Academic Tutor System - a proactive partnership approach to connecting with our students at a personal level.

The aim of our Annual Diversity and Inclusion Report is:

- to monitor progress against the diversity and inclusion targets, for both staff and students, that the University adopted in 2015-16 (see sections 1.1-1.2);
- to provide a summary of our main diversity and inclusion-related actions over the last year;
- to take stock, through an update of diversity and inclusion-related data, of where we are as a university (in many cases making comparison with the national sector); and
- to outline our priorities and priority actions for the 2019-20 academic year.


## Governance arrangements for Diversity and Inclusion

The University has robust leadership and governance arrangements for diversity and inclusion that are outlined in the figure below:


At the operational level, the Athena SWAN Implementation Team, the Race Equality Action Team (RE-ACT) Team and the LGBT+ Action Plan Group are responsible for developing and delivering action plans in the 3 diversity and inclusion thematic areas (gender, race and sexual orientation) that were agreed as an institutional priority for staff by the University Executive Board (UEB) in 2015. Each group is chaired by the Dean for Diversity and Inclusion. These groups comprise staff and student membership and work across staff and student D\&I priorities. Additionally, Student Services oversee much action in relation to our D\&I priorities for students.
Progress is reported by the Dean for Diversity and Inclusion and the Director of Student Services to the Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Board (DIAB) which meets bi-annually, chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor. DIAB membership is from across the University, including representatives of the relevant staff networks and RUSU.
The DIAB challenges the Dean, the Director of Student Services and the action plan groups, on progress. However, the University of Reading takes the approach that responsibility for ensuring a diverse and inclusive organisation must be embedded into the day-to-day business of the University. Therefore, we have appointed Diversity and Inclusion Champions in all 15 academic schools, and, to date, in four of the Functions. These members of staff are typically given time to carry out a range of activities that are relevant and appropriate for their area. Many Schools also have theirown Diversity and Inclusion-related committees to agree local diversity and inclusion actions and monitor progress.

### 1.1 Progress on 2020 targets for staff

The University's Executive Board has committed to equality targets for staff which are detailed below along with the progress made.

## Gender

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Target (baseline as at February } \\ & \text { 2016) } \end{aligned}$ | Progress (except where otherwise indicated the position indicated is as at 31 August 2018) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Have at least 30\% of either gender in all key University Committees and Boards, including the University Executive Board(UEB). | The committees and Boards that meet this target include the following: <br> - Council - Female 38.5\% and Male 61.5\% <br> - Senate - Female 47.7\% and Male 50.8\% <br> - University Board for Teaching and Learning Female 60\% and Male 40\% <br> - University Board for Research and InnovationFemale 39.1\% and Male 60.98\% <br> - University Executive Board-Female 25 \% and Male 75\% <br> - Strategy and Finance Committee of Council Female 16.7\% and Male 83.3 \%. <br> For further detail and timelines see section 6.1, Table 19. |
| 2 | Maintainthe 2015/16 baseline of at least $45 \%$ of either gender in the overall University Leadership Group-including UEB, Deans, Heads of School and Heads of Function. | - At 31 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ August 2019, the Leadership Group has 31 male and 22 female members. It is currently $42 \%$ Female and 58\% Male. <br> - The percentage of female members of the Leadership Group has remained the same as it was last year. <br> - However, there has been a 3\% decrease in female membership of the Leadership Group from the 2015/16 baseline of $45 \%$ and from the 2016/17 baseline of $50 \%$ female. |
| 3 | Have a gender-balanced professoriate, with at least $40 \%$ of professors of either gender. <br> The baseline is $30 \%$ female. | - Currently 35.08\% of professorial staff are female <br> - The proportion offemale professors has increased by $0.5 \%$ compared to 2017/18. <br> - As the University continues to work towards its target of $40 \%$ professors of either gender, we have higher percentage of female professors in post compared to the national average is $25.5 \%$. |


|  |  | Source - UCEA Higher Education Workforce Report 2019, based on data from the 2017-18 HESA Staff Record. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | Reduce the gender pay gap that exists at senior (professorial and Grade 9) levels. <br> The baseline is $11 \%$ (there are no significant pay gaps at other levels as at Feb 2016). | As of $1^{\text {st }}$ January 2019: <br> - The gender pay gap for the professoriate was: 9.26\% <br> - The gender pay gap for Grade 9 staff was $11.18 \%$ <br> - The gender pay gap for Professors and Grade 9 Professional \& ManagerialStaffcombined is 9.28\%. This is an increase of $1.41 \%$ on the corresponding 2017/18 figure of $7.87 \%$. |
| 5 | Achieve University-wide AthenaSWAN GenderCharter Mark Silver level recognition, with all STEM Schools holding awards and all other Schools working towards Gender Equality Charter Mark recognition. | - The University has focused on delivering the institutional action plan for our Bronze Athena SWAN award. <br> - We also set up an Athena SWAN Self -Assessment team that led work on the University's institutional Athena SWAN Silver Award. This was submitted to Advance HE in November 2019. <br> - Four of our Schools hold an Athena SWAN Silver award - the School of Mathematical, Physical \& Computational Sciences (SMPCS), the School of the Built Environment (SBE formerly SCME), School of Archaeology, Geography and Environmental Sciences (SAGES) and the School of Chemistry Food and Pharmacy (SCFP). <br> - Three of our Schools hold an Athena SWAN Bronze award - the School of Psychology and Clinical Language Sciences (SPCLS), the School of Biological Science (SBS), and the School of Agriculture Policy and Development (SAPD). <br> - Three non -STEM Schools have signed up to the Athena SWAN Charter and are preparing submissions for an award. These include Henley Business School (HBS), School of Politics, Economics and International Relations (SPEIR) and School of Humanities. |

Race
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}\hline & \begin{array}{l}\text { Target (baseline as at } \\ \text { February 2016) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Progress (except where otherwise indicated the } \\ \text { position indicated is as at 31 August 2018) }\end{array} \\ \hline 1 & \begin{array}{l}\text { All key University committees } \\ \text { to match academic staff BAME } \\ \text { representation by2020. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}15.31 \% . \\ \text { No committees currently match this in terms of }\end{array} \\ \text { representation (ranges from 0\% to 12.5\%). } \\ \text { See section 6.1, Table 20 for more detail. }\end{array} \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll}\text { Council and its sub- } \\ \text { committees to set targets for } \\ \text { BAMErepresentationontheir } \\ \text { committees consistent with } \\ \text { national census baseline for } \\ \text { BAME. }\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { Council has been continuing to work to diversify its } \\ \text { membership. In particular in 2018-19 its Appointments } \\ \text { and Governance Committee has: i) introduced a new } \\ \text { policy for recruitment of Lay Members of Council (the } \\ \text { members that are not staff or students of the } \\ \text { University) with a diversity and inclusion emphasis; ii) } \\ \text { introduced a new skills matrix to take stock of skill gaps } \\ \text { of Lay Members on Council, which has identified a need } \\ \text { for more experience of "implementation of Diversity } \\ \text { and Inclusion Initiatives"; iii) advertised for new Lay } \\ \text { Members of Council, seeking experience of "successful } \\ \text { implementation of D\& initiatives" and "a diverse } \\ \text { Council membership, representative of the diversity of } \\ \text { our staff and student body". }\end{array}\right.\right\}$

The University to attain Bronze Race Equality Charter Mark (REC) before 2018 and be working towards silver by 2021.

In 2017/18, as a part of the work on our submission for the Race Equality Charter Bronze award, a detailed audit of the University's race equality practices was completed, and an action plan was developed and agreed by the University's Executive Board.

Some of the actions that we are taking to address race equality issues were acknowledged as good practice by Advance HE, but unfortunately, on this occasion we were not awarded the Bronze Charter Mark.

As a part of our on-going work to make the University more race inclusive, in 2018/19, we formally launched the three-year Race Equality Action Plan.

A Race Equality Action Group (RE-ACT), with membership from across the organisation was set up to take forward work on prioritising actions and coordinating delivery.

## Sexual orientation

|  | Target (baseline as at <br> February 2016) | Progress (except where otherwise indicated the <br> position indicated is as at 31 August 2017) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | More than 70\% of UK-based <br> staff to have declared their <br> sexual orientation through <br> Employee Self-Service by <br> 2018 and 95\% by 2020. <br> In 2013-14, the figure was <br> $32 \%$. | Declaration rates stand at 52.87\% which is a decrease of <br> $3.9 \%$ from 56.83\% in 2017/18. |
| 2 | For further details please see section 6.1, Table 21. |  |
| To improve the position on <br> the Stonewall Workplace <br> Equality Index, aspiring to be <br> in the top 50 by 2020. <br> Feb 2016 position was 204. | In 2018/19 we achieved our highest ever ranking of 80 in <br> the Stonewall WEl 2019 and became a Stonewall Top <br> 100 Employer. <br> This is significant progress compared to our ranking of <br> 138 in the Stonewall WEI 2018. |  |

### 1.2 Progress on 2020 targets for students

The table below is a summary of progress updates against each objective to provide focus on areas that need to be progressed.

Progress against D\&I targets for Student Equality ('NA' indicates 'Not Available' at the time of publication)

| 2020 Student Equality target (\%) |  | Target (\%) by 2020 | Actual (\%) 2018/19 | Actual (\%) 2017/18 | Actual <br> (\%) $2016 / 17$ | Actual <br> (\%) 2015/16 | Actual <br> (\%) $2014 / 15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{U} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | Reduction of the attainment gap (proportion of 1st/2.1) between BAME and White undergraduate students. | 12 | 16.1 | 10.8 | 16.68 | 12.63 | 16.5 |
|  | Reduction of the postgraduate BAME student failure rate. | 4 | 7.44 | 7.22 | 8 | 6 | 6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\vdots}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{U}{0} \end{aligned}$ | A minimum gender balance of 30:70 across 75\% of our subject areas. | 75 | 71 | 66 | 63 | 68 | 61 |
|  | Reduction in the attainment gap (proportion of 1st/2.1) between female and male undergraduate students. | 6 | 9.73 | 7.96 | 8.49 | 6.08 | 10.5 |
|  | Reduction of the gap between the proportion of undergraduate men and women in full-time employment six months after graduation who are in professional/managerial employment. | 7 | NA | NA | 2.7 | 4.9 | 10.2 |
|  | Maintain an attainment gap of <3 percentage points between proportion of disabled and non-disabled undergraduates who achieve 1st class degrees. | <3 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 6.93 | 0.97 | 2.66 |
|  | Reduction of the gap between the proportion of disabled and non-disabled students assumed to be unemployedsix months after graduate. | 0 | NA | NA | 1.17 | 2.76 | 2.9 |

### 1.3 Overview of Key Priorities for 2019/20

Reflecting on the progress against our targets reported in sections 1.1 and 1.2 and following on from our actions undertaken in the last academic year, the following are our main priority areas for action, across all protected characteristics, in the academic year 2018-19.

Further detail about the actions that we propose to undertake, split up by protected characteristic, are given below in section 2 (for staff) and section 3 (for students).

Main priority actions 2019/20 in relation to our staff

- Complete work of University Athena SWAN Self-Assessment Team, resulting in submission to Advance HE for an Institutional-Level Silver Athena SWAN Award, this submission comprising: i) a self-assessment document taking stock of where we are on gender equality; ii) a gender equality action plan for January 2020 through to April 2024.
- Toform new Athena SWAN implementationgroup(ASIG) to drive actions and ensure that this continues to be representative of Schools/Functions.
- Make at least one successful School-level Athena SWAN submission from an Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Business or Law (AHSSBL) school.
- Supporting Functions to appoint D\&l leads, leading thinking on local D\&l actions, matching the leads established across Schools.
- Reduce Professorial and Grade 9 Professional and Support gender pay gaps.
- Continue to improve staff awareness of the University's Harassment \& Bullying policy and reporting arrangements, including the development and promotion of the \#NeverOK campaign.
- Ensure grades 1-5 and Black staff are represented on RE-ACT and the next SAT.
- Recruit a Chair for the Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) Staff Network and support the network togrow and contribute to delivering the University's race equity objectives.
- Drive on declaration rates using stories of actions resulting from new understanding of the staff population gained from this data.
- Train and support Junior Common Room (JCR) representatives, Society welfare representatives, Hall Warden Assistants, RUSU staff, bar staff and security staff to reinforce messages around zerotolerance to racism, including cultural appropriation.
- Bring staff involved with student support together to develop understanding and wide use across the University of the Stonewall Service Delivery Toolkit.
- Develop guidance for LGBT+ staff considering working overseas and their managers.
- Continue to raise awareness of LGBT+ experiences and history through events and training in and around LGBT+ History Month, Trans Day of Remembrance, the International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia, and Transphobia, and the University's annual Wolfenden Lecture.
- Continue our community partnership activities by reaching out and showing support to the local LGBT+ community, e.g. through University presence at Reading Pride, and through public events and engagement, e.g. our annual Wolfenden Seminar and Lecture, events led by staff and students in LGBT+ History Month.
- Work jointly with staff and students' networks and RUSU, to raise awareness of different gender identities, including through trans awareness training sessions, the promotion of "pronoun badges" and associated communications.
- In consultation with the Staff Disability Network and disabled staff more generally, develop and adopt formal University targets for disability on the staff side.


## Main priorities for action in relation to our students

Over the next year areas of focus will include:

- Identify and address any disproportionality in engagement with teaching, learning and student support services, and outcomes, between different student cohorts, specifically on ethnicity.
- Monitorthestudentuptakeofemployabilitysupportinitiatives byprotected characteristic.
- Assess impact of Student Dashboard on different student groups and consider further developments.
- Assess the impact of our new Academic Tutor system in promoting reflective practice for different student groups and on the realisation of desired outcomes, especially in Science and HBS areas.
- Evaluate the full implementation of Blackboard Ally.
- Enhance clarity and understanding amongst staff and prospective students of reasonable adjustments for disabilities, making it possible for prospective students to make informed choices and for them to access reasonable adjustments.
- Review of the end-to-end process for the allocation of halls accommodation to students with disabilities or medical conditions to ensure that the best possible allocations are made from the start.
- Development of an online registration process for students with disabilities and for students registering for the Counselling and Wellbeing Service. This allows students faster access to the support they need.
- Introduce institutional Evaluation \& Impact Framework to assist the D\&I team in identifying target areas/group for further intervention, focusing resources, and reviewing the progress of D\&l action plan.
- Ensure our teaching curriculum at every degree level is representative for all student groups.
- Continue the work to embed the inclusive T\&L policy and practice into curriculum design and development.
- Expand the CF reviews to taught postgraduate programmes following the UG programme reviews. All PGT programmes CF reviews commenced from September this year and run for 2 academic years.
- Continue to provide a range of bespoke development opportunities for students and staff in order to support curriculum review activities.
- Enhance student engagement, attainment and student progression whatever their background.
- Recruit more peer mentors, supporting students to break down the isolation, enrich their academic skills and develop their transferable skills.
- Increase the use of digital platforms as complementary support. The Career Smart is popular and will be re-launched, in addition to a programme level approach to employability.
- Conduct a UROP project to explore the experience of LGBT+ students at the University.
- Continue to provide training opportunities forstaff on how best to support our disabled students.
- Provide a series of training and workshops for all Academic Tutors in academic tutoring skills and use of the Student Progress Dashboard.
- Understand and address BAME attainment in more detail.
- Continue our SESTEM project to identify the challenges faced by BAME students who have studied STEM subjects and create interventions where necessary.
- Continue to invest in exceptional digital resources to support flexible student learning opportunities in line with our Inclusive T\&L strategy.
- Promote the professional and full use of the Student Progress Dashboard to proactively identify students who are struggling or disengaging with study.
- Lecture Capture will be installed to record live lectures and teaching sessions in a range of teaching spaces commencing in the latter half of 2019-20 and beyond.
- Complete the proof of concept work for 'student attendance management' system and deploy the learning in developing the policy and in the procurement process.
- Implement a student case management system in order to be able to store, retrieve and disseminate (as appropriate) case information about students to allow the team involved in welfare and wellbeing to provide better and more informed information, advice and guidance.


## Section 2

## Staff - 2018/19 achievements and key actions planned for 2019/20

### 2.1.1 Gender- Key achievements 2018/19

- We have continued work on making the workplace more gender inclusive by taking forward a range of activities that are included in our organisational level Athena SWAN action plan.
- Set up an Athena SWAN Self-Assessment Team, representative of the University that actively engaged with staff and students and prepared a submission for an institutional Athena SWAN Silver Award, an associated action plan for the University on gender equality for the next four years, including an embedded gender pay gap action plan.
- Supported the development and submission of four Department-level Athena SWAN submissions from four Schools/Departments across the University. All Science, Technology, Engineering, Math's and Medicine (STEMM) schools at the University of Reading now hold Athena SWAN awards, with the majority being at a Silver level. Following the April 2019 Athena SWAN awards round, the number of our schools holding Athena SWAN awards has risen from six to seven. While several schools retained Bronze and Silver awards, two schools saw significant improvements against previous years. The School of Agriculture, Policy and Development (SAPD) received a Bronze award in this round, and the School of Chemistry, Food \& Pharmacy (SCFP) rose from Bronze to Silver.
- Silver awards are now held by the School of Chemistry, Food \& Pharmacy (SCFP), School of the Built Environment (SBE), School of Mathematical, Physical and Computational Sciences (SMPCS), and the School of Archaeology, Geography and Environmental Science (SAGES). Bronze awards are currently held by School of Agriculture, Policy and Development (SAPD), School of Psychology and Clinical Language Sciences (SPCLS) and School of Biological Sciences (SBS).
- We continued supporting the implementation of our revised procedures for academic promotions, including running workshops for academics to encourage them to apply for academic promotion through the personal titles process and emphasising the new criteria for citizenship and leadership that explicitly values diversity and inclusion work and contributions.
- Revised and improved the University's policy, procedures, and support arrangements around harassment and bullying, and developed and launched the University's \#NeverOK campaign, including communicating arrangements for reporting and support around harassment and bullying.
- Launched and delivered the first pilot of RISE, the University's new personal and leadership development programme with a diversity and inclusion emphasis.
- Completed the development and launch of the University's new bespoke online diversity and inclusion training module.
- Made further progress in establishing diversity and inclusion leads in Schools and Functions and supported leads in setting up local governance arrangements to monitor and progress work on diversity and inclusion activities.
- Reviewed the role and broadened the remit and membership of the Diversity and Inclusion Champions Community of Practice (DICCOP). This group meets once every term to discuss specific issues and challenges and share good practice on diversity and inclusion activities. The group also provided advice and support on the institutional Athena SWAN submission.
- Made further improvements to the Athena SWAN dashboard to enable staff working on Charter Marksubmissions to access and analyse data more efficiently to identify trends and/or challenges and define appropriate actions to address these.
- Improved the collection and analysis of recruitment retention information on diversity through the use of the new applicant tracking system.
- The Women@Reading - Allies and Champions (W@R) network has developed and grown in 2018/19. From being a group that hosted lunchtime events, it has now started to focus on being involved in exploring deeper issues of gender equality in employment at the University of Reading and in creating support for specific groups.

The network has focused on promotion and attracting new members from all walks of University life by offering activities which have included skills development, personal stories from role models or information sharing and discussion on topical issues.

During the year, the network has grown to some 140 people and the majority are women. However, the W@R Steering Committee has agreed to change the name of the network to include Allies and Champions, recognising the really important role that men play in championing gender equality and being active in creating the environment and culture to make this happen.

In order to diversify the support that it offers, in 2019/20 the network will be introducing Menopause Cafés and work on setting up a support group for the victims of Domestic Abuse. Other actions that the network will focus on includes contributing to work that is underway to address the Gender Pay Gap and to drive the targets that the University has agreed to ensure gender equity at all levels of University employment.

## Gender - key actions planned for 2019/20

- Complete work of University Athena SWAN Self-Assessment Team, resulting in submission to Advance HE for an Institutional-Level Silver Athena SWAN Award, this submission comprising: i) a self-assessment document taking stock of where we are on gender equality; ii) a gender equality action plan for January 2020through to April 2024.
- To form new Athena SWAN implementationgroup (ASIG) to drive actions and ensure that this continues to be representative of Schools/Functions.
- Make at least one successful School-level Athena SWAN submission from an Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Business or Law (AHSSBL) school.
- Supporting Functions to appoint D\&I leads, leading thinking on local D\&I actions, matching the leads established across Schools.
- Change our travel and expenses policy to make clear that additional childcare costs made necessary by attending a training course or conference (costs additional to the routine everyday costs of childcare) are an allowable expense.
- Enhance awareness of the full range of flexible working options available.
- To ensure that we are attracting gender balance in applications, and that this is feeding into gender-balanced shortlists and appointments, including at senior levels.
- Reduce Professorial and Grade 9 Professional and Support gender pay gaps.
- Continue to build the network of mentoring representatives from each School and Function, sharing best practice across the University at termly meetings.
- Continue to improve staff awareness of the University's Harassment \& Bullying policy and reporting arrangements, including the development and promotion of the \#NeverOK campaign.


