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ROYAL HOLLOWAY UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
EQUALITY MONITORING DATA
EMPLOYMENT REPORT: 2012/13
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This is a summary of our full equality monitoring report for staff for the period 2012/13. We regularly monitor the profile of our staff to meet our legal obligations according to the Equality Act 2010 and in line with good higher education practice (HEFCE, 2004; ECU, 2013). Over and above our legal obligations, carrying out equality monitoring of our staff helps us to assess the impact of our equal opportunities policy, to develop our equality strategy and scheme; to identify areas for improvement; and also to recognise where we are making progress. This provides us with data to help us meet the public sector equality duty which requires HEIs in the exercise of their functions to have due regard to: eliminating discrimination, harassment, and victimisation; advancing equality of opportunity; and fostering good relations.

Staff profile

The staff population continues its recent pattern of growth. Distribution across staff groups remains largely within a percentage point of last year’s report, although over the last three years there has been a 2.5% drop in M&A. Around four out of five employees are on permanent contracts, though this varies from the vast majority of Academic and M&A staff being on permanent contracts to only one in five of Research staff. Part-time work is most common in the M&A and Admin 1-5 groups (at just under half). There were 2493 casual and visiting teacher contracts engaged, an increase of 182, of which there were 1544 of the former and 949 of the latter (a 4% increase of casual staff and a 14% increase of visiting teachers).

Gender

The percentage of female staff has stabilised around 52% (856), an increase from 49.7% in 2007, still below figures for national representation of 53.8%. There has been little change in the overall proportions of male to female academic staff and in their proportions at various levels. The mix of approximately three men to two women at Lecturer and Senior Lecturer levels changes to approximately three to one at Reader and Professor levels. However, the distribution across faculties shows up several anomalies. Arts and Social Science, despite having an exact gender balance at Lecturer and Reader levels, has imbalances at Senior Lecturer and Professor levels and consequently result in an overall imbalance of three to two in favour of men. The Science Faculty has even more dramatic imbalances with an overall proportion of three to one in favour of men. This is a barely unchanged picture over the recent monitoring period. Whereas, nationally, more than half of academic staff working in non-Science subject areas are women, at RHUL it is around 37% (108). It may be that a more balanced proportion is achieved by including the 46% (439) of visiting teachers who are women, although this data split by faculty is not available for this report.
Women applied for posts at RHUL in relatively high numbers, and were more likely to be shortlisted and successful in the recruitment process. In the academic group, despite female applicants being only half that of the male, appointments were almost exactly balanced. Overall, women again formed over half of new starters, and formed the overwhelming majority of those who completed training, including on H&S, IT, and ADS training. More women left the College than men and given the gender balance of academic staff leaving compared with the increased number of male starters, the male/female imbalance is likely to be further skewed.

**Ethnicity**

The percentage of all minority ethnic staff is virtually unchanged but the minority ethnic staff of UK nationality continues its slight upward trend (from 9.7% last year to 10.4%, 123, this year). Staff of Asian ethnicity are still the largest minority ethnic grouping, with those of Chinese ethnicity the largest within that. There is a higher percentage of women amongst the Black staff (62%, 16) than men (38%, 10), but the numbers of Asian staff are roughly divided equally between the genders. Overall, 12.6% (61) of all academic staff and 10.5% (32) of academic staff of UK nationality are of minority ethnic origin, figures which continue to mark a steady increase in numbers and proportion. Whereas minority ethnic academic staff (around two thirds of whom are of Asian or Chinese background) are, at twice the College strength (24.5%, 26), well represented at Lecturer level, that reduces to 7% (12) at Professorial level; these figures vary considerably across Faculties. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the total percentage of minority ethnic academic staff including those at Lecturer and at Professorial level, are higher than last year. While 45% (123) of White academics at the college with UK nationality are at professorial level, only 28% (9) of minority ethnic academics with UK nationality are at that level. RHUL attracts a very large number of minority ethnic job seekers (32%, 2468, of all applicants), this reduces to 16% (40) appointed (22%, 7, appointed to Academic posts; nil to Technical posts). Once appointed minority ethnic staff seem to be taking up training in proportion to their numbers in the College, although the percentage for whom appraisals are reported is well below their proportions on the staff.

**Nationality**

Applicants from 109 countries sought employment at RHUL, and more than a quarter of RHUL staff are non-UK nationals – of these, around 60% from the EU; 16% from the Commonwealth – mostly employed as academics or researchers. The decrease in the percentage of UK nationality academics (to under two-thirds) and researchers (to two fifths) has been steady since 2009. Academic staff are drawn from 38 countries and, apart from the UK, the highest percentages are from Germany and from the USA (5.8%, 29, of academic staff and 5.4%, 27, respectively). At lecturer and then at reader levels, non-UK academics equal those of UK nationality and at professorial level they are more than a quarter. Just over a third of new starters in 2012/13 were of non-UK nationality, again, most numerous in Research and Academic posts.
Disability

There is very little change in the overall percentage of disabled staff, which has hovered around the 2% level for some years (this year there are 1.9% (32) disabled staff), although there is a slightly higher percentage amongst casual staff (2.2%, 34) and visiting teachers (2.3%, 22). The proportions are fairly consistent across academic levels, all below 2%, although the overall numbers are small. The percentage of disabled applicants and of those appointed is higher than overall staff percentages.