### 2.1.2. Race - Key achievements 2018/19

- The University agreed to remain a signatory to the Race Equality Charter principles and has 3 years to submit a new application whilst remaining signed up to that charter.
- Taking on board the feedback from Advance HE on our Race Equality Charter application, the University's Race Equality Action Plan was launched in early 2019. A Race Equality Action Group (RE-ACT), with membership from across the organisation was also set up to take forward work on prioritising actions and co-ordinating delivery of the action plan. The RE-ACT group has met a couple of times and with a new Dean for D\&I in post in early 2020 work will commence on reviewing our race equality priorities and launching activities to deliver them in partnership with thematic diversity and inclusion leads across the University.
- We continued to support the development of BAME staff through funding for places on the Stellar-HE programme and the Advance HE (formerly Leadership Foundation for Higher Education) Diversifying Leadership programme. In 2018/19, 2 BAME colleagues were supported to attend each programme.
- To mark Black History Month in October 2018, a number of events were held including:
- A seminar by Professor Shirley Anne Tate, Leeds Beckett University on "Whiteliness and Institutional Racism: Hiding Behind Unconscious Bias" on 14 October 2018
- A screening of the film BlacKkKlansman on 11 October 2018
- A Black History Month Cross Campus Exhibition was organised in partnership with RUSU, to celebrate the contributions of people of colour to different disciplines
- During 2018/19, the University developed linkages with local employers Oracle and Thames Water and led work on setting up the Thames Valley Race Equity and Cultural Harmony (REACH) Network. The network brings together over 30 companies from the Thames Valley region that have committed to working together to attract, progress and retain diverse talent at every level across the businesses, by ensuring that workplace cultures are inclusive for people from diverse backgrounds.

A launch event was held on $17^{\text {th }}$ May 2019 and was attended by more than 50 people from the Thames Valley business community. It was a thought-provoking afternoon of reflection, discussions, learning, networking and sharing practical tips on how employers need to pro-actively engage with staff to understand structural and cultural barrierslinked to race equity and then define sustainable interventions that willenable our workplaces to be more inclusive for attracting and retaining diverse talent.

Guest speakers at the launch event included AlokSharma MP, Minster for Employment who discussed the \#explainorchange initiative, encouraging everyone to initiate conversations about race disparity and consider the impact of race on people's lived experiences.

Rob Neil, Head of Project Race at the Ministry of Justice shared the tops tips that he had gleaned through his work on how to initiate change and enable organisations to get conversations started on race equity. He mentioned that a focus on inclusion is "Morally right for business" and that businesses with diverse staff are " $35 \%$ more likely to financially perform better than industry peers". He highlighted the importance of listening to and understanding the lived experiences of staff as "stories are data with a soul". He emphasised that all of us have a role to change the culture of our organisations from within. We need understand stereotypes, identify bias and impact, most of all choose our role and action. We need to "Start with inclusion and diversity will follow".

Carole Carpenter, Director of HR at the Berkshire NHS Trust shared information on their "Making it Right" programme that proactively aims to enable BAME staff to progress within the organisation.

The presentations were followed by a session where participants discussed activities and opportunities that they would like to use to work in partnership to promote race equity and cultural inclusion. The key activities identified include:

- Cross company networking - Destigmatising and enabling conversations about race (it's okay to ask!) creating a safe, open, transparent and inclusive environment. Includes extending the invite to members of our supply chain and the job centre
- Mentoring -Cross industry mentoring and reverse mentoring, sharing Return on Investment and evidencing the benefits of this approach
- Create platform to share best practice - This includes experiences and successes in relation to recruitment, progression and retention as well as other themes both at face-to-face meetings, via email and social media LinkedIn group and a regular network newsletter
- Senior leadership collaboration -Visible collaboration from MPs and CEOs to leaders and senior managers across companies
- Charter/ inclusion commitment - Work towards signing up to a collective crossindustry charter e.g. Business In The Community (BITC) Race Equality Charter
- Role models - Support our peers and act as role models

Members of the REACH Network will continue to meet and develop its workplan in 2019/20.

## Race -Key actions planned for 2019/20

Race priorities for 2019/20 are drawn from the Race Equality Action Plan, which has 11 themes.

- Ensure grades 1-5 and Black staff are represented on RE-Act and the next SAT
- Organise an annual programme of events designed to both engage staff and students with diverse and unfamiliar cultures and get people talking, as well as highlighting similarities
- Recruit a Chair for the Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) Staff Network and support the network to grow and contribute to delivering the University's race equity objectives.
- Drive on declaration rates using stories of actions resulting from new understanding of the staff population gained from this data
- Contribute to the review, refresh and relaunch of report and support processes available to staff and students who experience racial discrimination or harassment
- Explore training/information available to frontline staff (e.g. security) on racism
- Train and support Junior Common Room (JCR) representatives, Society welfare representatives, Hall Warden Assistants, RUSU staff, bar staff and security staff to reinforcemessages aroundzerotolerance toracism, including cultural appropriation
- Pilot anonymised shortlisting for applications for Grades 1-5 posts in Marketing, Communications and Engagement (MCE)
- Build quarterly analysis of diversity data collated from the Applicant Tracking System into business as usual activity
- Analyse responses collated from online exit questionnaires to identify any examples of perceived racial discrimination, and take appropriate action where possible to address this
- Collect ethnicity and other demographic information on feedback forms for training courses to evaluate any differential impact for BAME staff
- Begin to monitor ethnicity and gender of Early Career Researchers (ECRs) interested in and supported to apply for fellowships
- Publicise ethnicity differences in lump sums to Heads of School and Heads of Function
- Organise showcase of ethnicity related examples from Curriculum review


### 2.1.3. Sexual Orientation - Key achievements 2018/19

- We have made significant progress in making the University a more LGBT+ inclusive organisation. This was recognised through our improved ranking in the Stonewall

Workplace Equality Index. In 2018 we were ranked at $\mathbf{8 0}$ compared to 138 in the previous year and became a Stonewall Top 100 Employer.

- The improved ranking is a result of many concrete actions across the University aimed at making the University a more inclusive and welcoming environment for our LGBT+ staff and students, whether actions carried out by individuals, by our LGBT Plus network group, by RUSU, or by particular Schools and Functions. Examples include:

1. Increasing the number of LGBT+ Allies by organising two LGBT+ Ally recruitment and information sharing sessions that were jointly hosted by the Vice-Chancellor, the LGBT+ Staff Network, and RUSU. As a part of this campaign we distributed hundreds of LGBT+/LGBT+ Ally postcards and lanyards across campus.
2. Training of LGBT Role Models, and making LGBT+ role models more visible across the institution, for example on Faces of Reading.
3. Reaching out to the local community, e.g. through Staff/Student presence at Reading Pride, or last year's Wolfenden Seminar and Wolfenden Lecture on the poisonous legacy of Section 28.
4. Led work on strengthening the collaborative work and sharing of good practice between members of the Thames Valley LGBT+ Network. This included recruiting new member organisations to join the network and hosting meetings during the 2018/19 academic year.
5. Demonstrating the University's support, and the support of the University's senior leadership, through public ceremonies for Trans Day of Remembrance, and the International Day against Homophobia, Biphobia and Transphobia.
6. Worked closely with the LGBT+ Staff Network group to plan a range of activities to mark LGBT+ History month and other important dates for the LGBT+ community and used these to raise awareness of sexual orientation issues.
7. Worked behind the scenes across the University, e.g. in HR on our policies and procedures, in Estates and Facilities on gender neutral toilets, in Procurement on how we pass our values onto and work with our suppliers, in Planning and Support and Legal on our Equal Opportunities Policy and analysis of data.
8. Continued our community partnership activities by reaching out and showing support to the local LGBT+ community, e.g. through University presence at Reading Pride, and through public events and engagement, e.g. our annual Wolfenden Seminar and Lecture, events led by staff and students in LGBT+ History Month.
9. Worked jointly with staff and student's network and RUSU, to raise awareness of different gender identities, including through trans awareness training sessions and through the launch of new "pronoun badges" and associated communications.

- We worked closely with the LGBT+ Staff Network to plan and deliver a number of activities to mark LGBT+ History month and other important dates for the LGBT+ community and used these to raise awareness of sexual orientation issues. These include the following:

1. $\mathbf{1 0}$ October 2018 - 'Same-Sex Marriage and the Law: European and International Approaches' Workshop with Alina Tryfonidou (Reading, and Co-Chair of the LGBT+ Network), Loveday Hodson (Leicester), and Damian Gonzalez-Sanchez (Sheffield)
2. $\mathbf{1 1}$ February $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$-‘Offences against the person? Discovering hidden LGB histories in Berkshire court archive' - Public event where University of Reading students Amy Hitchings and George Stokes discussed the findings of their summer 2018 research project regarding the above topic
3. $\mathbf{1 3}$ February 2019 - An LGBT+ Ally information and recruitment session hosted by the ViceChancellor and the LGBT+ staff network
4. 1 May 2019 - 'Contemporary Challenges Facing LGBT+ Asylum Seekers: UK and Global Perspectives' - Conference organised by a member of the network and with the support of the network
5. $\mathbf{1 6}$ May $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ - Hosted the third Annual Wolfenden Lecture "Our Trans Lives: life, love and Lorraine" that was delivered by Jake \& Hannah Graf where they discussed everything from their transgender lives through to Lorraine Kelly's sofa! http://www.reading.ac.uk/15/about/newsandevents/Events/Event794868.aspx
6. $\mathbf{1 7}$ May 2019 - IDAHOBIT flag-raising ceremony and speeches, hosted by the LGBT+ Staff Network, the Students' Union, and Professor Parveen Yaqoob, the University's Champion for Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

- As a part of the LGBT+ Allies campaign we distributed hundreds of LGBT +Ally postcards and lanyards across campus. This increased visibility of LGBT+ issues has resulted in positive feedback in the 2017/18 staff survey where $98 \%$ staff said that they agree that the University of Reading respects people equally regardless of their sexual orientation.
- We focused on raising awareness of trans-gender issues by organising two Transawareness training sessions for staff and students that were led by an external facilitator, Rosemary Taylor, who is a local teacher and a former University of Reading student.
- The University sponsored two places for LGBT+ staff to apply to attend the Stonewall Leadership programme and mentoring is offered to any staffmember who attends the Leadership programme.


## Sexual Orientation - Priority actions planned for 2019/20

- Bring staff involved with student support together to develop understanding and wide use across the University of the Stonewall Service Delivery Toolkit.
- Develop guidance for LGBT+ staff considering working overseas and their managers.
- Continue to raise awareness of LGBT+ experiences and history through events and training in and around LGBT+ History Month, Trans Day of Remembrance, the International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia, and Transphobia, and the University's annual Wolfenden Lecture.
- Organise two LGBT+ Allies Information/Recruitment Sessions to recruit LGBT+ allies through our including running the first of these on the London Road campus.
- Continue our community partnership activities by reaching out and showing support to the local LGBT+ community, e.g. through University presence at Reading Pride, and through publicevents and engagement, e.g.our annual Wolfenden Seminar and Lecture, events led by staff and students in LGBT+ History Month.
- Work jointly with staff and students' networks and RUSU, to raise awareness of different gender identities, including through trans awareness training sessions, the promotion of "pronoun badges" and associated communications.
- To explore reverse mentoring using the information about the successful approach taken at Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust.
- Plan and run intersectional events - potentially at Wolfenden Seminar and Lecture.
- To work jointly with RUSU to deliver student-staff LGBT+ events.
- To improve the visibility of LGBT+ support within student services.


### 2.1.4. Disability - Progress against 2018/19 priority actions

- Supported the development of the Staff Disability Network established last year and collaborated to organise awareness raising events. The network has been meeting regularly and is working to increase its influence within the University of Reading, to make our community more inclusive to all staff members.

The key initiatives that the network has supported include the following:

1. Disability Passport - The Network has set up a working group and liaised with UCU and HR to support a Disability Passport for the University. Advice and guidance have also been sought from the Business Disability Forumtotake this initiative forward. The groupwillcontinuetoworkin 2019/20tofinalise ideasbeforedisseminatingmore widely.
2. Disability Awareness Training for Line Managers - The Network provided feedback on the pilot Disability Awareness training that is proposed for SAGES. In 2019/20 will support HR in identifying appropriate resources and specialist trainers for Disability Awareness Training.
3. Work with Estates and the School of Built Environment - The network provided feedbackon expanding eligibilityfordisabled parkingspaces/permits andresolving issues with non-functioning hearing loops in the University.
4. Campaign on accessible spaces-Supported RUSU's Disability Officer on their campaign on accessible spaces. These discussions identified an opportunity for further
support to disabled students in preparation for the workplace. Therefore, in 2019/20, the Network will explore options for staff who are members of the Network to mentor and support students with a disability.
5. Communication and awareness raising through events to increase its visibility. Work is currently underway on setting up a webpage for the Network and its core members. The webpages will include an events calendar.
6. Collaboration with RUSU-Conversationshavetakenplacetohostjointeventswith RUSU. The RUSU Disability Officer has also been involved in piloting a portable hearing loop which the Staff Network has.
7. Purchased a single membership for Purple Spaces for 2019-20 to share good practice with other organisations. The membership has supported structuring the work of the Network for 2019/20. Discussions have also taken place to set up a support group with other Higher Education Institutions who are members of Purple Space.

- Disability Confident Scheme - The University has continued to work with internal stakeholders on reviewing the operational challenges/barriers we face in signing up to the Disability Confident Award and setting in place the processes necessary to enable sign-up. In 2019/20, we will work actively with the Staff Network and HR to prepare the University to sign up and become Disability Committed.
- The University has retained its membership of the Business Disability Forum and worked with the Staff Network to promote the support that the Business Disability Forum can offer to staff at the University, such as free consultation for updating any current policy etc.
- Supported work to enhance the accessibility of our main jobs site, through the addition of the Recite tool to the jobs page. This enables applicants to change the features of the job advertisements to present in different languages, text size, colour, background colour, spacing etc.


## Disability - Priority actions planned for 2019/20

- In consultation with the Staff Disability Network and disabled staff more generally, develop and adopt formal University targets for disability on the staff side.


### 2.1.5. Other - Key achievements 2018/19

- The University's Library Service has created guides to resources for LGBT+, gender studies, disability and inclusion related research. These guides aim to highlight the resources held by the Library to support studies in these multi-disciplinary areas. They have been created in consultation with staff and student representatives from RUSU. A newguide, highlighting race andethnicity-related research resources, will beavailable in 2019/20.

The Library actively encourages students and staff to put forward suggestions for resources to help support a more diverse curriculum, particularly in any area felt to be underrepresented. Suggestions can be submitted in person or via a dedicated online form. Titles are purchased from a dedicated fund and are listed on the Library's Diversity fund reading lists.

To provide an inclusive library environment for students, a number of library staff have undertaken training in related areas, including transgender awareness and support for library users with disabilities. This enables them to offer more pro-active support for students with different needs and to provide a better service for them. The library also has a working group which focuses on developing support and initiatives relating to diversity and inclusion in the Library.

- Fundingfordiversity andinclusioninitiatives-During 2018/19the Universityoffered funding for Department and School level diversity and inclusion initiatives. These funds were offered to support staff time for projects, covering costs for producing materials and hosting diversity and inclusion related events. The following projects received funding in the November 2018 round.

| 1 | Dr Amanda Clarke, School of Archaeology, Geography, and Environmental Science, <br> Creating Confidence: Enabled Fieldwork |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Dr Katherine Harloe, Department of Classics, School of Humanities, Decolonising the <br> Curriculum: Creative and Practical Strategies |
| 3 | Dr Shalini Sinha, Department of Philosophy, School of Humanities, Sexuality and <br> gender: radical revisioning through cross-cultural philosophical dialogue |
| 4 | Dr Rhi Smith, University Museums and Special Collections Services, and Blythe Varney <br> (RUSU Disability Officer), Accessible Heritage Volunteering Awareness |
| 5 | Dr Jeanne-Louise Moys, Department of Typography \& Graphic Communication, Iam, <br> we are ... different by design |
| 6 | Dr Sonia Hood, Study Advice \& Maths Support, Library, Understanding difference in <br> group work: a student perspective |

The following projects received funding in the August 2019 round.

# Jane Setter, SLL, Supporting successful BAME outcomes: Student life through a lens \#2 

Suzy Tutchell, IoE, A Stitch in Time: Inclusive Threads of Learning Mark Laynesmith, Chaplaincy, Interfaith Intern Ludmilla Cerne and David Nutt, SCFP, Student-led activities for better integration of students from the NUIST-Reading Academy
Jennifer Scott and Sam Williams, SMPCS, International Women in Mathematics Day 2020
Julie Farwell, SLL, Women's Springboard 2019 cohort Termly Meetings
Sarah Cardey and Rebecca Jerrome, SAPD, Resourcesfor decolonizing the curriculum
Yasmine Shamma, SLL, Revisionist Thinking: Fostering Inclusive Diversity within the Curriculum, and Beyond
Eileen Hyder, CQSD, CQSD Diversity \& Inclusion event: addressing ethnicity attainment differentials.
Calvin Smith, SMPCS, Hidden figures: putting people back into mathematics resources
Naomi Lebens, UMASCS, Drawing Diversity: Artist-in-Residence
Flavia Ghouri and Sophie Oduyale, SCFP, Setting up positive role models for the diverse body of students in Pharmacy
Nicola Abram, SLL, BAME students in English Literature: A Network
Matthew Windsor, School of Law, Decolonising the Legal Curriculum
Tony Capstick, SLL, Diversifying the curriculum: drawing on students' linguistic and cultural heritage to develop intercultural awareness
Sedtin Wan, International Student Advisory Team, Gingerbread Village
Sedtin Wan, International Student Advisory Team, Global Buddies
Elizabeth Conaghan, School of Law, "The Disappearance of Miss Bebb" - a play about challenging inequalities.
Eleanor Draycott, IT, DiversIT: Diversity in Tech Event
Ellen Hackl, Technical Services, Making practical classes in Pharmacy Inclusive-byDesign.
Emma Butler, Careers, Identifying what support students with disabilities need with their career decisions and applications.
Jeanne-Louise Moys SACD; Richard Nunes HBS; Carolina Vasilikou, SBE, INCLUSIVE WAY HACKATHON: the design of everyday wayfinding in outdoor public environments.
Dr Rachael Neal and Rebecca Morgan, SAPD, Investigating effects of educational background and otherD\&I characteristics on student retention and attainment in SAPD UG programmes.
Dr Matthew McFrederick, FTT, Race and Performance Today
Dr Karen Jones, IoE, Leadership and Diversity in Higher Education

### 2.2 Summary of headline data 2018/19 for staff

### 2.2.1. Gender - Headline Data

- The University produced and published its second gender pay gap report in March 2019. The mean gender pay gap for the University as at 31 March 2019 is 20.51\% and the median gender pay gap is $18.52 \%$. In comparison, the mean gender pay gap for the University as at 31 March 2017 was $19.58 \%$ and the median gender pay gap was $20.99 \%$.

The gender pay gap is significantly affected by occupational segregation and reflects the uneven distribution ofmen and womenthroughout the paystructure; with women being over-represented amongst the lower grades in cleaning, catering and clerical roles, and men being over-represented amongst the higher grades in professorial and senior management roles. Further details are available in the Gender Pay Gap Report 2018

- Female staff continue to receive most of the awards through the University's Reward and Recognition processes across all categories including additional increments, contribution points, and merit-based promotions, at a proportion that meets or exceeds the proportion of female staff ( $57.4 \%$ ) in the workforce. However, male staff still receive on average more than females when it comes to lump sum awards and this difference has increased from last year. However, the difference is still smaller than it was at its largest differential. Further details can be found in Section 6.1, Tables 5-7.
- $56 \%$ of successful applications to the Personal Titles process were from females in 2018/19, continuing the near balance in promotions seen since 2016/17. The proportion of eligible female staff who applied for promotion to Associate Professor was higher than that for male staff (Section 6.1, Table 3), and the success rate for female applicants (67\%) was lower than at any time in the past 5 years (Section 6.1, Table 2a).

The success rate for male applicants for promotion to Associate Professor (79\%) also reduced in 2018/19 but remained higher than that for female applicants, and the percentage of eligible males applying was the lowest in the past 5 years. Further details can be found in Section 6.1, Tables 2-4.

Applications from female staff for promotion to Professor increased both in terms of number and in proportion to the eligible population. The success rate for female applicants was $21 \%$ higher than for male applicants, continuing the trend since the introduction of the new system (Section 6.1, Table 2b). In 2018/19, 62\%
of successful applications were from female staff compared to $71 \%$ in 2017/18. The positive impact of the new process for Personal Titles is clear, but further evaluation of the most influential factors (e.g.criteria, mentors, consideration of all personal circumstances) is needed to understand what is supporting female success more than male. Further details can be found in Section 6.1, Tables 2b and 4.

- Working for gender balance on key decision-making Committees -Council, Senate, and University Executive Board (UEB) have seen an increase in female representation in

2018/19 compared to the previous year. However, University Board for Research has seen female representation decrease to $39.1 \%$ in 2018/19 compared to $52 \%$ in 2017/18.

We have met the targets for $30 \%$ representation of either gender on majority of our Committees with improvements still needed for UEB ( $5 \%$ short of target) and the Strategy \& Finance Committee ( $13 \%$ short of target). Details can be found in Section 6.1, Table 19.

- Recruitment data for 2018/19 shows that we had $57 \%$ female applicants and $38 \%$ male applicants for roles at the University and that their success rates are balanced in terms of being short-listed and then appointed. Further details can be found in Section 6.1, Tables 22 and 25.


### 2.2.2 Race - Headline Data

- The race /ethnicity pay gap has increased in 2018/19 and now stands at 20.98\% (mean) compared to $14.23 \%$ in 2017/18. Further details can be found in Section 6.1, Table 15.
- The success of BAME staff in the reward processes has been mixed in 2018/19. For additional increments, contribution points and merit- based promotion, there has been an increase in awards to BAME staff.
- For additional increments, 17.24 BAME staff received an award compared to $6.7 \%$ in 2017/18.
- For contribution points, $15 \%$ BAME staff received awards compared to $7.55 \%$ in 2017/18.
- Formerit-based promotion, the award for BAME staff was $33.33 \%$ compared to $16.67 \%$ in 2017/18.
- For the award of lump sum and celebrating success sum awards, BAME staff have seen a decrease in awards.
- For lump sum, BAME staff received $8 \%$ of the awards compared to $8.65 \%$ for the previous year.
- For celebrating success, $9 \%$ BAME staff received an award compared to $10.75 \%$ in 2017/18.

Further details can be found in section 6.1, Tables 12-14.

- During 2018/19, staff declaration rates for ethnicity have seen a slight decrease and now stand at $92.73 \%$ compared to 93.18 \% in 2017/18. Further details can be found in Section 6.1, Table 21.
- BAME applicants make up a significant proportion of the applicants for jobs at the University. However, they are less successful than White applicants when it comes to being shortlisted for interview and being offered the position. Further details can be found in Section 6.1, Table 27.
- In the Personal Titles process for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor, small numbers of BAME staff in both the eligible pools and applicants mean that success rates
and representation fluctuate substantially from year to year. However, the success rate for BAME staff in 2018/19 was below that for White staff at both Associate Professor and Professor levels.

There are positive signs of more confidence in the application process with a higher proportion of eligible BAME academics applying for promotion than the white population, particularly at professorial level. At Professor level, this resulted in a stronger representation of BAME staff in successful applications than in the eligible population.

### 2.2.3 Sexual Orientation - Headline Data

- Ranking in the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index improved significantly to 80 in 2019 from 138 in the 2018 and the University became a Stonewall Top 100 Employer.
- Declaration rates for sexual orientation have decreased to $52.87 \%$ compared to $56.83 \%$ last year.


### 2.2.4 Disability - Headline Data

- Declaration rates for disability have decreased significantly to 70\% compared to 78\% last year.
- Recruitment-155 applicants who declared a disability applied for roles at the University. This equates to $1 \%$ of total applicants. Further details can be found in Section 6.1, Table 23.
- Recruitment Success Rates - From the pool of 155 applicants (with declared disability) who applied for roles at the University, 102 (65.8\%) were not shortlisted for an interview. From the remaining 53 applicants that were shortlisted, 30 applicants (19.4\%) were not successful in the interview and 23 applicants (14.8\%) were successful and offered a role. Further details can be found in Section 6.1, Table 26.


### 2.3 Other Priorities

## Other priorities - Actions planned for 2019/20

- Encourage larger completion by staff of diversity-monitoring data fields in Employee Self Service, to enable anonymous analysis of diversity data.
- Working Groups on Teaching Intensive Staff, on Sessional Lecturers, and on Teaching Fellows have completed their work and reported suggested actions to UEB. However, many of those actions were then taken over by a local claim submitted by UCU. Therefore, a joint committee has been set up to consider UCU's claims and that committee work is still ongoing. It is hoped that the work will progress during 2019/20, to reach a joint agreement.
- Develop, as part of preparations for the University's submission into the next Research Excellence Framework REF 2021, a code of practice on: the fair and transparent identification of staff with significant responsibility for research; determining who is an independent researcher; the selection of outputs.
- Enhance the University's Diversity and Inclusion website to provide advice on support for staff and students specific to a number of protected characteristics.


## Section 3

## Students-2018/19 achievements and keyactions planned for 2019/2020

Set against the backdrop of raised expectations of students from diverse social, cultural and economic backgrounds, the University of Reading is actively seeking a variety of approaches to the promotion of equality of opportunities in all its functions. This report highlights the key interventions undertaken during 2018-19 to achieve our diversity and inclusion objectives.

- Provided new support route for student wellbeing. The newly established Student Welfare team sit within Student Services and work with Schools across the University to deliver frontline pastoral support. The team has supported 1,022 students this year. $88 \%$ of the students who used the services felt the service was meaningful and would recommend the team to theirfriends. The team also re-introduced the Notification for Concern form for staff or students who are concerned about a student, would like the team to be involved. This reporting form has brought 132 students into contact with the team.
- Piloted the 'finalist' initiative project, focusing on the career readiness of our undergraduate students, particularly those from W ${ }^{1}$ backgrounds in Spring-Summer 2019. As part of the project, several new initiatives were trailed and the feedback from students was overwhelmingly positive:
- Assessment centre, a simulated event to support students' confidence and enhance their experience in the graduate market. $56 \%$ of these students were from underrepresented backgrounds.
- 1:1 Finalist Appointments targeted subjects that have low level of impact on Graduate Outcomes. Of 233 attendees, $62 \%$ were identified as underrepresented students.
- The Careers services team developed an online training course, Career Smart, for final year students, particularly those from a low $\mathrm{IMD}^{2}$ background. The course was designed to support students who for various reasons might be unable to engage in career learning during the academic year or may need to forgo placement/internship opportunities for financial or caring reasons. The aim of the course is to ensure they become more prepared and informed in seeking graduate employments. The first run of the course attracted 501 students.
- Introduced the new academic tutor system (ATS), a proactive partnership approach to connecting with our students at a personal level. Through following up their academic, personal and professional progress, academic tutors offer tailored support for students. Feedback taken from UKES ${ }^{3} 2019$ survey demonstrates that $71 \%$ of student respondents reported a positive experience with their academic tutor (up 3.9 percentage points from 2018) and $59 \%$ of student respondents felt their academic tutor signposted them to appropriate support services (up 5.9percentage points from 2018).
- 

[^0]- Extended student welfare support and training programmes.
- Expanded the Life Tools Talks ${ }^{4}$ to a wider population of students $(2,550)$, a 31.3 percentage point up from last year, in collaboration with Schools and academic staff. This programme is in high demand, particularly among international students and mature students
- BigWhite Wall, a newly developed onlinesupport resource is available 24/7to provide wellbeing support for students who do not want or cannot access face to face support. It has supported 386 students last academic year. 127 Guided Support Courses were signed up to
- Completed the refurbishment of the Library with a range of improvements to facilities throughout the building for all users. The key improvements being:
- bigger lifts providing better access for users with mobility or access needs
- gender neutral and disabled toilet provision on every floor
- height adjustable desks for better and adaptable study spaces
- dedicated staff with special responsibilities for supporting disabled students, such as a 'fetch and carry' service for retrieving books from the shelves when required
- Launched Blackbullion, an online financial support system over the summer to provide a wide variety of advice and guidance in terms of finance management. Among 981 student users across every degree level, nearly two thirds (63.3\%) of these users were undergraduates and one in four ( $22.8 \%$ ) were taught postgraduates. It was popular among BAME students at IFP and PGT levels of study, as well as female students at all degree levels
- Continued the Electronic Management Assessment (EMA) programme to ensure consistent and transparent assessment processes. The programme has been awarded the Blackboard Catalyst Award for Optimising the Student Experience in recognition of the significant and evidenced impact on the learner experience

Update on priority actions identified in our 2018-19 Annual report

| Priority | Progress |
| :--- | :--- |
| Undertake research to identify <br> the barriers to reducing degree <br> attainment gap for different <br> student groups, and then <br> develop action plans and design <br> student support and <br> intervention programmes <br> accordingly. | The student experience in STEM degree (SESTEM) <br> project was carried out to address the differential degree <br> outcome between White and BAME students at the |
| University. The research involved over 100 staff and 51 |  |
| White/BAME undergraduates. Data analysis is underway, |  |
| and findings will be reported in due course. |  |

[^1]| Adopt a data informed <br> approach to capture and <br> analyse increased learning <br> activity data to offer quality <br> information for Schools in <br> measuring progress, informing <br> pedagogical practice and <br> enhancing attainment and <br> pastoral care. | Attendance management \& support (SAMS) project has <br> commenced with an aim to capture, store and report on <br> information relating to student attendance for T\&L such <br> that to flag up students for whom an additional <br> intervention is required. |
| :--- | :--- |
| The Student Progress Dashboard was developed during |  |
| 2018-19 and launched in autumn 2019. It wasdesigned to |  |
| demonstrate students' completion of assessment, their |  |
| progress trajectory and to monitor their actual |  |
| attainment against their goals. |  |\(\left|\begin{array}{l}Further progress the work to <br>

embed employability into <br>
curriculum design to enhance <br>
student employability and <br>
transferable skills in conjunction <br>
with CQSD, Schools and <br>
Careers.\end{array} \begin{array}{l}There is a continuous improvement with a focus on <br>
embedded employability into the mainstream curriculum <br>
to all UG programmes. One of the approaches to this in <br>
2018-19 was through the work of the Curriculum <br>
Framework. <br>
The 'triangle' collaboration between students, academic <br>
and professional staff offers a wealth of opportunities for <br>
developing the skills and attributes that employers most <br>
highly value. <br>

Careers confidence survey shows that students are\end{array}\right|\)| increasingly confident with their employability ${ }^{5}$. |
| :--- | :--- |

[^2]| voice schemes (e.g. the <br> possible Reading 100 student <br> panel) | As part of the project, the University is planning a Reading <br> 100 student panel which will involve working with <br> students from a variety of subject areas, ethnicities and <br> levels of study. <br> Led by TLD in partnership with RUSU and Student <br> Services, currently the work is still in the scoping stage. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Launch and build on our <br> University-wide \#NeverOK <br> campaign in order to promote <br> respect and tolerance and to <br> encourage reporting of bullying, <br> harassment and discrimination. | The \#NeverOK campaign was launched to raise <br> awareness of the routesfor reporting racialand other <br> harassment incidents. <br> Positive comments via email from students have been <br> reported. As the campaign is at its early stages, the data <br> is really too small to make any meaningful conclusion. We <br> will continue to monitor this. <br> As part of \#NeverOK campaign, 20 interactive workshops <br> were run by the Good Lad Initiative to promote positive <br> behaviour. |
| Continue the implementation <br> and monitoring of the policy on <br> Inclusive Teaching and Learning <br> and preparation for upcoming <br> legal requirements around the <br> accessibility of digital platforms <br> and resources. | Assisted by ADE team within CQSD, the policy on <br> Inclusive Practice in T\&L was developed and distributed, <br> alongside the provision of a series of training sessions and <br> supporting events on T\&L, including TEL. <br> A Web Accessibility Statement has been developed and <br> implemented to ensure digital accessibility of all our <br> websites and mobile applications. <br> The 8th Global Accessibility Awareness Day was held in 8 |
| May 2019 to raise awareness about digital access and |  |
| inclusion. The workshop attracted 30 staff attendees. |  |$|$

[^3]
### 3.1 Gender

## Gender - Headline data

Women comprised $55.6 \%$ of all undergraduate students and $56.3 \%$ of all taught postgraduate students (PGT) and 54.1\% of all research postgraduate students (PGR). Overall, $55.9 \%$ of all students were female. These patterns have been consistent over a number of years at the University. It coincided with the trend that success application rates among females were higher than males at every degree level except that of home applications at PGT level, where the opposite pattern was observed over the past three years.

## Recruitment and admissions

## UG admissions by gender.

- There were more applications to the University from prospective students who were female (53.8\%). Female applicants were more likely to be offered a place, making up 54.1\% of all admissions. These patterns were very similar to previous years.
- The gender balance of the home and international applicants was broadly comparable, but the gap between the proportion of female and male applications was slightly larger for international students in the last three years.


## PGT admissions by gender.

- In 2018-19 applications were received from 13,300 women ( $56.9 \%$ ) and 7,785 men (43.0\%). Success rates among female applicants who were offered a place were higher than for male applicants ( $67.2 \%$ and $64.4 \%$, respectively). This trend has remained constant since 2016-17.
- The gender difference for home applications were similar to international applications, but the gap was slightly wider for home applications.
- Among home applications, the proportion of female applicants has gradually dropped from $60.1 \%$ in $2016-17$ to $57.9 \%$, but still higher than that of male applicants (41.9\%). In contrast, there was a higher offer rate to male applicants over the same period. $75.4 \%$ of male applicants were offered a place, compared with $66.2 \%$ female applicants.


## PGR admissions by gender

- In contrast, we continued to attract a higher proportion of male applicants, making up $56.0 \%$ of all research postgraduate applications. This was largely accounted by the international applicants who were male applicants comprised $58.2 \%$ of applications in comparison to $48.3 \%$ of home applicants.
- Female applicants consistently had a higher offer rate than male applicants (34.0\% compared with $31.6 \%$ ), which reflects higher success application rates female applicants in progression through the selection process.
- Asforhome applicants, the proportions offemale applicants(51.0\%),female offerholders ( $49.7 \%$ ) and female enrolments ( $50.5 \%$ ) were comparable to their male counterparts. However, the last two years saw relatively higher proportions offemale applicants, female offer holders and female enrolments.

Further details are presented in Tables 1-3.

## Progression, retention and attainment

There were notable gender differences among undergraduates in progression, retention and attainment, with larger proportions of female students progressing, continuing or receiving a first/2:1 compared with male students.

## Progression:

- Among all UoR undergraduates, since 2016-17 there has been a drop in the progression rates with a 3.7 percentage point decrease in female students ( $92.2 \%$, down from 95.9\%) and a 3.8 percentage point decrease in male students ( $88.5 \%$, down from $92.3 \%$ ).
- As in previous years, consistently the proportion of female students passed at $1^{\text {st }}$ attempt was higher compared with male students ( $85 \%$ and $78.2 \%$, respectively).
- The 2018-19 figure continued a slight downward trend with more male students failed to progress at the second attempt than female students ( $4.9 \%$ and $1.9 \%$, respectively).
- The proportion of home male students who failed to progress ranged from $4 \%$ to $5 \%$ in comparison to $2 \%$ for female students over the past three years. The difference between the two was very similar to that for international students (around 3 percentage points).

Further details can be found in Table 4.

## Retention:

- In 2018-19, female student retention was 94.4\%, down from 95.5\%, compared with $92.4 \%$ for male students, down from $94 \%$ in 2016-17. This represents a small drop in the proportion of both male and female students from its peak last year.
- However, the increased retention gap mainly resulted in a 1.8 percentage point decrease among male students from $94.2 \%$ in 2017-18 to 92.4\% in 2018-19.
- Consistently a higher proportion of UG male students withdrew during their studies compared with females ( $7.6 \%$ and $5.5 \%$, respectively).
- The proportions of male and female students who continued their studies were comparable at both PGT and PGR levels of study.
- Among taught postgraduates, the proportion of female students retained has increased year on year to $96.3 \%$ and $96.4 \%$ for male students, representing the smallest retention gap by gender over three years.
- Similarly, among research postgraduates,female student retention rose by 0.7 percentage points to $97.2 \%$ and males by 1.7 percentage points to $96.7 \%$.

Further details can be found in Tables 5-7.

## Attainment:

- Consistently a higher proportion of female students achieved a first/2:1 compared with male students since 2016-17.
- In 2018-19, good (first/2:1) degree attainment has increased to 86\% for females and dropped to 76.3 \% for male students, increasing the attainment gap to 9.7 percentage points. This was also the case when looking only at those received first class degrees.
- Higher proportions of female students continued to achieve a first/2:1 both for home and international students. The attainment gap for home students has been stable ( $88.7 \%$ for females as opposed to $79.0 \%$ for males). For international students, it fluctuated slightly, ranging from 10 to 17 percentage points.
- At PGT level, the proportion of female students achieving a distinction/merit has continued to decrease from $79.0 \%$ in 2016-17 to $76.9 \%$ in 2018-19, In the same period, the opposite trend was observed in males, increasing from $77.7 \%$ to $79.3 \%$. This has caused a
fluctuation in attainment gap, ranging from 0.1 percentage points to 2.4 percentage points in the last three years.

Further details can be found in Tables 8-9.

## Gender - 2018/19 Actions

- Student Progress Dashboard was established to help students find the progress they have achieved. The live progress data will also help staff proactively identify and assist students who are disengaging with their studies
- EMA system has been implemented to improve students' assessment experience
- Inclusive T\&Lpolicy has been developed to guide on designing the curriculum and assessing inclusivity, as well as creating inclusive environments


## Gender- Actions planned for 2019/20

- Continue to review of our approach to recruitment and selection with the consideration of the gender balance of applicants at each application process to ensure equity of outcome
- Continue to work towards the implementation of our student attendance management system which will allow us to identify disengagement early
- Consider how the Student Progress Dashboard can be deployed to close the gender gaps in attainment


### 3.2 Race

## Race - Headline data

- The proportion of students who identified as Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) has steadily increased year on year, rising from $30.4 \%$ in 2016-17 to $32.7 \%$ in 2018-19. BAME students were better represented among postgraduates than undergraduates over the past three years.
- The majority of BAME students studying at every degree level were Asian students, However, the composition of BAME students varied by degree level. Asian students were most pronounced at the undergraduate level, Chinese students comprised the majority at the taught postgraduate level, but Arab students (11.8\%) comprised the majority at the research postgraduate level, relatively higher than Asian and Chinese students ( $10.1 \%$ and $7.3 \%$, respectively).
- 3,080 home students at the University identified as BAME, up from 2,265 in 2016-17, representing a growth from $17.9 \%$ to $21.2 \%$ in 2018-19. The proportions of Asian and Black home students have seen the most growth among BAME groups in this time period, increasing by 1.7 percentage points and 1 percentage points, respectively. In comparison, the proportions of Mixed and Other ethnic group have both grown by 0.3 percentage points.
- Overall BAME applicants are less likely to be offered a place than their White peers across every degree level. The offer rate gap between the two cohorts was particularly pronounced at PGR level over the recent three years.
- BAME students are less likely to achieve first/2:1degree outcomes than their White peers. In 2018-19 there was a 16.1 percentage point gap in attainment between BAME students and their White counterparts, which was widened from 10.7 percentage points in 2017-18. By
- looking at data over a longer time frame, it is evident that this figure fluctuates significantly from year to year.


## Recruitment and admissions

UG admissions by ethnicity (home students only)
Approximately three quarters of international applicants did not declare their ethnic identities, thus only home applicants were reported.

- BAME applicants comprised $25.9 \%$ of applications in 2018-19, up 3.3 percentage points over three years.
- Among BAME applicants, the majority groups were Asian (12.2\%) and Black (5.7\%) every year. However, there was a continued trend that a higher proportion of unknown ethnicity 9-10\% in the last three years.
- BAME applicants continued to have lower offer rates compared with White applicants (80.0\% and 87.4\% respectively).
- The proportion of BAME applicants who enrolled was slightly higher in comparison to White applicants in recent two years ( $21.7 \%$ and $21.1 \%$ respectively), but this contrasts with the trend observed in2016-17.


## PGT admissions by ethnicity

- The proportion of home applications from BAME groups increased by 2.6 percentage points to $18.5 \%$ over three years. Consistently, the proportion of Asian applicants was higher compared with any other BAME groups ( $9.5 \%$ for Asian, followed by $4.0 \%$ for Black).
- In the same period, BAME applicants comprised 93.2\% of all international applicants, increased by 1.5 percentage points. As in previous years, the majority were Chinese (48.4\%), followed by Asian (17.1\%) and Black (15.4\%).
- BAME international applicants consistently had higher offer rates than BAME home applicants, $64.2 \%$ and $60.9 \%$ respectively.
- The proportion of BAME international applicants who took up an offer was significantly lower compared with BAME home applicants, $8.1 \%$ and $54.8 \%$ respectively. This trend is similar to previous years.


## PGR admissions by ethnicity

- There was a consistent pattern that the proportion of BAME applicants was significantly higher compared with White applicants ( $71.6 \%$ and $22.7 \%$ respectively), but they had lower offer rate than White applicants (27.7\% as opposed to 46.7\%).
- Among home applications, the proportion of BAME applicants slightly fell by 2.9 percentage points to $12.3 \%$ in the last three years.
- Among international applications, there was little change in the proportion of BAME applicants ( $88-89 \%$ ) over the recent three years. The majority applicants were Arab (32.8\%), Black (21.4\%), followed by Asian (18.9\%).
- The offer rate to BAME international applicants was consistently lower compared with White international applicants ( $26.6 \%$ and $40.6 \%$ respectively).
- Overall Chinese international applicants had a higher offer rate (50.0\%) than White applicants (40.6\%), Black (25.5\%) and Mixed (22.7\%) in the past three years,

Further details can be found in Tables 10-12.