Age

RHUL follows the general national pattern of age bands and is broadly consistent with recent reports. Casual and visiting staff have a younger age profile as do women and minority ethnic staff (with some variations between ethnic groups). The other decade age bands are relatively balanced apart from those in their sixties where men are the higher percentage. A higher proportion of Academic and Technical staff are in the 61+ band, with that rising to 23% (44) in the professorial roles. There were a large number of applications from and appointments of young people.

Sexual orientation

The percentage of staff who have provided data relating to their sexual orientation is 24% (404), up from 9%. Just over 4% (17) of those who provided data are gay, lesbian, or bisexual or have an other sexual orientation, with the remainder, 96% being heterosexual.

Religion or Belief

Of the 25% (407) of staff who have provided data on religion or belief, or who answered but preferred not to say, seven named religions or beliefs are represented, as well as a small number who were of an ‘other’ religion or belief. The majority (87%, 355) of those who provided data were almost equally split between Christian or of no religion or belief.

Carer responsibilities

Data on carer responsibilities is collected from new staff whose carer status is requested on application (and from whom 97%, 8030, provided data this year). Of those appointed, 18% (45) had carer responsibilities; they were appointed in five of the six job categories, 44% (20) of them in Admin 6-10 posts. Comparing numbers of carer applicants to shortlistees and appointees, carer responsibility does not seem to have been an impediment to obtaining an interview or securing a post.

Senior management

All senior managers (37) are on full-time permanent contracts. Just under three quarters of senior managers are male. The proportion of women senior managers has decreased in the last year so that they now represent just over a quarter of the total (27%, 10). Last year they were 31%. A very small number of senior managers declared a disability and a very small number are of minority ethnic origin. Just under
15% are of non-UK nationality. The age profile is higher than the age profile of staff, with 70% in the 51+ age bracket.

Conclusions

The staff population continues its recent pattern of growth. Distribution across staff groups remains largely within a percentage point of last year’s report. The percentage of female staff has stabilised and there has been little change in the overall proportions of male to female academic staff and in their proportions at various levels. Overall, women applied for posts at RHUL in relatively high numbers, and were more likely to be shortlisted and successful in the recruitment process.

The percentage of all minority ethnic staff is virtually unchanged but those of UK nationality continue its slight upward trend. Staff of Asian ethnicity are still the largest minority ethnic grouping, and there is a higher percentage of women than men amongst the Black staff. Amongst academics, minority ethnic origin staff are more prominent at lecturer than at professor level. RHUL attracts a very large number of minority ethnic job seekers and applicants from abroad: more than a quarter of RHUL staff are non-UK nationals, mostly employed as academics or researchers, a phenomenon that has been steady since 2009.

With regard to disability, age and carer responsibility there has been little change over this monitoring period. Proportions of disabled staff at RHUL lag behind national figures, although the percentage of disabled applicants and shortlistees is higher than that of the existing staff. With regard to age, RHUL follows the general national pattern of age bands and is broadly consistent with recent reports. On balance, carer responsibility does not seem to have been an impediment to obtaining an interview or securing a post. The two relatively new areas for which data is collected - sexual orientation and religion/belief - have both seen an increase in response rates, but it will be some time before robust conclusions can be derived from this, as yet, very partial data.

Recommendations

Recommendations are set out in the full report and cover:

- Discussion by the Equality Steering Group of this report, recommendations and action taken on recommendations from last year’s report. This should inform the development of the new Equality Scheme/Strategy.
- Inclusion in next report of equality monitoring data for College Council membership.
- Exploration of visiting teacher equality monitoring data by faculty.
- Keep under review collection of gender identity data.
- Look into reason for lack of inclusion of appraisal data for M&A staff.
- Reviewing response levels once MyView dashboard is launched, monitoring in particular the response rates for religion or belief and for sexual orientation.
- Consider looking at grievance and disciplinary data over a longer timescale than one year.
- Explore relatively low percentage of women in senior management roles.
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1. INTRODUCTION

This report of our staff profile for 2012/13 is based on staff in post at 31st August 2013. Activity data, for example the data on recruitment, grievances and disciplinaries, training and appraisals, is for the whole period 1st September 2012 – 31st August 2013. We have reported on the staff profile since 2003/04, developing and extending the data each year and, where relevant, making comparisons with previous years, which gives us useful trend information. A summary of the action taken in response to the recommendations in last year’s report is attached in the Appendix.

The report focuses on the main equality characteristics of age, disability, ethnicity, gender, nationality, sexual orientation and religion. We also include data relating to carer responsibilities. The report covers current status with regard to the overall staff profile and main job categories, contract type, recruitment and selection, new starters and leavers, staff undertaking learning and development, appraisals, promotions, and grievances and disciplinaries.