## Progression, retention and attainment

## Progression:

- BAME UG students continued to have a lower pass at the first attempt rate than their White counterparts ( $72.9 \%$ as opposed to $86.8 \%$ ). This represents a reduced gap by 1.9 percentage points from last year.
- As in previous years, the highest rate of progression following the second attempt was from Chinese students (91.2\%), followed by Mixed ethnicity students (88.1\%), while Black students had the lowest (81.3\%). The trend was also observed in BAME home students.
- The proportion of BAME students who failed at the second attempt was similar to that in the last year at $5.2 \%$, in comparison to the failure rate of $2.4 \%$ for White students.
- Consistently the ethnicity gap in progression rate was more significant for home students compared with international students (10.6\% as opposed to 5.4\%).

Further details can be found in Table 13.

## Retention:

- In 2018-19 White UG students had a slightly higher retention rate of 96.9\% compared with $96.7 \%$ for BAME students. The opposite pattern was observed in the last two years,
- Retention rates varied considerably by ethnicity. The Chinese UG students had the highest retention rate (97.9\%), followed by Back students (97.2\%), Other (96.6\%), Mixed (96.4\%) and Asian students (95.9\%).
- There has been a noticeable decline in the retention rate of Asian undergraduate students, a drop of 2.3 percentage points from 98.2\% since 2017-18.
- At both PGT and PGR levels, consistently BAME students had higher retention than White students in the last three years.
- Amongtaught postgraduate students, Chinese students overall had a higher retention rate (99.9\%) than other ethnic groups (98.6\% for Asian, $98.1 \%$ for Black and $97.4 \%$ for Mixed, respectively).
- However, there was noticeable divergence among BAME research postgraduates. Asian students had the highest retention (100\%) and followed by Arab students (98.8\%).
- Therehas been a continued increase in the retention rate among Asian research postgraduate students by 2.8 percentage points from $97.2 \%$ since 2016-17.

Further details can be found in Tables 14-16.

## Attainment:

- In 2018-19 the proportion of White students receiving a first/2:1 slowly increased to 87.03\% compared with $70.97 \%$ of BAME students, down from $74.4 \%$ last year.
- Notably the proportion of BAME students gaining a first/2:1 has decreased by 3.5 percentage points since 2017-18, increasing the attainment gap to 16.1 percentage points.
- The widened attainment gap mainly was related to the fall in Asian students by 10.1 percentage points and Arab students by 5.3 percentage points from its peak of $79.6 \%$ and 63.5\% in 2017-18 respectively.
- However, there has been a 5.2 percentage point increase in the proportion of Black students obtaining a first/2:1 since 2017-18.
- The proportion of BAME home students achieving a first/2:1 was slightly higher compared with BAME international students (73.4\% as opposed to 68.8\%). This represents an increased gap by 4.4 percentage points from last year.
- Among taught postgraduates, White students have consistently achieved a higher proportion of distinction/merit awards than other ethnic groups.
- Across all BAME PGT students, higher proportions of Asian and Arab ethnic groups received a distinction/merit ( $74.2 \%$ and $77.6 \%$, respectively) compared with Black and Chinese students ( $68.5 \%$ and $65.4 \%$, respectively).
Further details can be found in Tables 17-18.


## Race - 2018/2019 Actions

- A range of events focusing on BAME attainment, experiences in the black community and black culture took place at the University in celebration of Black History Month.
- The UoR's first Muslim Chaplain was appointed to provide faith-based guidance and pastoral care to students and staff across the University, particularly of Muslim students and colleagues.

Race - Actions planned for 2019/2020

- Implementation of our monthly ‘Global Buddies’ social scheme providing an informal social event in an alcohol-free environment. The scheme was designed to facilitate social engagement and the development of peer networks as well as an opportunity to signpost relevant support services.
- Continue to develop and pilot new initiatives to improve BAME student attainment and progression.
- Continue to work towards the implementation of our Student Attendance Management system which will allow us to identify disengagement early.
- Evaluate the use and impact of the Student Progress Dashboard in relation to BAME students and consider how it can be deployed to close the attainment gaps in attainment.
- Monitor the impact of targeted local BAME initiatives and consider scalability and applicability across the University.
- Pilot the Student voice panel with proportionate representation from BAME students.


### 3.3 Disability

## Disability - Headline data

The proportion of students disclosing disability has continued to increase from 11.8\% in 201617 to 14.9\% in 2018-19. 2,150 Undergraduates, 381 Taught and 101 Research graduates (equating to $17.5 \%, 9.1 \%$ and $9.3 \%$ respectively) disclosed a disability, representing increased proportions of disabled students at every degree level from 13.8\%, 7.1\% and 7.8\% respectively in 2016-17. 4.6\% of disabled students received Disabled Student Allowance, which has remained relatively static over the past three years. Across all degree levels, the proportion of disabled students with DSA achieving a first/2:1 or a distinction/merit was larger than those without DSA.

## Recruitment and admissions

## UG admissions by disability

- There were 2,429 applicants with a declared disability (11\% of all undergraduate student applicants, up from 10.3\% in 2016-17); of these 698 were accepted ( $15.8 \%$ of total undergraduate acceptances, a slight fall from 18.1\% in 2016-17).
- The offer rates to disabled students was comparable to nondisabled students (84.6\% and $84.7 \%$ respectively), but they had a considerably higher offer enrolment rate than nondisabled offer holders. This trend is similar to previous years.


## PGT admissions by disability

- In 2018-19 applications were received from 713 students with a declared disability (3.9\% of total taught postgraduate student applications). Of those who accepted offers from the University, 377 (9.2\%) were disabled students, up from 6.6\% in 2016-17.
- The offer rates to disabled and nondisabled students were comparable (66.2\% and 66.0\% respectively), narrowing the gap from 5.7 percentage points ( $61.1 \%$ for disabled students and 66.8\% for nondisabled students) in 2017-18.


## PGR admissions by disability

- There were 131 applicants with a declared disability, 4.3\% of all PGR applicants, up 0.7 percentage points from 2016-17. Of these 39 were enrolled ( $8.5 \%$ of all acceptances, a small drop from previous years).
- Disabled students tended to have a higher offer rate than nondisabled students (42.0\%, down from $47.3 \%$ and $32.2 \%$, up from $30.9 \%$ respectively), reducing the gap between the two from 16-17 percentage points in the last two years to 9.8 percentage points in 201819.

Consistently higher proportions of disabled offer holders actually enrolled compared with nondisabled offer holders at every degree level. However, the difference between the two at UG level was noticeably smaller than that at PGT and PGR levels.

Further details can be found in Tables 19-21.

## Progression, retention and attainment

## Progression:

- Consistently a slightly lower proportion of disabled UG students passed at the first attempt compared with nondisabled students ( $79 \%$ and $82.5 \%$, respectively). This trend is similar to previous years.
- The proportion of disabled students with DSA support who passed at first attempt (80.4\%) was comparable to nondisabled students ( $82.5 \%$ ), but there was a 4 percentage point disparity for disabled students without DSA support (78.4\%). This pattern has little change since 2016-17.

Further details can be found in Table 22.

## Retention:

- At UG level, overall the retention rate was higher among nondisabled students, although disabled student retention edged up to $93.3 \%$ from $92.9 \%$ last year, which was comparable to nondisabled students (93.6\%, a small fall from 95.3\% in 2017-18).
- Similarly, at PGT level, retention rates were comparable among disabled (96.42\%, up from 94.4\% last year) and nondisabled students (96.35\%, up from 95.8\% in 2017-18).
- At both UG and PGT levels, disabled students with DSA consistently had higher retention than nondisabled students over the last three years. The proportions of disabled and nondisabled students who withdrew from their study were comparable.
- There were no significant differences in retention rates between disabled and nondisabled students at PGR level, but there remained a trend that disabled students with DSA had a slightly higher retention rate (98.1\%) than nondisabled students (97\%).
Further details can be found in Tables 23-25.


## Attainment:

- Consistently disabled undergraduates achieved slightly fewer $1^{\text {st }} / 2: 1$ degrees than nondisabled students ( $80.6 \%$ as opposed to $82.2 \%$ ), but the proportion of disabled students with DSA achieving a $1^{\text {st }} / 2: 1$ (82.9\%) was comparable to nondisabled students (82.2\%) in recent two years.
- At PGT level, overall disabled students attained similar proportions of distinction/merit awards in the last three year (around $78 \%$ for each cohort) with the exception of last year, only $74 \%$ for disabled students in comparison to $78.2 \%$ for nondisabled students.
- In the same period, there remained a trend that disabled PGT students with DSA (81.1\%) consistently outperformed those without DSA (77.5\%).

Further details can be found in Tables 26-27.

## Disability - 2018/2019 Actions

- A dedicated team within the student accommodation was available to meet with all disabled students to discuss personal emergency plans. Further, a trained welfare lead was dedicated on site to meet students who need to discuss anything in confidentiality. All frontline accommodation staff were trained mandatorily in mental health awareness with a particular focus on disabled students.
- Continued support for disabled students in accessing learning includes support with making DSA applications, provisions of helpers for notes-taking, social support and academic mentoring. 386 students received this support in 2018-19.
- Estates pointed dedicated individuals with responsibility for providing advice on accessibility for disabled students to increased campus accessibility and inclusivity. It also included:
- the installation of 1:1 consultation pods to facilitate flexibility and accessibility
- the provision of additional 1:1 spaces for the Disability Advisory Service
- the improvements to the IT building entrance to provide level access for the mobility impaired
- the reconfiguration of the entrance and doors of university buildings to easy access of wheelchair users
- improvements to the library making better accessibility throughout the building
- Piloting of Blackboard Ally among students and staff as a tool to support learning.
- Piloted dedicated employability workshops for disabled students.


## Disability - Actions planned for 2019/2020

- Continue to improve the accessibility of all digital resources such as VLEs to improve the engagement of our disabled students.
- University-wide implementation of Blackboard Ally to provide teaching materials in alternative formats ondemand.
- Continued collaborative work with academics, professionals and RUSU to raise awareness of mental health and wellbeing matters among students and staff to respond to the rapid rise in students with mental health problems.
- Roll out of lecture capture to support student learning, functioning as an occasional replacement for students who miss classes due to chronic illness or a consequence of their impairment from dyslexia to visual or hearing impairments.
- Implementation of a new Student Case Management System to support Disability, Counselling and Wellbeing and Welfare teams in better communication and storage of student information in an appropriately accessible format.
- Launch of the Early Start Programme for students who wish/need to arrive at University early to familiarise themselves with the campus and services in a quieter environment.


### 3.4 Sexual Orientation

Sexual orientation - Headline data
In 2018-19, 3.8\% of students were identified as Lesbian/Gay woman, Gay man and Bisexual (LGB) and this has remained largely stable since 2016-17, oscillating at $4 \%$. Due to smaller numbers, research postgraduate students who identified as LGB was excluded from any analysis in this report.

An additional caveat should be carefully considered before drawing conclusions from the report, however. Comparatively small numbers of LGB students at PGT level mean that data relating LGB is prone to significant annual fluctuation.

## Attainment:

The proportion of students who classified as LGB achieving a first/2:1 increased significantly, from $78.2 \%$ in $2016-17$ to $84.6 \%$ in 2018-19, which was 2.2 percentage points larger compared with those identified as heterosexual. This was mostly resulted in the higher proportion of LGB receiving a first in the same period (29.1\%), a steady increase from $22.7 \%$ in 2016-17.

Among home UG students, there was a similar but significant increase of the proportion of LGB students achieving a first/2:1 from 40.4\% in 2016-17 to 85.7\% in 2018-19. This was mainly caused by a significant rise in the proportion of LGB students, achieving firsts (30.4\%, a rapid increase by 18.8 percentage points from 2016-17). In contrast, the proportion of Heterosexual students achieving firsts has remained stable at $28-29 \%$ in the same period.

Only small numbers of PGT students identified as LGB but of these, a higher proportion achieved a distinction/merit ( $82.7 \%$ ) compared with $80.0 \%$ of Heterosexual students. However, the opposite pattern was observed in previous years. Further details can be found in Tables 28-29.

Sexual orientation - 2018/19 Actions and Actions planned for 2019/2020

See the sexual orientation section for staff for student-staff actions.

## Section 4 - Additional Information

### 4.1 Other Information (Staff)

## Support and Guidance

- The University has a range of mechanisms in place for staff for advice, guidance and support. We have an Employee Assistance Programme (EAP) provider and we have HARC (Health, Advocacy, Respect and Care) Advisors and Harassment Advisors who can also provide advice and support. These advisors are employees who volunteer for the roles and who receive appropriate training to enable them to do this.
- Contact with Harassment advisors is typically low, particularly in relation to diversity and inclusion issues. In the 2018/2019 academic year 5 contacts were made with Harassment Advisors and 2 of these were on diversity issues. This compares with 4 out of 5 enquiries being D\&I related in the previous year.
- Contact with HARC Advisors decreased to 2 in 2018/19 and neither of these were related to diversity and inclusion issues. In 2019/20, we are changing the way support is offered to staff and HARC advisors will be replaced by Wellbeing Peer Support Volunteers.


## Grievance and Disciplinary

- In the $2018 / 19$ academic year there were 13 grievance or disciplinary matters and 5 of these had a diversity and inclusion element. This is a significant decrease compared to 2017/18 when there were 9 disciplinary matters or grievances that were related to diversity and inclusion.


## Committee Data

- Committee data shows some improvement in the diversity of committees in relation to race / ethnicity.
- There has been a $3.7 \%$ increase in BAME representation in Senate compared to last year. It is now $7.7 \%$.
- Council now has $11.5 \%$ BAME representation and University Executive Board (UEB) has 12.5\% BAME representation
- Strategy \& Finance Committee (S\&FC) remains unchanged at 100\%
- A positive shift has been made in relation to gender balance for Council, University Board for Teaching and Learning Senate, University Executive Board (UEB) and University Renumeration Committee, all of which have increased female representation.
- The Committees and Boards that meet the targets for $30 \%$ representation of either gender include the following:
- Council - Female 38.1\% and Male 61.5\%
- University Board for Teaching and Learning - Female 60\% and Male 40\%
- University Executive Board - Female 25\% and Male 75\%
- University Renumeration Committee - Female 40\% and Male 60\%
- University Research and Innovation - Female 39.1\% and Male 60.9\%

This means that apart from UEB ( $5 \%$ short of target) and Strategy \& Finance Committee ( $13.3 \%$ short of target) we have met the targets for $30 \%$ representation of either gender.

## Learning and Development

We offer a range of learning and development opportunities to support all staff, including the following programmes specific to Women, BAME and LGBT+ staff to help them develop and progress in their careers.
In 2018/19 staff were offered access to the following talent and leadership development programmes:

- Springboard-26 women attended this programme that supports them to enhance their own skills and abilities, challenge power and inequity, while building confidence, assertiveness and a positive image. Changes have been madetothe application and evaluation process to ensure that we capture changes to behaviour and benefits to the organisation in more detail.
- StellarHE - 2 BAME staff members attended this leadership development programme that has been designed specifically to develop and implement leadership strategies that reflect the unique challenges and experiences of BAME academic and professional services staff across the higher education sector.
- Aurora - 10 female staff members attended the Aurora programme that aims to encourage a wide range of women in academic and professional roles to think of themselves as leaders, to develop leadership skills and to help the employer institutions maximise the potential of thesewomen.
- Stonewall Leadership Programme - Two LGBT+ members of staff were sponsored to attend this leadership development programme that provides a chance for participants to reflect on how their identity as an LGBT person has had an impact on their leadership journey and explore how they can become a more authentic, inclusive and visible leader
- Advance HE (formerly LFHE) Diversifying Leadership - 1 BAME staff member participated in this programme comprised of three one-day workshops, plus a facilitated action learning set day that explores leadership theory, cultural identity and power and influence, as well as
individual goalsetting and action planning to support participants in applying theirlearning post-programme.
- RISE (Ready for an inclusive and supportive environment at the University of Reading) was piloted in 2019 with 17 staff attending.

The aim of this programme is to provide staff the skills and confidence in their ability to:

- role model University behaviours and contribute positively to D\&l initiatives within their School or Function
- Make a difference and call out behaviour from any position they may sit in
- Find ways they can be involved in actively addressing and promoting a diverse and inclusive working environment
- Apply techniques that can be used to challenge and develop themselves in all areas of life in order to achieve their full potential
- Foster and develop effective networks
- Set clear and practical personal and career goals

Feedback from the pilot has been positive and 2 further programmes are scheduled to be delivered in 2019/20

We continually review the impact of these talent and leadership development programmes and seek potential alternatives if needed. Feedback from participants from the programmes this year is below:

- Aurora - is rated as good to excellent and the most valued elements were external speakers sharing their experience, and the power and politics session. Delegates reported gaining an insight into 'how to make the boat go faster' by way of approach. The provision ofamentorbytheUniversitywas alsoseen asincrediblyuseful(notallorganisationsdo this) and the women-only nature of the course helped connections build between delegates morequickly, resulting in deeper conversations and exploration oftopics.
- Springboard - feedback continues to be positive with the key themes being around confidence building, networking and goal setting. Participants reported feeling more positive and self-aware because of the course. They also noted they felt more confident in speaking out about issues they had experienced. They said that the programme provided a good insight into how they perceive themselves and how others perceive them - this was noted as useful in recognising and developing their strengths. Participants also mentioned they were already benefiting from the direction on structuring their goals, assessing where they want to be and how to get there.


### 4.2 Other Information (Students)

### 4.2.1 Student complaints

The data collation process was not yet completed at the time of publication.

### 4.2.2 Student appeals

The data collation process was not yet completed at the time of publication.

## Section 5 - Staff and Student Profile

### 5.1 Staff Profile

The University of Reading staff profile taken from a 31 March 2019 snapshot is below:
Sex

| Category | Headcount | Proportion |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 2523 | $57.4 \%$ |
| Male | 1870 | $42.6 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 4393 |  |

Ethnicity

| Category | Headcount | Proportion |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Asian | 288 | $6.6 \%$ |
| Black | 92 | $2.1 \%$ |
| Chinese | 114 | $2.6 \%$ |
| Mixed | 24 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Other | 63 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Unknown | 673 | $15.3 \%$ |
| White | 3139 | $71.5 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 4393 |  |

## Sexual Orientation

| Category | Headcount | Proportion |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Bisexual | 41 | $0.9 \%$ |
| Gay man | 42 | $1.0 \%$ |
| Gay woman / lesbian | 25 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Heterosexual / straight | 2047 | $46.6 \%$ |
| Other | 16 | $0.4 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 177 | $4.0 \%$ |
| (blank) | 2045 | $46.6 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 4393 | $100.0 \%$ |

Considered Disabled

| Category | Headcount | Proportion |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No | 3082 | $70.2 \%$ |
| Not Known | 543 | $12.4 \%$ |
| Yes | 108 | $2.5 \%$ |
| (blank) | 660 | $15.0 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 4393 |  |

## Religion and Belief

| Category | Headcount | Proportion |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agnostic | 327 | 7.4\% |
| Atheist | 512 | 11.7\% |
| Buddhist - Hinayana | 6 | 0.1\% |
| Buddhist - Mahayana | 18 | 0.4\% |
| Christian - Orthodox | 127 | 2.9\% |
| Christian - Protestant | 476 | 10.8\% |
| Christian - Roman Catholic | 246 | 5.6\% |
| Confucianism | 3 | 0.1\% |
| Hinduism | 73 | 1.7\% |
| Islam - Shiite | 7 | 0.2\% |
| Islam - Sunni | 41 | 0.9\% |
| Judaism - Orthodox | 5 | 0.1\% |
| Judaism - Reform | 8 | 0.2\% |
| Not Specified | 498 | 11.3\% |
| Other | 80 | 1.8\% |
| Sikhism | 18 | 0.4\% |
| Taoism | 4 | 0.1\% |
| (blank) | 1944 | 44.3\% |
| Grand Total | 4393 |  |

### 5.2 Student Profile

This section provides a snapshot of the university's population, split bygender, ethnicity, and disability in addition to other protected characteristics (age, sexual orientation, religion and belief). The ethnicity data has been presented in terms of BAME.

All UoR student population by level of study over three years

|  | IFP\&FD | UG | PGT | PGR | Grand Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Headcount | Headcount | Headcount | Headcount |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 7}$ | 183 | 10909 | 3618 | 1097 | 15807 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 8}$ | 217 | 12073 | 3626 | 1047 | 16963 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 9}$ | 198 | 12322 | 4170 | 1091 | $\mathbf{1 7 7 8 1}$ |

## Gender

All UoR students by gender over three years

|  |  | Female | Male | Other/Unspecified | Grand Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2016 / 7$ | Headcount | 9027 | 6805 | 7 | 15839 |
|  | Percentage | $56.99 \%$ | $42.96 \%$ | $0.04 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |
|  | Headcount | 9705 | 7283 | 8 | 16996 |
|  | Percentage | $57.10 \%$ | $42.85 \%$ | $0.05 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |
| $2018 / 9$ | Headcount | 9952 | 7835 | 17 | 17804 |
|  | Percentage | $55.90 \%$ | $44.01 \%$ | $0.10 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |

All UoR students by gender over three years

|  |  |  | Female | Male | Other/Unspecified | UoR Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UG | 2016/7 | Headcount | 6241 | 4666 | 2 | 10909 |
|  |  | Percentage | 57.21\% | 42.77\% | 0.02\% | 100.00\% |
|  | 2017/8 | Headcount | 6814 | 5258 | 1 | 12073 |
|  |  | Percentage | 56.44\% | 43.55\% | 0.01\% | 100.00\% |
|  | 2018/9 | Headcount | 6854 | 5468 | 0 | 12322 |
|  |  | Percentage | 55.62\% | 44.38\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |
| PGT | 2016/7 | Headcount | 2076 | 1539 | 3 | 3618 |
|  |  | Percentage | 57.38\% | 42.54\% | 0.08\% | 100.00\% |
|  | 2017/8 | Headcount | 2154 | 1467 | 5 | 3626 |
|  |  | Percentage | 59.40\% | 40.46\% | 0.14\% | 100.00\% |
|  | 2018/9 | Headcount | 2347 | 1811 | 12 | 4170 |
|  |  | Percentage | 56.28\% | 43.43\% | 0.29\% | 100.00\% |
| PGR | 2016/7 | Headcount | 588 | 507 | 2 | 1097 |
|  |  | Percentage | 53.60\% | 46.22\% | 0.18\% | 100.00\% |
|  | 2017/8 | Headcount | 575 | 470 | 2 | 1047 |
|  |  | Percentage | 54.92\% | 44.89\% | 0.19\% | 100.00\% |
|  | 2018/9 | Headcount | 590 | 497 | 4 | 1091 |
|  |  | Percentage | 54.08\% | 45.55\% | 0.37\% | 100.00\% |

UoR UG students by subject of study and gender 2018/19


## Ethnicity

Institutional level ethnicity breakdown over three years

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / \mathbf { 7 }}$ |  |  | 2017/8 | 2018/9 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Arab | 418 | $2.64 \%$ | 450 | $2.65 \%$ | 465 | $2.61 \%$ |
| Asian - Chinese | 1345 | $8.49 \%$ | 1526 | $8.98 \%$ | 1477 | $8.30 \%$ |
| Asian - excluding <br> Chinese | 1651 | $10.42 \%$ | 1822 | $10.72 \%$ | 2094 | $11.76 \%$ |
| Black | 709 | $4.48 \%$ | 808 | $4.75 \%$ | 940 | $5.28 \%$ |
| Mixed | 560 | $3.54 \%$ | 605 | $3.56 \%$ | 657 | $3.69 \%$ |
| Other | 138 | $0.87 \%$ | 167 | $0.98 \%$ | 188 | $1.06 \%$ |
| Unknown | 596 | $3.76 \%$ | 763 | $4.49 \%$ | 857 | $4.81 \%$ |
| White | 10422 | $65.80 \%$ | 10855 | $63.87 \%$ | 11126 | $62.49 \%$ |
| All BAME | 4821 | $30.44 \%$ | 5378 | $31.64 \%$ | 5821 | $32.69 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 15839 | $100.00 \%$ | 16996 | $100.00 \%$ | 17804 | $100.00 \%$ |

Proportions of all BAME students at the University by level of study over three years


UoR all student numbers by known ethnicity and domicile (2018/19)


Disability

All UoR students by disability

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 7}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 9}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Disabled - DSA | 652 | $4.12 \%$ | 706 | $4.15 \%$ | 817 | $4.59 \%$ |
| Disabled - No DSA | 1212 | $7.65 \%$ | 1426 | $8.39 \%$ | 1841 | $10.34 \%$ |
| No known disability | 13975 | $88.23 \%$ | 14864 | $87.46 \%$ | 15146 | $85.07 \%$ |
| All Declared Disability | 1864 | $11.77 \%$ | 2132 | $12.54 \%$ | 2658 | $14.93 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 15839 | $100.00 \%$ | 16996 | $100.00 \%$ | 17804 | $100.00 \%$ |

UoR all student numbers by disability over three years


Age

UoR all new entrants by age over three years

|  | 2016/7 |  |  | 2017/8 | 2018/9 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ or younger | 178 | $1.12 \%$ | 197 | $1.16 \%$ | 193 | $1.08 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ to $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 9907 | $62.55 \%$ | 10928 | $64.30 \%$ | 10825 | $60.80 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ to $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 2514 | $15.87 \%$ | 2659 | $15.64 \%$ | 2795 | $15.70 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ to $\mathbf{3 4}$ | 1771 | $11.18 \%$ | 1758 | $10.34 \%$ | 2066 | $11.60 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 5}$ or older | 1469 | $9.27 \%$ | 1450 | $8.53 \%$ | 1925 | $10.81 \%$ |
| Unknown | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 4 | $0.02 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 15839 | $100.00 \%$ | 16996 | $100.00 \%$ | 17804 | $100.00 \%$ |

UoR UG new entrants by age group over three years

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 7}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 9}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ or younger | 172 | $1.58 \%$ | 166 | $1.37 \%$ | 168 | $1.36 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ to $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 9792 | $89.76 \%$ | 10817 | $89.60 \%$ | 10738 | $87.14 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ to $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 759 | $6.96 \%$ | 827 | $6.85 \%$ | 1031 | $8.37 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ to $\mathbf{3 4}$ | 140 | $1.28 \%$ | 153 | $1.27 \%$ | 213 | $1.73 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 5}$ or older | 76 | $0.70 \%$ | 107 | $0.89 \%$ | 172 | $1.40 \%$ |
| Unknown | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 3 | $0.02 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 10909 | $100.00 \%$ | 12073 | $100.00 \%$ | 12322 | $100.00 \%$ |

Religion or belief

All UoR students by religion and belief (new entrants only) over three years

|  | 2016/7 |  |  | 2017/8 | 2018/9 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Any other religion or <br> belief | 73 | $1.00 \%$ | 80 | $1.02 \%$ | 77 | $0.95 \%$ |
| Buddhist | 186 | $2.55 \%$ | 237 | $3.01 \%$ | 222 | $2.72 \%$ |
| Christian | 2177 | $29.88 \%$ | 2425 | $30.83 \%$ | 2321 | $28.49 \%$ |
| Hindu | 174 | $2.39 \%$ | 198 | $2.52 \%$ | 226 | $2.77 \%$ |
| Information refused | 568 | $7.80 \%$ | 747 | $9.50 \%$ | 1030 | $12.64 \%$ |
| Jewish | 30 | $0.41 \%$ | 21 | $0.27 \%$ | 31 | $0.38 \%$ |
| Muslim | 502 | $6.89 \%$ | 627 | $7.97 \%$ | 737 | $9.05 \%$ |


| No religion | 3171 | $43.52 \%$ | 3356 | $42.67 \%$ | 3319 | $40.74 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sikh | 87 | $1.19 \%$ | 109 | $1.39 \%$ | 120 | $1.47 \%$ |
| Spiritual | 68 | $0.93 \%$ | 65 | $0.83 \%$ | 64 | $0.79 \%$ |
| Unknown | 250 | $3.43 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 7286 | $100.00 \%$ | 7865 | $100.00 \%$ | 8147 | $100.00 \%$ |

## Sexual orientation

All UoR students by sexual orientation (new entrants only) over three years

|  | 2016/7 |  |  | 2017/8 | 2018/9 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Bisexual | 176 | $2.42 \%$ | 212 | $2.70 \%$ | 188 | $2.31 \%$ |
| Gay man | 59 | $0.81 \%$ | 78 | $0.99 \%$ | 82 | $1.01 \%$ |
| Gay woman/lesbian | 32 | $0.44 \%$ | 21 | $0.27 \%$ | 40 | $0.49 \%$ |
| Heterosexual | 5796 | $79.55 \%$ | 6325 | $80.42 \%$ | 6418 | $78.78 \%$ |
| Information refused | 731 | $10.03 \%$ | 797 | $10.13 \%$ | 861 | $10.57 \%$ |
| Other | 96 | $1.32 \%$ | 132 | $1.68 \%$ | 149 | $1.83 \%$ |
| Unknown | 396 | $5.44 \%$ | 300 | $3.81 \%$ | 409 | $5.02 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 7286 | $100.00 \%$ | 7865 | $100.00 \%$ | 8147 | $100.00 \%$ |

## Section 6 - Diversity and Inclusion Data

### 6.1 Staff Data

Table 1 - Summary of changes to the Personal Titles Process

| 2016/2017 | 2017/18 | 2018/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Re written the criteria to be clearer with a requirement for evidence <br> - Been clearer on the requirements for success <br> - Requested a commentary which outlines how the achievements compare to what would be expected in that discipline | - Contextual statement submission for seconded staff introduced (Form C) <br> - Promotion explicitly open to all academic staff in the University group <br> - Personal circumstances process amended to ensure candidateandHead of School agree statement before submission to committee <br> - Final year where candidates on TI or T\&R contractwillbepermitted to submit an application without already having achieved HEA status | - As previously announced, all applicants must have achieved FHEA or equivalent prior to making an application <br> - All contextual statements must include a statement on the convention on multiple authorship, if any, commonly accepted within the discipline <br> - External assessments will no longer be requested for Associate Professor applications. For promotion to Professor, at least one external assessment will be required <br> - The application form has been revised to remove responsibility for the provision of potential external assessors from the candidates - instead, Schools will be asked to provide this information after the School Personal Titles Committee has determined which cases will go forward to the University committee <br> - From 2019/20, the School committee will be asked to indicate whether or not the candidate has demonstrated sufficient sustained quality by indicating yes or no only (rather than scoring 1-6 as in previous years). It is required that where a candidate is judged by the School not to have demonstrated sustained quality, the application will not be recommended to the University Committee |

Table 2 - Personal Titles Summary - Total Successful Applications for Associate Professor and Professor (by Sex)

|  | Successful applicants as a \% of the number of applicants in that sex. Actual no. in brackets. |  |  |  |  | Successful male or female applicants as \% of total successful applicants. Actual no. in brackets. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| Male | $\begin{gathered} 96 \% \\ (26 / 27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \% \\ (23 / 30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74 \% \\ (23 / 31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 70 \% \\ (32 / 46) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74 \% \\ (37 / 51) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54 \% \\ (26 / 48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 59 \% \\ (23 / 39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 43 \% \\ (23 / 53) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47 \% \\ (32 / 68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44 \% \\ (37 / 85) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (22 / 22) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 76 \% \\ (16 / 21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 73 \% \\ (30 / 41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75 \% \\ (36 / 48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75 \% \\ (48 / 64) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46 \% \\ (22 / 48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41 \% \\ (16 / 39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57 \% \\ (30 / 53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53 \% \\ (36 / 68) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 56 \% \\ (48 / 85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

Table 2a. Personal Titles Summary - Successful Applications for Associate Professor (by Sex)

|  | Successful applicants as a \% of the number of applicants in that sex. Actual no. in brackets. |  |  |  |  | Successful male or female applicants as \% of total successful applicants. Actual no. in brackets. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| Male | $\begin{gathered} 95 \% \\ (19 / 20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 78 \% \\ (14 / 18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 85 \% \\ (17 / 20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \% \\ (24 / 30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79 \% \\ (22 / 28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51 \% \\ (19 / 37) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51 \% \\ (14 / 27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48 \% \\ (17 / 38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \\ (24 / 40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48 \% \\ (22 / 46) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 100 \% \\ (18 / 18) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 81 \% \\ (13 / 16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75 \% \\ (21 / 28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 76 \% \\ (16 / 21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67 \% \\ (24 / 36) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49 \% \\ (18 / 37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49 \% \\ (13 / 27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52 \% \\ (21 / 38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \% \\ (16 / 40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52 \% \\ (24 / 46) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

Table 2b. Personal Titles Summary - Successful Applications for Professor (by Sex)

|  | Successful applicants as a \% of the number of applicants in that sex. Actual no. in brackets. |  |  |  |  | Successful male or female applicants as \% of total successful applicants. Actual no. in brackets. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| Male | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (7 / 7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75 \% \\ (9 / 12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54 \% \\ (6 / 11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \% \\ (8 / 16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \% \\ (15 / 23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 64 \% \\ (7 / 11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75 \% \\ (9 / 12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \% \\ (6 / 15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \% \\ (8 / 28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \% \\ (15 / 39) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (4 / 4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 60 \% \\ (3 / 5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 69 \% \\ (9 / 13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74 \% \\ (20 / 27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86 \% \\ (24 / 28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \% \\ (4 / 11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \% \\ (3 / 12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \\ (9 / 15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 71 \% \\ (20 / 28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 62 \% \\ (24 / 39) \end{gathered}$ |

Table 3 - Applications for Associate Professor via Personal Titles (by Sex)

|  | Percentage of applicants against sex baseline (total numbers of staff of each sex eligible |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4 - Applications for Professor via Personal Titles (by Sex)

|  | Percentage of applicants against sex baseline (total numbers of staff of each sex eligible |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | to apply). |  |  |  |  |

Please note that only candidates who made it to the University stage are included in the above data. Applicants who weren't successful at the School stage have been omitted.

Table 5 - Reward Processes (by Sex)
(Based on the 12-month period 1 April 2017-31 March 2018)

|  | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Additional Increment | 11 Male - 24\% <br> 35 Female-76\% | 10 Male - 39\% <br> 16Female-61\% | 12 Male - 32\% <br> 26 Female - <br> 68\% | 11 Male -24.44\% <br> 34 Female-75.56\% | 7 Male - 24\% <br> 22 Female - 76\% |
| Contribution Points | 14 Male2-29\% <br> 35 Female-71\% | 14 Male-44\% <br> 11 Female- <br> (56\%) | 19 Male - 32\% <br> 40 Female - <br> 68\% | 15 Male -28.30\% <br> 38 Female - 71.70\% | 12 Male - 30\% <br> 28 Female - 70\% |
| Merit Based Promotion | 2 Male-33.3\% <br> 4 Female-66.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \text { Male - } 71 \% \\ & 2 \text { Female - } 29 \% \end{aligned}$ | 3 Male - $43 \%$ <br> 4 Female - 57\% | 2 Male-33.33\% <br> 3 Female- 66.67 \% | 3 Male-50\% <br> 3 Female-50\% |

Table 6 - Lump Sum (by Sex)

|  | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number <br> Awarded | 130 Male - 30\% <br> 310 Female - 70\% | 154 Male - 36\% <br> 275 Female - <br> 64\% | $\begin{aligned} & 192 \text { Male - 41\% } \\ & 281 \text { Female - } 59 \% \end{aligned}$ | 220 Male-42.3\% <br> 300 Female -57.7\% | $\begin{aligned} & 191 \text { Male - 35\% } \\ & 349 \text { Female - } 65 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Average <br> Value | £545.85 Male <br> £504.95 Female <br> Difference $£ 40.90$ | £530.10 Male <br> £537.41 Female <br> Difference $£ 7.31$ | £457.31 Male <br> $£ 483.10$ Female <br> Difference $£ 25.79$ | £831.72 Male <br> £758.53 Female <br> Difference $£ 73.19$ | £533.32-Male <br> £464.39 - Female <br> Difference $£ 68.93$ |

Table 7 - Celebrating Success (by Sex)

|  | $14 / 15$ | $15 / 16$ | $16 / 17$ | $17 / 18$ | $18 / 19$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | $221(34.5 \%)$ | $220(34 \%)$ | $221(30 \%$ | $192(34.97 \%)$ | $296(34 \%)$ |
| Female | $418(65.5 \%)$ | $429(66 \%)$ | $524(70 \%)$ | $357(65.03 \%)$ | $565(66 \%)$ |

Table 8 - Gender Pay Gap

|  | As at 31 March 2017 | As at 31 March 2018 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Gender Pay gap (difference in mean <br> hourly rate) | $19.58 \%$ | $20.51 \%$ |
| Gender Pay gap (difference in median <br> hourly rate) | $20.99 \%$ | $18.52 \%$ |

[^4]Table 9 - Personal Titles Summary - Successful Applications for Associate Professor and Professor (by Ethnicity) *

|  | Successful applicants as a \% of the number of applicants in that category. Actual no. in brackets. |  |  |  |  | Successful male or female applicants as \% of total successful applicants. Actual no. in brackets. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| White | $\begin{gathered} 98 \% \\ (43 / 44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74 \% \\ (29 / 39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75 \% \\ (45 / 60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 76 \% \\ (59 / 78) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 72 \% \\ (65 / 90) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90 \% \\ (43 / 48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74 \% \\ (29 / 39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 85 \% \\ (45 / 53) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 87 \% \\ (59 / 68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 76 \% \\ (65 / 85) \end{gathered}$ |
| BAME | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (5 / 5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78 \% \\ & (7 / 9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & (4 / 8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \\ (9 / 15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79 \% \\ (15 / 19) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \% \\ (5 / 48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \% \\ (7 / 39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \% \\ (4 / 53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \% \\ (9 / 68) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \% \\ (15 / 85) \end{gathered}$ |
| Unknown | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (3 / 3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (4 / 4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ (0 / 1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83 \% \\ & (5 / 6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{gathered} 8 \% \\ (3 / 39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \% \\ (4 / 53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ (0 / 68) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \% \\ (5 / 85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

Table 9a.Personal Titles Summary - Successful Applications for Associate Professor (by Ethnicity)*

|  | Successful applicants as a \% of the number of applicants in that category. Actual no. in brackets. |  |  |  |  | Successful male or female applicants as \% of total successful applicants. Actual no. in brackets. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| White | $\begin{gathered} 97 \% \\ (33 / 34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79 \% \\ (22 / 28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 82 \% \\ (32 / 39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 83 \% \\ (33 / 40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 72 \% \\ (34 / 47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 89 \% \\ (33 / 37) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 81 \% \\ (22 / 27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 84 \% \\ (32 / 38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 83 \% \\ (33 / 40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74 \% \\ (34 / 46) \end{gathered}$ |
| BAME | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (4 / 4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \% \\ & (3 / 4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & (3 / 6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 70 \% \\ (7 / 10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67 \% \\ (8 / 12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \% \\ (4 / 37) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \% \\ (3 / 27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \% \\ (3 / 38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \% \\ (7 / 40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \% \\ (8 / 46) \end{gathered}$ |
| Unknown | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (2 / 2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (3 / 3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ (0 / 1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \% \\ & (4 / 5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{gathered} 7 \% \\ (2 / 27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \% \\ (3 / 38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ (0 / 40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \% \\ (4 / 46) \end{gathered}$ |

Table 9b. Personal Titles Summary - Successful Applications for Professor (by Ethnicity) *

|  | Successful applicants as a \% of the number of applicants in that category. Actual no. in brackets. |  |  |  |  | Successful male or female applicants as \% of total successful applicants. Actual no. in brackets. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| White | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (10 / 10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63 \% \\ (7 / 11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 62 \% \\ (13 / 21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 68 \% \\ (26 / 38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 72 \% \\ (31 / 43) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 91 \% \\ (10 / 11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \% \\ (7 / 12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 87 \% \\ (13 / 15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 93 \% \\ (26 / 28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79 \% \\ (31 / 39) \end{gathered}$ |
| BAME | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (1 / 1) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \% \\ & (4 / 5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & (1 / 2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (2 / 5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (7 / 7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \% \\ (1 / 11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \% \\ (4 / 12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \% \\ (1 / 15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \% \\ (2 / 28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \% \\ (7 / 39) \end{gathered}$ |
| Unknown | N/A | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (1 / 1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (1 / 1) \end{gathered}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (1 / 1) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{gathered} 8 \% \\ (1 / 12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \% \\ (1 / 15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ (0 / 28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \% \\ (1 / 39) \end{gathered}$ |

Table 10 - Applications for Associate Professor via Personal Titles (by Ethnicity) *

|  | Percentage of applicants against baseline (total numbers of staff of each sex eligible to apply). |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| White | 11\% (34/313) | 9\% (28/318) | 18\% (39/217) | 13\% (40/309) | 16\% (47/297) |
| BAME | 9\% (4/47) | 7\% (4/56) | 9\% (6/65) | 14\% (10/73) | 16\% (12/73) |
| Unknown | 0\% (0/28) | 6\% (2/33) | 10\% (3/29) | 2\% (1/49) | 9\% (5/56) |

Table 11 - Applications for Professor via Personal Titles (by Ethnicity) *

|  | Percentage of applicants against baseline (total numbers of staff of each sex eligible to |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 7 / 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 / 1 9}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 4 / 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 / 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 / 1 7}$ | $15 \%(38 / 256)$ | $17 \%(43 / 251)$ |
| White | $5 \%(10 / 220)$ | $5 \%(11 / 241)$ | $9 \%(21 / 245)$ | $15 \% \%(23 / 32)$ | $16 \%(5 / 31)$ |
| BAME | $4 \%(1 / 26)$ | $16 \%(5 / 31)$ | $6 \%(2 / 32)(7 / 31)$ |  |  |
| Unknown | $0 \%(0 / 7)$ | $1 \%(1 / 81)$ | $13 \%(1 / 8)$ | $0 \%(0 / 17)$ | $6 \%(1 / 18)$ |

* Please note that only candidates who made it to the University stage are included in the above data. Applicants who weren't successful at the faculty/school stage have been omitted.

Table 12 - Reward Processes (by Ethnicity)

|  | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Additional Increment | 7\% BAME <br> 89\% White <br> 4\% Unknown | 27\% BAME <br> 69\% White <br> 4\% Unknown | 11\% BAME <br> 87\% White <br> 2\% Unknown | 3 BAME - 6.67\% <br> 41 White - 91.11\% <br> 1 Unknown-2.22\% | 5 BAME - 17.24\% <br> 21 White - 72.41\% <br> 3 Unknown - 10.35\% |
| Contribution Points | 8\% BAME <br> 92\% White <br> 0\% Unknown | 8\% BAME <br> 84\% White <br> 8\% Unknown | 5\% BAME <br> 93\% White <br> 2\% Unknown | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4 \text { BAME }-7.55 \% \\ & 49 \text { White }-92.45 \% \\ & 0 \text { Unknown }-0 \% \end{aligned}$ | 6 BAME - 15\% <br> 34 White - 85\% <br> 0 Unknown - 0\% |
| Merit Based Promotion | 0\% BAME <br> 100\% White <br> 0\% Unknown | 0\% BAME 100\% White 0\% Unknown | 0\% BAME 100\% White 0\% Unknown | 1 BAME -16.67\% <br> 5 White-83.33\% <br> 0 Unknown - 0\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { BAME - } 33.33 \% \\ & 4 \text { White - } 66.66 \% \\ & 0 \text { Unknown - 0\% } \end{aligned}$ |

Table 13 - Lump Sum (by Ethnicity)

|  | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number <br> Awarded | 26 BAME - 6\% <br> 398 White - 91\% <br> 15 Unknown - 3\% | 32 BAME - 7\% <br> 373 White - 87\% <br> 22 Unknown - 6\% | 42 BAME -9\% <br> 412 White - 87\% <br> 19 Unknown - 4\% | 45 BAME-8.65\% <br> 445 White-85.58\% <br> 30 Unknown - <br> 5.77\% | 45 BAME - 8\% <br> 451 White - 84\% <br> 44 Unknown - 8\% |
| Average <br> Value | £506.92 BAME <br> £515.17 White <br> Difference $=£ 8.25$ | £471.88 BAME <br> £544.84 White <br> Difference = <br> £72.96 | £425 BAME <br> £480.47 White <br> Difference $=£ 55.47$ | £501.80 BAME <br> £827.13 White <br> Difference=$£ 325.33$ | $\begin{aligned} & £ 412.22 \text { - BAME } \\ & \text { £497.13 - White } \\ & \text { Difference }=£ 84.91 \end{aligned}$ |

Table 14 - Celebrating Success (by Ethnicity)

|  | $14 / 15$ | $15 / 16$ | $16 / 17$ | $17 / 18$ | $18 / 19$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BAME | $60(10 \%)$ | $57(9 \%)$ | $82(12 \%)$ | $59(10.75 \%)$ | $81(9 \%)^{*}$ |
| White | $556(90 \%)$ | $570(91 \%)$ | $612(88 \%)$ | $469(85.43 \%)$ | $700(81 \%)^{*}$ |

[^5]Table 15 - Ethnicity Pay Gap

| $14 / 15$ | $15 / 16$ | $16 / 17$ | $17 / 18$ | $18 / 19$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $22.20 \%$ | $20.06 \%$ | $19.80 \%$ | $14.23 \%$ | $20.98 \%$ (mean)* |
|  |  |  | $23.30 \%$ (median)* |  |

[^6]Table 16 - Grievance Data

| 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 grievances related to D\&I (1 not upheld and 1 withdrawn, 1 not concluded and 2 resulting in dismissal | 1 grievance re maternity leave, settled outside of the formal process <br> 1 disciplinary with a race equality element - final written warning | There were no grievance or disciplinary matters that had a D\&I element in the 2016/17 academic year | 9 grievances related to D\&। (1 exit outside of formal process, <br> 1 not pursued by the aggrieved, 6 not upheld, 1 in progress) | 13 grievances in total <br> 5 cases related to D\&I (race, gender, pregnancy /maternity, and age) <br> Of the 13,2 were upheld 8 were not upheld 2 resolved outside of the formal process and 2 were not progressed. <br> 13 disciplinary cases in total <br> 3 cases related to DI (disability, gender) <br> Of the 13,2 resulted in no action, 4 resulted in a written warning, 2 resulted in final written warnings, 4 were not progressed (for example, because the individual resigned or was made redundant), and 1 is still in progress |

Table 17 - Contact with Harassment Advisors

| $14 / 15$ | $15 / 16$ | $16 / 17$ | $17 / 18$ | $18 / 19$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 contacts | 4 contacts | 8 contacts | 5 contacts | 3 contacts |
| 3 related to D\&I | 1 relating to D\&I <br> (sexual <br> harassment) <br> disability and <br> sexual <br> harassment) | 6 related to D\&I <br> (sexual 2, racial 2, <br> pregnancy 1, <br> gender 1) | 2 staff, 3 <br> students) | 2 related to DI <br> (sexual <br> harassment and <br> gender) |
| 4 related to D\&I |  |  |  |  |
| (gender, sexual |  |  |  |  |
| orientation, race |  |  |  |  |
| and age) |  |  |  |  |$\quad$|  |
| :--- |

Table 18 - Contact with HARC Advisors

| $14 / 15$ | $15 / 16$ | $16 / 17$ | $17 / 18$ | $18 / 19$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 contact, not D\&I <br> related | 1 contact, not <br> related to D\&I | 2 contacts, not <br> related to D\&I | 3 contacts, <br> 1 contact related <br> to D\&I disability | 2 contacts, not <br> related to D\&I. |

Table 19 - Committees Data (By Sex)

|  | 14/15 |  | 15/16 |  | 16/17 |  | 17/18 |  | 18/19 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M |
| Council | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 24 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ 76 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 34 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ 66 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 37 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ 63 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 37 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ 63 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 38.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ 61.5 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Strategy and <br> Finance <br> Committee | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 92 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 17 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 83 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 17 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 83 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 17 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 83 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 16.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 83.3 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| University <br> Board of <br> Teaching and <br> Learning | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 43 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ 57 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 56 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 64 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 53 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 47 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 56 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 44 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 60 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 40 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| University <br> Board of <br> Research and <br> Innovation | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 25 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 75 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 50 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 50 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 52 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 48 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ 52 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 48 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 39.1 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ 60.9 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Senate | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ 42 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51 \\ 58 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ 38 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ 62 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ 41 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49 \\ 59 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47 \\ 59 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ 41 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ 47.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ 50.8 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| University <br> Executive <br> Board | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 14 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 86 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 14 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 86 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 25 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 75 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Renumeration Committee |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 33 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 67 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 40 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 60 \% \end{gathered}$ |

Table 20 - Committee Data (by Ethnicity)

|  | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Senate | 64 (92\%) White 3 (4\%) BAME 3 (4\%) Unknown | 72 (87\%) White <br> 4 (5\%) BAME <br> 7 (8\%) Unknown | 71 (89\%) White 3 (4\%) BAME 6 (8\%) Unknown | 55 (84.6\%) White <br> 5 (7.7\%) BAME <br> 3 (4.6\%) Unknown <br> 2 (3.1\%) Info refused |
| Council | 25 (96\%) White <br> 1 (4\%) BAME | $\begin{gathered} 29 \text { (97\%) White } \\ 1 \text { (3\%) BAME } \end{gathered}$ | 26 (96\%) White <br> 1 (4\%) BAME | 23 (88.5\%) White 3 (11.5\%) BAME |
| University Executive Board | 7 (100\%) White | 7 (100\%) White | 7 (100\%) White | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \text { (87.5\%) White } \\ & 1 \text { (12.5\%) BAME } \end{aligned}$ |
| Strategy \& Finance Committee | 12 (100\%) White | 12 (100\%) White | 12 (100\%) White | 12 (100\%) White |

Table 21 - Declaration Rates

| Protected <br> Characteristic | $\mathbf{1 4 / 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5} / \mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 / 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 / 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 / 1 9}$ | Direction of <br> Travel |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $99.96 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | No Change |
| Ethnicity | $92.38 \%$ | $93.15 \%$ | $87.35 \%$ | $93.18 \%$ | $92.73 \%$ | Slight <br> decrease |
| Disability | $90.79 \%$ | $92.43 \%$ | $86.58 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $70.89 \%$ | Decrease of <br> $7.11 \%$ |
| Sexual orientation | $40.70 \%$ | $56.82 \%$ | $56.83 \%$ | $52.87 \%$ | $48.79 \%$ | Decrease of <br> $4.08 \%$ |
| Age | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | No Change |
| Religion or belief | $39.84 \%$ | $51.78 \%$ | $51.57 \%$ | $47.25 \%$ | $43.74 \%$ | Decrease of <br> $3.51 \%$ |

Table 22 - Recruitment, Applications (by Sex)

| Gender | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 7869 | $57 \%$ |
| Male | 5167 | $38 \%$ |
| Unknown | 83 | $1 \%$ |
| [blank] | 584 | $4 \%$ |

Table 23 - Recruitment, Applications (by Disability Status)

| Disability status | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled | 155 | $1 \%$ |
| Not disabled | 1360 | $10 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 743 | $5 \%$ |
| [blank] | 11445 | $84 \%$ |

Table 24 - Recruitment, Applications (by Ethnicity)

| Ethnicity | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| BAME | 4695 | $34 \%$ |
| White | 7944 | $58 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 381 | $3 \%$ |
| Not Known | 95 | $1 \%$ |
| [blank] | 588 | $4 \%$ |

Table 25 - Recruitment, Success Rates of Applicants by Sex (as a percentage of applications from that sex)

| Gender | Not shortlisted |  | Interviewed by not successful |  | Successful |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Female | 6141 | $78.9 \%$ | 923 | $11.9 \%$ | 722 | $9.3 \%$ |
| Male | 4098 | $80.1 \%$ | 531 | $10.4 \%$ | 485 | $9.5 \%$ |
| Unknown | 62 | $75.6 \%$ | 10 | $12.2 \%$ | 10 | $12.2 \%$ |
| [blank] | 9 | $1.6 \%$ | 2 | $0.3 \%$ | 567 | $98.1 \%$ |

N.B. Rows may not add up to $100 \%$ due to rounding

Table 26 - Recruitment, Success Rates of Applicants by Disability (as a percentage of applicants of that disability status)

| Disability status | Not shortlisted |  | Interviewed by not successful | Successful |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Disabled | 102 | $65.8 \%$ | 30 | $19.4 \%$ | 23 | $14.8 \%$ |
| Not disabled | 931 | $69.4 \%$ | 210 | $15.6 \%$ | 201 | $15.0 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 462 | $63.4 \%$ | 117 | $16.0 \%$ | 150 | $20.6 \%$ |
| [blank] | 8815 | $77.8 \%$ | 1109 | $9.8 \%$ | 1410 | $12.4 \%$ |

N.B. Rows may not add up to $100 \%$ due to rounding

Table 27 - Recruitment, Success Rates of applicants by ethnicity (as a percentage of applicants of that ethnicity)

| Ethnicity | Not shortlisted |  | Interviewed by not <br> successful |  | Successful |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| BAME | 4018 | $86.4 \%$ | 357 | $7.7 \%$ | 276 | $5.9 \%$ |
| White | 5912 | $75.2 \%$ | 1062 | $13.5 \%$ | 886 | $11.3 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 296 | $79.1 \%$ | 36 | $9.6 \%$ | 42 | $11.2 \%$ |
| Not Known | 74 | $77.9 \%$ | 8 | $8.4 \%$ | 13 | $13.7 \%$ |
| [blank] | 10 | $1.7 \%$ | 3 | $0.5 \%$ | 567 | $97.8 \%$ |

N.B. Rows may not add up to $100 \%$ due to rounding

### 6.2 Student Data

Table 1 - UoR UG admissions by gender over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Female | Applications | 13287 | 55.31\% | 12451 | 53.83\% | 11935 | 53.82\% |
|  | Offers | 11126 | 55.50\% | 10957 | 54.54\% | 10191 | 54.26\% |
|  | Enrols | 2316 | 56.50\% | 2463 | 53.67\% | 2384 | 54.11\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 83.74\% |  | 88.00\% |  | 85.39\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 17.43\% |  | 19.78\% |  | 19.97\% |
| Male | Applications | 10736 | 44.69\% | 10679 | 46.17\% | 10240 | 46.18\% |
|  | Offers | 8920 | 44.50\% | 9134 | 45.46\% | 8590 | 45.74\% |
|  | Enrols | 1783 | 43.50\% | 2126 | 46.33\% | 2022 | 45.89\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 83.08\% |  | 85.53\% |  | 83.89\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 16.61\% |  | 19.91\% |  | 19.75\% |
| Other/ Unspecified | Applications | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 0.00\% |
|  | Offers | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
|  | Enrols | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |
| UoR Total | Applications | 24023 | 100.00\% | 23130 | 100.00\% | 22176 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers | 20046 | 100.00\% | 20091 | 100.00\% | 18781 | 100.00\% |
|  | Enrols | 4099 | 100.00\% | 4589 | 100.00\% | 4406 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 83.45\% |  | 86.86\% |  | 84.69\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 17.06\% |  | 19.84\% |  | 19.87\% |

Table 2-UoR PGTadmissions bygender over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Female | Applications | 8992 | 55.46\% | 10008 | 54.99\% | 10300 | 56.87\% |
|  | Offers | 6333 | 56.85\% | 6839 | 56.42\% | 6919 | 57.89\% |
|  | Enrols | 2077 | 60.57\% | 2314 | 60.75\% | 2456 | 59.73\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 70.43\% |  | 68.34\% |  | 67.17\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 23.10\% |  | 23.12\% |  | 23.84\% |
| Male | Applications | 7201 | 44.41\% | 8164 | 44.86\% | 7785 | 42.98\% |
|  | Offers | 4800 | 43.09\% | 5269 | 43.47\% | 5017 | 41.98\% |
|  | Enrols | 1350 | 39.37\% | 1491 | 39.14\% | 1645 | 40.00\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 66.66\% |  | 64.54\% |  | 64.44\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 18.75\% |  | 18.26\% |  | 21.13\% |
| Other/ Unspecified | Applications | 20 | 0.12\% | 28 | 0.15\% | 27 | 0.15\% |
|  | Offers | 6 | 0.05\% | 13 | 0.11\% | 15 | 0.13\% |
|  | Enrols | 2 | 0.06\% | 4 | 0.11\% | 11 | 0.27\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 30.00\% |  | 46.43\% |  | 55.56\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 10.00\% |  | 14.29\% |  | 40.74\% |
| Grand Total | Applications | 16213 | 100.00\% | 18200 | 100.00\% | 18112 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers | 11139 | 100.00\% | 12121 | 100.00\% | 11951 | 100.00\% |
|  | Enrols | 3429 | 100.00\% | 3809 | 100.00\% | 4112 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 68.70\% |  | 66.60\% |  | 65.98\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 21.15\% |  | 20.93\% |  | 22.70\% |

Table 3-UoR PGR admissions bygender over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 | 2017/8 | 2018/9 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |  |
| Female | Applications | 1158 | $43.62 \%$ | 1289 | $43.96 \%$ | 1328 | $43.58 \%$ |
|  | Offers | 410 | $51.70 \%$ | 478 | $51.68 \%$ | 451 | $45.33 \%$ |
|  | Enrols | 202 | $56.58 \%$ | 245 | $57.24 \%$ | 232 | $49.89 \%$ |


|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 35.41\% |  | 37.08\% |  | 33.96\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 17.44\% |  | 19.01\% |  | 17.47\% |
| Male | Applications | 1490 | 56.12\% | 1634 | 55.73\% | 1707 | 56.02\% |
|  | Offers | 382 | 48.17\% | 445 | 48.11\% | 540 | 54.27\% |
|  | Enrols | 154 | 43.14\% | 183 | 42.76\% | 230 | 49.46\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 25.64\% |  | 27.23\% |  | 31.63\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 10.34\% |  | 11.20\% |  | 13.47\% |
| Other/ Unspecified | Applications | 7 | 0.26\% | 9 | 0.31\% | 12 | 0.39\% |
|  | Offers | 1 | 0.13\% | 2 | 0.22\% | 4 | 0.40\% |
|  | Enrols | 1 | 0.28\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 3 | 0.65\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 14.29\% |  | 22.22\% |  | 33.33\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 14.29\% |  | 0.00\% |  | 25.00\% |
| Grand Total | Applications | 2655 | 100.00\% | 2932 | 100.00\% | 3047 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers | 793 | 100.00\% | 925 | 100.00\% | 995 | 100.00\% |
|  | Enrols | 357 | 100.00\% | 428 | 100.00\% | 465 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 29.87\% |  | 31.55\% |  | 32.66\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 13.45\% |  | 14.60\% |  | 15.26\% |

Table 4 - UoR UG students progression by gender over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Female | Passed at $1^{\text {st }}$ | 3702 | 90.47\% | 3759 | 87.62\% | 3522 | 85.03\% |
|  | Passed at $2^{\text {nd }}$ | 220 | 5.38\% | 277 | 6.46\% | 297 | 7.17\% |
|  | Failed at $2^{\text {nd }}$ | 61 | 1.49\% | 96 | 2.24\% | 79 | 1.91\% |
|  | Other | 109 | 2.66\% | 158 | 3.68\% | 244 | 5.89\% |
| Male | Passed at $1^{\text {st }}$ | 2578 | 83.54\% | 2770 | 79.78\% | 2722 | 78.17\% |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Passed at } \\ & \text { 2nd } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 270 | 8.75\% | 344 | 9.91\% | 360 | 10.34\% |
|  | Failed at $2^{\text {nd }}$ | 115 | 3.73\% | 177 | 5.10\% | 171 | 4.91\% |
|  | Other | 123 | 3.99\% | 181 | 5.21\% | 229 | 6.58\% |
| Other/Unspecified | Passed at 1st | 1 | 100.00\% | 2 | 100.00\% | 1 | 100.00\% |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Passed at } \\ & \text { 2nd } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
|  | Failed at 2nd | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
|  | Other | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Grand Total | Passed at 1st | 6281 | 87.49\% | 6531 | 84.12\% | 6245 | 81.90\% |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Passed at } \\ & \text { 2nd } \end{aligned}$ | 490 | 6.83\% | 621 | 8.00\% | 657 | 8.62\% |
|  | Failed at 2nd | 176 | 2.45\% | 273 | 3.52\% | 250 | 3.28\% |
|  | Other | 232 | 3.23\% | 339 | 4.37\% | 473 | 6.20\% |

Table 5 - UoR UG retention by gender over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Female | Withdrawn | 292 | 4.49\% | 315 | 4.46\% | 400 | 5.54\% |
|  | Retained | 6216 | 95.51\% | 6748 | 95.51\% | 6820 | 94.46\% |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0.00\% | 2 | 0.03\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Male | Withdrawn | 313 | 6.30\% | 318 | 5.74\% | 447 | 7.59\% |
|  | Retained | 4655 | 93.68\% | 5219 | 94.24\% | 5443 | 92.41\% |
|  | Unknown | 1 | 0.02\% | 1 | 0.02\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Other/Unspecified | Withdrawn | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 50.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
|  | Retained | 2 | 100.00\% | 1 | 50.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Grand Total | Withdrawn | 605 | 5.27\% | 634 | 5.03\% | 847 | 6.46\% |
|  | Retained | 10873 | 94.72\% | 11968 | 94.95\% | 12263 | 93.54\% |
|  | Unknown | 1 | 0.01\% | 3 | 0.02\% | 0 | 0.00\% |

Table 6 - UoR PGT retention by gender over three years

| 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 | 2018/9 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |  |
| Female | Withdrawn | 265 | $7.69 \%$ | 142 | $4.01 \%$ | 141 | $3.69 \%$ |
|  | Retained | 3181 | $92.31 \%$ | 3395 | $95.96 \%$ | 3678 | $96.31 \%$ |


|  | Unknown | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 1 | $0.03 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male | Withdrawn | 174 | $6.98 \%$ | 113 | $4.57 \%$ | 100 | $3.60 \%$ |
|  | Retained | 2320 | $93.02 \%$ | 2360 | $95.39 \%$ | 2679 | $96.40 \%$ |
|  | Unknown | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 1 | $0.04 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Other | /Unspecified | Withdrawn | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 1 | $16.67 \%$ | 0 |
|  | Retained | 5 | $100.00 \%$ | 5 | $83.33 \%$ | 14 | $100 \%$ |
|  | Withdrawn | 439 | $7.38 \%$ | 256 | $4.25 \%$ | 241 | $3.04 \%$ |
|  | Retained | 5506 | $92.62 \%$ | 5760 | $95.71 \%$ | 6371 | $96.36 \%$ |
|  | Unknown | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 2 | $0.03 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |

Table 7 - UoR PGR retention by gender over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Female | Withdrawn | 35 | 3.51\% | 29 | 2.79\% | 29 | 2.76\% |
|  | Retained | 961 | 96.49\% | 1012 | 97.21\% | 1022 | 97.24\% |
| Male | Withdrawn | 48 | 5.06\% | 37 | 4.06\% | 31 | 3.33\% |
|  | Retained | 901 | 94.94\% | 875 | 95.94\% | 901 | 96.67\% |
| Other /Unspecified | Withdrawn | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
|  | Retained | 2 | 100.00\% | 2 | 100.00\% | 5 | 100.00\% |
| Grand Total | Withdrawn | 83 | 4.26\% | 66 | 3.38\% | 60 | 3.02\% |
|  | Retained | 1864 | 95.74\% | 1889 | 96.62\% | 1928 | 96.98\% |

Table 8 - UoR UG attainment (First and 2.1) by gender over three years

|  | 2016/7 |  |  | 2017/8 | 2018/9 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Female | 1351 | $82.38 \%$ | 1640 | $85.02 \%$ | 1717 | $86.02 \%$ |
| Male | 891 | $74.00 \%$ | 1058 | $77.23 \%$ | 1104 | $76.30 \%$ |
| Other/Unspecified | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 1 | $100.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 2242 | $78.78 \%$ | 2699 | $81.79 \%$ | 2821 | $81.93 \%$ |

Table 9 - UoR PGT attainment (Distinction / A or B and Merit / C) by gender over three years

|  | 2016/7 | 2017/8 | 2018/9 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Female | 1081 | $78.96 \%$ | 1180 | $78.09 \%$ | 1082 | $76.90 \%$ |
| Male | 1016 | $77.68 \%$ | 956 | $77.98 \%$ | 1063 | $79.33 \%$ |
| Other/Unspecified | 1 | $100.00 \%$ | 1 | $25.00 \%$ | 2 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 2098 | $78.34 \%$ | 2137 | $77.96 \%$ | 2147 | $78.10 \%$ |

Table 10 - UoR UG admissions by ethnicity over three years (Home students only)

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Arab | Applications | 128 | 0.62\% | 141 | 0.72\% | 160 | 0.86\% |
|  | Offers | 96 | 0.56\% | 114 | 0.67\% | 128 | 0.81\% |
|  | Enrols | 22 | 0.62\% | 34 | 0.87\% | 33 | 0.89\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 75.00\% |  | 80.85\% |  | 80.00\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 17.19\% |  | 24.11\% |  | 20.63\% |
| Asian Chinese | Applications | 134 | 0.65\% | 143 | 0.73\% | 143 | 0.77\% |
|  | Offers | 113 | 0.66\% | 129 | 0.75\% | 123 | 0.78\% |
|  | Enrols | 20 | 0.57\% | 38 | 0.97\% | 29 | 0.78\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 84.33\% |  | 90.21\% |  | 86.01\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 14.93\% |  | 26.57\% |  | 20.28\% |
| Asian excluding Chinese | Applications | 2038 | 9.95\% | 2028 | 10.33\% | 2268 | 12.22\% |
|  | Offers | 1577 | 9.16\% | 1694 | 9.91\% | 1811 | 11.44\% |
|  | Enrols | 319 | 9.05\% | 424 | 10.84\% | 517 | 13.87\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 77.38\% |  | 83.53\% |  | 79.85\% |


|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 15.65\% |  | 20.91\% |  | 22.80\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Black | Applications | 1029 | 5.02\% | 976 | 4.97\% | 1063 | 5.73\% |
|  | Offers | 745 | 4.33\% | 761 | 4.45\% | 800 | 5.05\% |
|  | Enrols | 130 | 3.69\% | 211 | 5.39\% | 212 | 5.69\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 72.40\% |  | 77.97\% |  | 75.26\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 12.63\% |  | 21.62\% |  | 19.94\% |
| Mixed | Applications | 938 | 4.58\% | 861 | 4.38\% | 807 | 4.35\% |
|  | Offers | 786 | 4.57\% | 742 | 4.34\% | 681 | 4.30\% |
|  | Enrols | 174 | 4.94\% | 180 | 4.60\% | 167 | 4.48\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 83.80\% |  | 86.18\% |  | 84.39\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 18.55\% |  | 20.91\% |  | 20.69\% |
| Other | Applications | 200 | 0.98\% | 227 | 1.16\% | 216 | 1.16\% |
|  | Offers | 148 | 0.86\% | 188 | 1.10\% | 182 | 1.15\% |
|  | Enrols | 40 | 1.14\% | 46 | 1.18\% | 54 | 1.45\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 74.00\% |  | 82.82\% |  | 84.26\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 20.00\% |  | 20.26\% |  | 25.00\% |
| Unknown | Applications | 2048 | 10.00\% | 1892 | 9.63\% | 1690 | 9.10\% |
|  | Offers | 1641 | 9.54\% | 1580 | 9.24\% | 1425 | 9.00\% |
|  | Enrols | 107 | 3.04\% | 137 | 3.50\% | 142 | 3.81\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 80.13\% |  | 83.51\% |  | 84.32\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 5.22\% |  | 7.24\% |  | 8.40\% |
| White | Applications | 13971 | 68.20\% | 13369 | 68.08\% | 12216 | 65.81\% |
|  | Offers | 12101 | 70.33\% | 11891 | 69.54\% | 10683 | 67.47\% |
|  | Enrols | 2712 | 76.96\% | 2843 | 72.66\% | 2573 | 69.04\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 86.62\% |  | 88.94\% |  | 87.45\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 19.41\% |  | 21.27\% |  | 21.06\% |
| All BAME | Applications | 4467 | 21.81\% | 4376 | 22.28\% | 4657 | 25.09\% |
|  | Offers | 3465 | 20.14\% | 3628 | 21.22\% | 3725 | 23.53\% |
|  | Enrols | 705 | 20.01\% | 933 | 23.84\% | 1012 | 27.15\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 77.57\% |  | 82.91\% |  | 79.99\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 15.78\% |  | 21.32\% |  | 21.73\% |
| Grand Total | Applications | 20486 | 100.00\% | 19637 | 100.00\% | 18563 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers | 17207 | 100.00\% | 17099 | 100.00\% | 15833 | 100.00\% |
|  | Enrols | 3524 | 100.00\% | 3913 | 100.00\% | 3727 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 83.99\% |  | 87.08\% |  | 85.29\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 17.20\% |  | 19.93\% |  | 20.08\% |

Table 11 - UoR PGT admissions by ethnicity over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Arab | Applications | 700 | 4.32\% | 727 | 3.99\% | 843 | 4.65\% |
|  | Offers | 360 | 3.23\% | 385 | 3.18\% | 456 | 3.82\% |
|  | Enrols | 52 | 1.52\% | 72 | 1.89\% | 98 | 2.38\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 51.43\% |  | 52.96\% |  | 54.09\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 7.43\% |  | 9.90\% |  | 11.63\% |
| Asian Chinese | Applications | 5214 | 32.16\% | 6107 | 33.55\% | 6274 | 34.64\% |
|  | Offers | 3858 | 34.64\% | 4256 | 35.11\% | 4015 | 33.60\% |
|  | Enrols | 537 | 15.66\% | 664 | 17.43\% | 542 | 13.18\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 73.99\% |  | 69.69\% |  | 63.99\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 10.30\% |  | 10.87\% |  | 8.64\% |
| Asian excluding Chinese | Applications | 2471 | 15.24\% | 2676 | 14.70\% | 2698 | 14.90\% |
|  | Offers | 1753 | 15.74\% | 1791 | 14.78\% | 1799 | 15.05\% |
|  | Enrols | 402 | 11.72\% | 466 | 12.23\% | 530 | 12.89\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 70.94\% |  | 66.93\% |  | 66.68\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 16.27\% |  | 17.41\% |  | 19.64\% |
| Black | Applications | 1930 | 11.90\% | 2284 | 12.55\% | 2187 | 12.07\% |


|  | Offers | 1156 | 10.38\% | 1389 | 11.46\% | 1395 | 11.67\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Enrols | 146 | 4.26\% | 143 | 3.75\% | 190 | 4.62\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 59.90\% |  | 60.81\% |  | 63.79\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 7.56\% |  | 6.26\% |  | 8.69\% |
| Mixed | Applications | 783 | 4.83\% | 978 | 5.37\% | 847 | 4.68\% |
|  | Offers | 493 | 4.43\% | 614 | 5.07\% | 551 | 4.61\% |
|  | Enrols | 91 | 2.65\% | 100 | 2.63\% | 100 | 2.43\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 62.96\% |  | 62.78\% |  | 65.05\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 11.62\% |  | 10.22\% |  | 11.81\% |
| Other | Applications | 138 | 0.85\% | 165 | 0.91\% | 125 | 0.69\% |
|  | Offers | 80 | 0.72\% | 106 | 0.87\% | 84 | 0.70\% |
|  | Enrols | 28 | 0.82\% | 19 | 0.50\% | 32 | 0.78\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 57.97\% |  | 64.24\% |  | 67.20\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 20.29\% |  | 11.52\% |  | 25.60\% |
| Unknown | Applications | 569 | 3.51\% | 688 | 3.78\% | 776 | 4.28\% |
|  | Offers | 378 | 3.39\% | 436 | 3.60\% | 496 | 4.15\% |
|  | Enrols | 174 | 5.07\% | 230 | 6.04\% | 284 | 6.91\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 66.43\% |  | 63.37\% |  | 63.92\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 30.58\% |  | 33.43\% |  | 36.60\% |
| White | Applications | 4408 | 27.19\% | 4575 | 25.14\% | 4362 | 24.08\% |
|  | Offers | 3061 | 27.48\% | 3144 | 25.94\% | 3155 | 26.40\% |
|  | Enrols | 1999 | 58.30\% | 2115 | 55.53\% | 2336 | 56.81\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 69.44\% |  | 68.72\% |  | 72.33\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 45.35\% |  | 46.23\% |  | 53.55\% |
| All BAME | Applications | 11236 | 69.30\% | 12937 | 71.08\% | 12974 | 71.63\% |
|  | Offers | 7700 | 69.13\% | 8541 | 70.46\% | 8300 | 69.45\% |
|  | Enrols | 1256 | 36.63\% | 1464 | 38.44\% | 1492 | 36.28\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 68.53\% |  | 66.02\% |  | 63.97\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 11.18\% |  | 11.32\% |  | 11.50\% |
| Grand Total | Applications | 16213 | 100.00\% | 18200 | 100.00\% | 18112 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers | 11139 | 100.00\% | 12121 | 100.00\% | 11951 | 100.00\% |
|  | Enrols | 3429 | 100.00\% | 3809 | 100.00\% | 4112 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 68.70\% |  | 66.60\% |  | 65.98\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 21.15\% |  | 20.93\% |  | 22.70\% |

Table 12 - UoR PGR admissions by ethnicity over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Arab | Applications | 518 | 19.51\% | 561 | 19.13\% | 777 | 25.50\% |
|  | Offers | 106 | 13.37\% | 107 | 11.57\% | 137 | 13.77\% |
|  | Enrols | 31 | 8.68\% | 39 | 9.11\% | 64 | 13.76\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 20.46\% |  | 19.07\% |  | 17.63\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 5.98\% |  | 6.95\% |  | 8.24\% |
| Asian Chinese | Applications | 140 | 5.27\% | 197 | 6.72\% | 187 | 6.14\% |
|  | Offers | 51 | 6.43\% | 74 | 8.00\% | 96 | 9.65\% |
|  | Enrols | 26 | 7.28\% | 43 | 10.05\% | 39 | 8.39\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 36.43\% |  | 37.56\% |  | 51.34\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 18.57\% |  | 21.83\% |  | 20.86\% |
| Asian excluding Chinese | Applications | 498 | 18.76\% | 523 | 17.84\% | 485 | 15.92\% |
|  | Offers | 132 | 16.65\% | 157 | 16.97\% | 181 | 18.19\% |
|  | Enrols | 34 | 9.52\% | 42 | 9.81\% | 57 | 12.26\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 26.51\% |  | 30.02\% |  | 37.32\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 6.83\% |  | 8.03\% |  | 11.75\% |
| Black | Applications | 438 | 16.50\% | 543 | 18.52\% | 522 | 17.13\% |
|  | Offers | 95 | 11.98\% | 123 | 13.30\% | 136 | 13.67\% |
|  | Enrols | 28 | 7.84\% | 32 | 7.48\% | 33 | 7.10\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 21.69\% |  | 22.65\% |  | 26.05\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 6.39\% |  | 5.89\% |  | 6.32\% |
| Mixed | Applications | 199 | 7.50\% | 262 | 8.94\% | 193 | 6.33\% |
|  | Offers | 53 | 6.68\% | 62 | 6.70\% | 50 | 5.03\% |
|  | Enrols | 14 | 3.92\% | 17 | 3.97\% | 12 | 2.58\% |


|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 26.63\% |  | 23.66\% |  | 25.91\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 7.04\% |  | 6.49\% |  | 6.22\% |
| Other | Applications | 44 | 1.66\% | 40 | 1.36\% | 19 | 0.62\% |
|  | Offers | 17 | 2.14\% | 18 | 1.95\% | 4 | 0.40\% |
|  | Enrols | 7 | 1.96\% | 8 | 1.87\% | 2 | 0.43\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 38.64\% |  | 45.00\% |  | 21.05\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 15.91\% |  | 20.00\% |  | 10.53\% |
| Unknown | Applications | 102 | 3.84\% | 134 | 4.57\% | 173 | 5.68\% |
|  | Offers | 42 | 5.30\% | 54 | 5.84\% | 68 | 6.83\% |
|  | Enrols | 27 | 7.56\% | 37 | 8.64\% | 41 | 8.82\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 41.18\% |  | 40.30\% |  | 39.31\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 26.47\% |  | 27.61\% |  | 23.70\% |
| White | Applications | 716 | 26.97\% | 672 | 22.92\% | 691 | 22.68\% |
|  | Offers | 297 | 37.45\% | 330 | 35.68\% | 323 | 32.46\% |
|  | Enrols | 190 | 53.22\% | 210 | 49.07\% | 217 | 46.67\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 41.48\% |  | 49.11\% |  | 46.74\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 26.54\% |  | 31.25\% |  | 31.40\% |
| All BAME | Applications | 1837 | 69.19\% | 2126 | 72.51\% | 2183 | 71.64\% |
|  | Offers | 454 | 57.25\% | 541 | 58.49\% | 604 | 60.70\% |
|  | Enrols | 140 | 39.22\% | 181 | 42.29\% | 207 | 44.52\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 24.71\% |  | 25.45\% |  | 27.67\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 7.62\% |  | 8.51\% |  | 9.48\% |
| Grand Total | Applications | 2655 | 100.00\% | 2932 | 100.00\% | 3047 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers | 793 | 100.00\% | 925 | 100.00\% | 995 | 100.00\% |
|  | Enrols | 357 | 100.00\% | 428 | 100.00\% | 465 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 29.87\% |  | 31.55\% |  | 32.66\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 13.45\% |  | 14.60\% |  | 15.26\% |

Table 13 - UoR UG students progression by ethnicity over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Arab | Passed at $1^{\text {st }}$ | 96 | 68.57\% | 92 | 61.74\% | 105 | 69.08\% |
|  | Passed at $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ | 30 | 21.43\% | 27 | 18.12\% | 21 | 13.82\% |
|  | Failed at $2^{\text {nd }}$ | 2 | 1.43\% | 14 | 9.40\% | 8 | 5.26\% |
|  | Other | 12 | 8.57\% | 16 | 10.74\% | 18 | 11.84\% |
| Asian Chinese | Passed at 1st | 368 | 82.70\% | 351 | 76.47\% | 374 | 81.84\% |
|  | Passed at 2nd | 46 | 10.34\% | 68 | 14.81\% | 43 | 9.41\% |
|  | Failed at 2nd | 9 | 2.02\% | 11 | 2.40\% | 11 | 2.41\% |
|  | Other | 22 | 4.94\% | 29 | 6.32\% | 29 | 6.35\% |
| Asian excluding Chinese | Passed at 1st | 572 | 83.50\% | 661 | 76.06\% | 705 | 71.50\% |
|  | Passed at 2nd | 58 | 8.47\% | 95 | 10.93\% | 119 | 12.07\% |
|  | Failed at 2nd | 23 | 3.36\% | 43 | 4.95\% | 58 | 5.88\% |
|  | Other | 32 | 4.67\% | 70 | 8.06\% | 104 | 10.55\% |
| Black | Passed at 1st | 206 | 71.03\% | 255 | 64.07\% | 296 | 65.92\% |
|  | Passed at 2nd | 48 | 16.55\% | 72 | 18.09\% | 69 | 15.37\% |
|  | Failed at 2nd | 17 | 5.86\% | 35 | 8.79\% | 34 | 7.57\% |
|  | Other | 19 | 6.55\% | 36 | 9.05\% | 50 | 11.14\% |
| Mixed | Passed at 1st | 255 | 87.63\% | 275 | 79.71\% | 255 | 77.51\% |
|  | Passed at 2nd | 18 | 6.19\% | 31 | 8.99\% | 35 | 10.64\% |
|  | Failed at 2nd | 9 | 3.09\% | 16 | 4.64\% | 14 | 4.26\% |
|  | Other | 9 | 3.09\% | 23 | 6.67\% | 25 | 7.60\% |
| Other | Passed at 1st | 52 | 71.23\% | 68 | 72.34\% | 62 | 66.67\% |
|  | Passed at 2nd | 12 | 16.44\% | 10 | 10.64\% | 15 | 16.13\% |
|  | Failed at 2nd | 2 | 2.74\% | 7 | 7.45\% | 4 | 4.30\% |
|  | Other | 7 | 9.59\% | 9 | 9.57\% | 12 | 12.90\% |


| Unknown | Passed at 1st | 238 | 82.35\% | 244 | 75.78\% | 306 | 78.87\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passed at 2nd | 29 | 10.03\% | 38 | 11.80\% | 41 | 10.57\% |
|  | Failed at 2nd | 11 | 3.81\% | 25 | 7.76\% | 9 | 2.32\% |
|  | Other | 11 | 3.81\% | 15 | 4.66\% | 32 | 8.25\% |
| White | Passed at 1st | 4494 | 90.50\% | 4585 | 89.41\% | 4142 | 86.82\% |
|  | Passed at 2nd | 249 | 5.01\% | 280 | 5.46\% | 314 | 6.58\% |
|  | Failed at 2nd | 103 | 2.07\% | 122 | 2.38\% | 112 | 2.35\% |
|  | Other | 120 | 2.42\% | 141 | 2.75\% | 203 | 4.25\% |
| All BAME | Passed at 1st | 1549 | 80.51\% | 1702 | 73.55\% | 1797 | 72.87\% |
|  | Passed at 2nd | 212 | 11.02\% | 303 | 13.09\% | 302 | 12.25\% |
|  | Failed at 2nd | 62 | 3.22\% | 126 | 5.45\% | 129 | 5.23\% |
|  | Other | 101 | 5.25\% | 183 | 7.91\% | 238 | 9.65\% |
| Grand Total | Passed at 1st | 6281 | 87.49\% | 6531 | 84.12\% | 6245 | 81.90\% |
|  | Passed at 2nd | 490 | 6.83\% | 621 | 8.00\% | 657 | 8.62\% |
|  | Failed at 2nd | 176 | 2.45\% | 273 | 3.52\% | 250 | 3.28\% |
|  | Other | 232 | 3.23\% | 339 | 4.37\% | 473 | 6.20\% |

Table 14 - UoR UG retention by ethnicity over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Arab | Withdrawn | 0 | 0.00\% | 6 | 2.60\% | 8 | 3.40\% |
|  | Retained | 192 | 100.00\% | 225 | 97.40\% | 227 | 96.60\% |
| Asian Chinese | Withdrawn | 8 | 1.10\% | 6 | 0.77\% | 17 | 2.06\% |
|  | Retained | 717 | 98.90\% | 775 | 99.10\% | 810 | 97.94\% |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 0.13\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Asian excluding Chinese | Withdrawn | 22 | 2.08\% | 22 | 1.76\% | 62 | 4.13\% |
|  | Retained | 1038 | 97.92\% | 1229 | 98.16\% | 1438 | 95.87\% |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 0.08\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Black | Withdrawn | 6 | 1.42\% | 9 | 1.67\% | 18 | 2.82\% |
|  | Retained | 418 | 98.58\% | 529 | 98.33\% | 620 | 97.18\% |
| Mixed | Withdrawn | 13 | 3.00\% | 14 | 2.84\% | 19 | 3.63\% |
|  | Retained | 421 | 97.00\% | 479 | 97.16\% | 505 | 96.37\% |
| Other | Withdrawn | 0 | 0.00\% | 8 | 6.15\% | 5 | 3.45\% |
|  | Retained | 94 | 100.00\% | 122 | 93.85\% | 140 | 96.55\% |
| Unknown | Withdrawn | 382 | 40.47\% | 366 | 34.79\% | 468 | 40.21\% |
|  | Retained | 561 | 59.43\% | 685 | 65.11\% | 696 | 59.79\% |
|  | Unknown | 1 | 0.11\% | 1 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| White | Withdrawn | 174 | 2.29\% | 203 | 2.50\% | 250 | 3.10\% |
|  | Retained | 7432 | 97.71\% | 7924 | 97.50\% | 7827 | 96.90\% |
| All BAME | Withdrawn | 49 | 1.67\% | 65 | 1.90\% | 129 | 3.33\% |
|  | Retained | 2880 | 98.33\% | 3359 | 98.04\% | 3740 | 96.67\% |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0.00\% | 2 | 0.06\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Grand Total | Withdrawn | 605 | 5.27\% | 634 | 5.03\% | 847 | 6.46\% |
|  | Retained | 10873 | 94.72\% | 11968 | 94.95\% | 12263 | 93.54\% |
|  | Unknown | 1 | 0.01\% | 3 | 0.02\% | 0 | 0.00\% |

Table 15 - UoR PGT retention by ethnicity over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Arab | Withdrawn | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 3 | 2.10\% |
|  | Retained | 103 | 100.00\% | 113 | 100.00\% | 140 | 97.90\% |
| Asian - Chinese | Withdrawn | 7 | 0.70\% | 6 | 0.52\% | 1 | 0.08\% |
|  | Retained | 987 | 99.30\% | 1152 | 99.48\% | 1182 | 99.92\% |
| Asian excluding Chinese | Withdrawn | 9 | 1.25\% | 12 | 1.65\% | 11 | 1.39\% |
|  | Retained | 709 | 98.75\% | 716 | 98.22\% | 780 | 98.61\% |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 0.14\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Black | Withdrawn | 6 | 1.91\% | 5 | 1.81\% | 6 | 1.93\% |
|  | Retained | 308 | 98.09\% | 271 | 98.19\% | 305 | 98.07\% |
| Mixed | Withdrawn | 2 | 1.28\% | 3 | 2.04\% | 4 | 2.58\% |
|  | Retained | 154 | 98.72\% | 144 | 97.96\% | 151 | 97.42\% |


| Other | Withdrawn | 4 | 8.89\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 2 | 5.26\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retained | 41 | 91.11\% | 38 | 100.00\% | 36 | 94.74\% |
| Unknown | Withdrawn | 327 | 48.23\% | 172 | 31.33\% | 130 | 21.89\% |
|  | Retained | 351 | 51.77\% | 377 | 68.67\% | 464 | 78.11\% |
| White | Withdrawn | 84 | 2.86\% | 58 | 1.93\% | 84 | 2.47\% |
|  | Retained | 2853 | 97.14\% | 2949 | 98.04\% | 3313 | 97.53\% |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 0.03\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| All BAME | Withdrawn | 28 | 1.20\% | 26 | 1.06\% | 27 | 1.03\% |
|  | Retained | 2302 | 98.80\% | 2434 | 98.90\% | 2594 | 98.97\% |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 0.04\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Grand Total | Withdrawn | 439 | 7.38\% | 256 | 4.25\% | 241 | 3.64\% |
|  | Retained | 5506 | 92.62\% | 5760 | 95.71\% | 6371 | 96.36\% |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0.00\% | 2 | 0.03\% | 0 | 0.00\% |

Table 16 - UoR PGR retention by ethnicity over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Arab | Withdrawn | 0 | 0.00\% | 3 | 1.29\% | 3 | 1.22\% |
|  | Retained | 216 | 100.00\% | 229 | 98.71\% | 242 | 98.78\% |
| Asian - <br> Chinese | Withdrawn | 5 | 4.03\% | 2 | 1.65\% | 4 | 3.31\% |
|  | Retained | 119 | 95.97\% | 119 | 98.35\% | 117 | 96.69\% |
| Asian excluding Chinese | Withdrawn | 7 | 2.78\% | 6 | 2.53\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
|  | Retained | 245 | 97.22\% | 231 | 97.47\% | 229 | 100.00\% |
| Black | Withdrawn | 3 | 2.03\% | 5 | 3.36\% | 2 | 1.35\% |
|  | Retained | 145 | 97.97\% | 144 | 96.64\% | 146 | 98.65\% |
| Mixed | Withdrawn | 1 | 1.82\% | 1 | 1.69\% | 1 | 1.41\% |
|  | Retained | 54 | 98.18\% | 58 | 98.31\% | 70 | 98.59\% |
| Other | Withdrawn | 2 | 8.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 4.00\% |
|  | Retained | 23 | 92.00\% | 29 | 100.00\% | 24 | 96.00\% |
| Unknown | Withdrawn | 28 | 22.05\% | 23 | 16.31\% | 20 | 12.20\% |
|  | Retained | 99 | 77.95\% | 118 | 83.69\% | 144 | 87.80\% |
| White | Withdrawn | 37 | 3.70\% | 26 | 2.63\% | 29 | 2.94\% |
|  | Retained | 963 | 96.30\% | 961 | 97.37\% | 956 | 97.06\% |
| All BAME | Withdrawn | 18 | 2.20\% | 17 | 2.06\% | 11 | 1.31\% |
|  | Retained | 802 | 97.80\% | 810 | 97.94\% | 828 | 98.69\% |
| Grand <br> Total | Withdrawn | 83 | 4.26\% | 66 | 3.38\% | 60 | 3.02\% |
|  | Retained | 1864 | 95.74\% | 1889 | 96.62\% | 1928 | 96.98\% |

Table 17 - UoR UG attainment (First and 2.1) by ethnicity over three years

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 7}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 8}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 9}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Arab | 23 | $58.97 \%$ | 40 | $63.49 \%$ | 32 |  |
| Chinese | 169 | $67.60 \%$ | 236 | $75.64 \%$ | 246 | $75.18 \%$ |
| Asian | 188 | $68.61 \%$ | 226 | $79.58 \%$ | 230 | $69.49 \%$ |
| Black | 64 | $64.00 \%$ | 59 | $59.00 \%$ | 79 | $64.23 \%$ |
| Mixed | 74 | $71.15 \%$ | 87 | $79.82 \%$ | 105 | $78.36 \%$ |
| Other | 11 | $61.11 \%$ | 10 | $62.50 \%$ | 17 | $58.62 \%$ |
| Unknown | 117 | $70.48 \%$ | 122 | $75.31 \%$ | 113 | $76.87 \%$ |
| White | 1596 | $84.22 \%$ | 1919 | $85.14 \%$ | 1999 | $87.03 \%$ |
| All BAME | 529 | $67.39 \%$ | 658 | $74.43 \%$ | 709 | $70.97 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 2242 | $78.78 \%$ | 2699 | $81.79 \%$ | 2821 | $81.93 \%$ |

Table 18 - UoR PGT attainment (Distinction / A or B and Merit / C) by ethnicity over three years

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 7}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 8}$ |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Arab | 36 | $70.59 \%$ | 39 | $67.24 \%$ | 59 | $77.63 \%$ |
| Chinese | 356 | $61.38 \%$ | 458 | $67.06 \%$ | 390 | $65.44 \%$ |
| Asian | 272 | $75.77 \%$ | 258 | $75.00 \%$ | 285 | $74.22 \%$ |
| Black | 127 | $69.40 \%$ | 146 | $64.32 \%$ | 159 | $68.53 \%$ |
| Mixed | 56 | $72.73 \%$ | 49 | $81.67 \%$ | 52 | $77.61 \%$ |
| Other | 19 | $70.37 \%$ | 9 | $69.23 \%$ | 13 | $81.25 \%$ |
| Unknown | 121 | $86.43 \%$ | 101 | $78.91 \%$ | 154 | $80.21 \%$ |
| White | 111 | $88.10 \%$ | 1077 | $87.70 \%$ | 1035 | $87.27 \%$ |
| All BAME | 866 | $67.82 \%$ | 959 | $69.24 \%$ | 958 | $69.88 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 2098 | $78.34 \%$ | 2137 | $77.96 \%$ | 2147 | $78.10 \%$ |

Table 19 - UoR UG admissions by disability over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Disability declared | Applications | 2472 | 10.29\% | 2452 | 10.60\% | 2429 | 10.95\% |
|  | Offers | 2105 | 10.50\% | 2153 | 10.72\% | 2055 | 10.94\% |
|  | Enrols | 742 | 18.10\% | 799 | 17.41\% | 698 | 15.84\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 85.15\% |  | 87.81\% |  | 84.60\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 30.02\% |  | 32.59\% |  | 28.74\% |
| No disability declared | Applications | 21551 | 89.71\% | 20678 | 89.40\% | 19747 | 89.05\% |
|  | Offers | 17941 | 89.50\% | 17938 | 89.28\% | 16726 | 89.06\% |
|  | Enrols | 3357 | 81.90\% | 3790 | 82.59\% | 3708 | 84.16\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 83.25\% |  | 86.75\% |  | 84.70\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 15.58\% |  | 18.33\% |  | 18.78\% |
| Grand Total | Applications | 24023 | 100.00\% | 23130 | 100.00\% | 22176 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers | 20046 | 100.00\% | 20091 | 100.00\% | 18781 | 100.00\% |
|  | Enrols | 4099 | 100.00\% | 4589 | 100.00\% | 4406 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 83.45\% |  | 86.86\% |  | 84.69\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 17.06\% |  | 19.84\% |  | 19.87\% |

Table 20-UoR PGT admissions by disability over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Disability declared | Applications | 506 | 3.12\% | 635 | 3.49\% | 713 | 3.94\% |
|  | Offers | 338 | 3.03\% | 388 | 3.20\% | 472 | 3.95\% |
|  | Enrols | 227 | 6.62\% | 304 | 7.98\% | 377 | 9.17\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 66.80\% |  | 61.10\% |  | 66.20\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 44.86\% |  | 47.87\% |  | 52.88\% |
| No disability declared | Applications | 15707 | 96.88\% | 17565 | 96.51\% | 17399 | 96.06\% |
|  | Offers | 10801 | 96.97\% | 11733 | 96.80\% | 11479 | 96.05\% |
|  | Enrols | 3202 | 93.38\% | 3505 | 92.02\% | 3735 | 90.83\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 68.77\% |  | 66.80\% |  | 65.98\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 20.39\% |  | 19.95\% |  | 21.47\% |
| Grand Total | Applications | 16213 | 100.00\% | 18200 | 100.00\% | 18112 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers | 11139 | 100.00\% | 12121 | 100.00\% | 11951 | 100.00\% |
|  | Enrols | 3429 | 100.00\% | 3809 | 100.00\% | 4112 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 68.70\% |  | 66.60\% |  | 65.98\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 21.15\% |  | 20.93\% |  | 22.70\% |

Table 21-UoR PGRadmissions by disability over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Disability declared | Applications | 96 | 3.62\% | 112 | 3.82\% | 131 | 4.30\% |
|  | Offers | 44 | 5.55\% | 53 | 5.73\% | 55 | 5.53\% |


|  | Enrols | 33 | 9.24\% | 40 | 9.35\% | 39 | 8.39\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 45.83\% |  | 47.32\% |  | 41.98\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 34.38\% |  | 35.71\% |  | 29.77\% |
| No disability declared | Applications | 2559 | 96.38\% | 2820 | 96.18\% | 2916 | 95.70\% |
|  | Offers | 749 | 94.45\% | 872 | 94.27\% | 940 | 94.47\% |
|  | Enrols | 324 | 90.76\% | 388 | 90.65\% | 426 | 91.61\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 29.27\% |  | 30.92\% |  | 32.24\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 12.66\% |  | 13.76\% |  | 14.61\% |
| Grand Total | Applications | 2655 | 100.00\% | 2932 | 100.00\% | 3047 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers | 793 | 100.00\% | 925 | 100.00\% | 995 | 100.00\% |
|  | Enrols | 357 | 100.00\% | 428 | 100.00\% | 465 | 100.00\% |
|  | Offers as \% of Apps |  | 29.87\% |  | 31.55\% |  | 32.66\% |
|  | Enrols as \% of Apps |  | 13.45\% |  | 14.60\% |  | 15.26\% |

Table 22 - UoR UG students progression by disability over three years


Table 23 - UoR UG retention by disability over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Disabled DSA | Withdrawn | 13 | 2.28\% | 16 | 2.61\% | 18 | 2.51\% |
|  | Retained | 557 | 97.72\% | 597 | 97.39\% | 698 | 97.49\% |
| Disabled No DSA | Withdrawn | 36 | 3.80\% | 116 | 9.24\% | 137 | 8.57\% |
|  | Retained | 911 | 96.20\% | 1138 | 90.68\% | 1461 | 91.43\% |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 0.08\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| No known disability | Withdrawn | 556 | 5.58\% | 502 | 4.68\% | 692 | 6.41\% |
|  | Retained | 9405 | 94.41\% | 10233 | 95.31\% | 10104 | 93.59\% |
|  | Unknown | 1 | 0.01\% | 2 | 0.02\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| All Declared Disability | Withdrawn | 49 | 3.23\% | 132 | 7.07\% | 155 | 6.70\% |
|  | Retained | 1468 | 96.77\% | 1735 | 92.88\% | 2159 | 93.30\% |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 0.05\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Grand Total | Withdrawn | 605 | 5.27\% | 634 | 5.03\% | 847 | 6.46\% |
|  | Retained | 10873 | 94.72\% | 11968 | 94.95\% | 12263 | 93.54\% |
|  | Unknown | 1 | 0.01\% | 3 | 0.02\% | 0 | 0.00\% |

Table 24-UoR PGT retention by disability over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Disabled - } \\ & \text { DSA } \end{aligned}$ | Withdrawn | 1 | 1.09\% | 3 | 3.03\% | 1 | 0.85\% |
|  | Retained | 91 | 98.91\% | 96 | 96.97\% | 116 | 99.15\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Disabled - No } \\ & \text { DSA } \end{aligned}$ | Withdrawn | 9 | 3.00\% | 21 | 6.31\% | 19 | 4.30\% |
|  | Retained | 291 | 97.00\% | 312 | 93.69\% | 423 | 95.70\% |
| No known disability | Withdrawn | 429 | 7.73\% | 232 | 4.15\% | 221 | 3.65\% |
|  | Retained | 5124 | 92.27\% | 5352 | 95.81\% | 5832 | 96.35\% |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0.00\% | 2 | 0.04\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| All Declared Disability | Withdrawn | 10 | 2.55\% | 24 | 5.56\% | 20 | 3.58\% |
|  | Retained | 382 | 97.45\% | 408 | 94.44\% | 539 | 96.42\% |
| Grand Total | Withdrawn | 439 | 7.38\% | 256 | 4.25\% | 241 | 3.64\% |
|  | Retained | 5506 | 92.62\% | 5760 | 95.71\% | 6371 | 96.36\% |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 0.00\% | 2 | 0.03\% | 0 | 0.00\% |

Table 25 - UoR PGR retention by disability over three years

|  |  | 2016/7 |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Disabled - } \\ & \text { DSA } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Withdrawn | 3 | 6.98\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 1 | 1.92\% |
|  | Retained | 40 | 93.02\% | 42 | 100.00\% | 51 | 98.08\% |
| Disabled No DSA | Withdrawn | 4 | 3.67\% | 5 | 4.35\% | 6 | 4.32\% |
|  | Retained | 105 | 96.33\% | 110 | 95.65\% | 133 | 95.68\% |
| No known disability | Withdrawn | 76 | 4.23\% | 61 | 3.39\% | 53 | 2.95\% |
|  | Retained | 1719 | 95.77\% | 1737 | 96.61\% | 1744 | 97.05\% |
| All Declared Disability | Withdrawn | 7 | 4.61\% | 5 | 3.18\% | 7 | 3.66\% |
|  | Retained | 145 | 95.39\% | 152 | 96.82\% | 184 | 96.34\% |
| Grand Total | Withdrawn | 83 | 4.26\% | 66 | 3.38\% | 60 | 3.02\% |
|  | Retained | 1864 | 95.74\% | 1889 | 96.62\% | 1928 | 96.98\% |

Table 26 - UoR UG attainment (First and 2.1) by disability over three years

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 7}$ |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Disabled - DSA | 122 | $77.22 \%$ | 142 | $82.56 \%$ | 160 | $82.90 \%$ |
| Disabled - No DSA | 137 | $73.66 \%$ | 225 | $80.07 \%$ | 285 | $79.39 \%$ |
| No known disability | 1983 | $79.26 \%$ | 2332 | $81.91 \%$ | 2376 | $82.19 \%$ |
| All Declared Disability | 259 | $75.29 \%$ | 367 | $81.02 \%$ | 445 | $80.62 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 2242 | $78.78 \%$ | 2699 | $81.79 \%$ | 2821 | $81.93 \%$ |

Table 27 - UoR PGT attainment (Distinction / A or B and Merit / C) by disability over three years

|  | 2016/7 | 2017/8 | 2018/9 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Disabled - DSA | 25 | $80.65 \%$ | 28 | $77.78 \%$ | 30 | $81.08 \%$ |
| Disabled - No DSA | 73 | $77.66 \%$ | 75 | $72.82 \%$ | 107 | $77.54 \%$ |
| No known disability | 2000 | $78.34 \%$ | 2034 | $78.17 \%$ | 2010 | $78.09 \%$ |
| All Declared Disability | 98 | $78.40 \%$ | 103 | $74.10 \%$ | 137 | $78.29 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 2098 | $78.34 \%$ | 2137 | $77.96 \%$ | 2147 | $78.10 \%$ |

Table 28 - UoR UG attainment (First and 2.1) by sexual orientation over three years

|  | $2016 / 7$ |  |  | 2017/8 | 2018/9 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |
| Heterosexual | 1903 | $79.76 \%$ | 2311 | $82.51 \%$ | 2403 | $82.41 \%$ |
| LGB* | 86 | $78.18 \%$ | 138 | $83.13 \%$ | 148 | $84.57 \%$ |
| Other | 18 | $56.25 \%$ | 27 | $62.79 \%$ | 25 | $73.53 \%$ |


| Unknown | 235 | $73.90 \%$ | 223 | $76.90 \%$ | 245 | $77.04 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grand Total | 2242 | $78.78 \%$ | 2699 | $81.79 \%$ | 2821 | $81.93 \%$ |

LGB includes lesbian/Gay woman, Gay man, and Bisexual.

Table 29 - UoR PGT attainment (Distinction / A or B and Merit / C) by sexual orientation over three years

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 7}$ |  |  | 2017/8 |  | 2018/9 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage | Headcount | Percentage |  |
| Heterosexual | 1275 | $80.24 \%$ | 1388 | $80.23 \%$ | 1584 | $79.92 \%$ |  |
| LGB* | 46 | $76.67 \%$ | 56 | $74.67 \%$ | 62 | $82.67 \%$ |  |
| Other | 27 | $72.97 \%$ | 37 | $71.15 \%$ | 54 | $72.97 \%$ |  |
| Unknown | 750 | $75.60 \%$ | 656 | $74.21 \%$ | 447 | $72.33 \%$ |  |
| Grand Total | 2098 | $78.34 \%$ | 2137 | $77.96 \%$ | 2147 | $78.10 \%$ |  |

LGB includes lesbian/Gay woman, Gay man, and Bisexual.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ WP (Widening Participation) backgrounds commonly refer to all who might not view learning as an option, or may be discouraged by social, cultural, economic or institutional barriers, including Disabled, DSA, BAME, POLAR Q1/Q2, IMD Q1/Q2, household income $<25 k$, state school, mature students, care leavers, etc.
    ${ }^{2}$ IMD (Index of Multiple Deprivation) is a widely used composite measure of relative deprivation of small areas across England.
    ${ }^{3}$ The UK Engagement Survey (UKES) is a national survey co-ordinated by Advanced HE, running annually at the University since 2018.

[^1]:    ${ }^{4}$ Life Tools Talks is a training programme, attempting to equip students and staff with practical approaches when encountering mental health, academic transition and success issues at university.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ Employability confidence on both 'self-management skills' and 'problem-solving skills' increased by 11percentage points, followed by 'IT skills', a10 percentage point increase and 'planning \&organisation', a 9percentage point increase over the last three years when tracking down the 2016-17 cohort at UG level throughout their progress each year.
    ${ }^{6}$ The UoR's access programme, a pre-entry online course provides the new University students with essential guide for starting university. The key target audience is disadvantaged students but open to all Part 1 students.
    ${ }^{7}$ The UoR's access programme, a peer-led support scheme where student mentors provide academic support for other students in the same subject areas through delivering study support sessions as needed.
    ${ }^{8}$ The UoR's access programme, a peer-led support scheme, attempting to help new entrants manage their transition process and settle into university.
    ${ }^{9}$ The UoR's access programme which pairs alumna/employers with Part 2 students for a 9/10-month period to help the mentees develop their employability skills.

[^3]:    ${ }^{10}$ Blackboard Ally is a user-friendly system that mainly generates downloadable formats for all course files automatically. It also allows users to self-check the accessibility of their learning materials and provides guidance on their further improvements.

[^4]:    * This uses the same data set as the Gender Pay Gap figures for the mandatory Gender Pay Gap report i.e. snapshot date as at $31^{\text {st }}$ March 2018

[^5]:    *This does not add up to $100 \%$ as a number of awards were given to staff who have not declared their ethnicity

[^6]:    * This uses the same data set as the Gender Pay Gap figures for the mandatory Gender Pay Gap report i.e. snapshot date as at $31^{\text {st }}$ March 2018