We regularly monitor the profile of our staff to meet our legal obligations according to the Equality Act 2010 and in line with good higher education practice (HEFCE, 2004; ECU, 2013). Over and above our legal obligations, carrying out equality monitoring of our staff helps us to assess the impact of our equal opportunities policy, to identify areas for improvement, and also to recognise where we are making progress including in relation to our Single Equality Action Plan. This provides us with data to help us meet the public sector equality duty which requires higher education institutions (HEIs) in the exercise of their functions to have due regard to: eliminating discrimination, harassment, and victimisation; advancing equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and fostering good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.1

The two additional areas of sexual orientation and religion which were reported on in a very limited way last year also feature in this report with slightly improved response figures due to the addition of new staff data and the updating of personal records by longer serving staff. Figures for reliable data now approach 25%-30% (though, given the nature of the perceived sensitivity of these categories, some responses are of the ‘prefer not to say’ kind), and therefore are still not yet sufficient to report on in detail.

We do not collect equality monitoring data relating to gender identity from staff. The ECU and the EHRC give advice on consulting in regards to monitoring gender identity and also, once the decision is taken to do so, advise on how to proceed (ECU, 2010, pp.27 - 29). We will continue to consider good practice in this area as it develops.

The Equality Challenge Unit reports on issues of pay as they intersect with equality considerations, but this report does not do so. The last RHUL equal pay audit was carried out as a separate exercise and was reported on in September 2012.

---

2. STAFF PROFILE

At the end of 2001/13, there were 1652 staff in post. A summary breakdown of staff in relation to percentages of women, disabled staff and minority ethnic staff is set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Staff profile - at a glance over past two years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Number at 31st August 2013</th>
<th>% of workforce at 31st August 2013</th>
<th>% of workforce at 31st August 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority ethnic (UK)*</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>10.4%***</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority ethnic (all)*</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>13.5%***</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* known ethnicity
** excludes 22 (1.8%) of UK staff who prefer not to provide details of their ethnic origin.
***excludes 45 (2.7%) of all staff who prefer not to provide details of their ethnic origin.

The split across the different staff groups for the past three years is set out in the table below, showing the continuing increase in administrative staff (Admin 1 – 5) and a new step up in Research staff compared to most other staff groups.

Table 2 Percentage of staff in different staff groups over a three year period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff group</th>
<th>2001/13</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin 1 – 5</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin 6 – 10</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; A</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Casuals and VTs
There were 2493 casual and visiting teacher contracts engaged, an increase of 182, of which there were 1544 of the former and 949 of the latter (a 4% increase of casual staff and a 14% increase of visiting teachers).
2.1 CONTRACT TYPE

2.1.1 Permanent/fixed term

Over 17% (287) of staff are on fixed term contracts – a continuing and steady increase over the last two years. The Academic and M&A groups are still the groups which have a minimum of fixed term contracts and Research posts have by far the highest number of fixed term contracts. The gender split in these contracts reflects very closely the staff profile in the College. The rise in fixed term contracts for minority ethnic employees noted in the last report has fallen back to near the figures for two years ago and is now only 3% more than that of White staff. The percentage on fixed term contracts is highest for staff of Black ethnicity (close to a third are on fixed term contracts – 8 out of 26 individuals). Apart from staff of Asian ethnicity or background, the percentages of all other minority ethnic groups on fixed term contracts are higher than the percentage of White staff (although numbers are quite small).
Overall, just about a half of starters (169) began on a fixed term contract, with this varying between all Research starters and only 7% of M&A starters; close to two-thirds of Technical and of Admin 6 - 10 posts were also contracted as fixed term.

Permanent/fixed term - academics
At RHUL only 3.2% (16) of academics are on fixed term contracts, the highest number in the lecturer group, where they are 7.3% (8) of that group and 50% of all academics on fixed term contracts.

Leavers by fixed term
Over a third of leavers (96) were on fixed term contracts. This is largely accounted for by the high number of fixed term Research and Admin 6 - 10 contracts coming to an end.

2.1.2 Full-time/part-time

![Figure 3 All staff full-time/part-time, 2012/13](image)

![Figure 4 Academic staff full-time/part-time, 2012/13](image)
Part-time contracts remain approximately a quarter of the total (435), and full-time staff are most common in Academic, Admin 6-10 and Research posts. Part-time work is most common in the M&A and Admin 1 - 5 groups (at just under half in each) and proportions remain within a few percentage points of what they were last year.

Women outnumber men on part-time contracts by more than 2:1 (almost 70%, 303, of those on part-time contracts are women and 35% of women are on part time contracts compared with only 17% of men). Men are 54.6% of those on full-time contracts (nationally, the comparable figure is 53.1% according to the ECU, p. 38).

The situation as regards ethnicity and part-time working remains the same, with just a four percent difference between White staff on full-time contracts (at 74%, 1031) and minority ethnic staff (at 71%, 153).

Overall, 62% (213) of starters were full-time, but this varies over staff groups, with only just over a quarter of starters (11) in M&A on full-time compared with 82.5% (47) of researchers.

**Full-time/part-time – academics**
Overall, 10.6% (53) of academics are on part-time contracts, with the highest numbers and greatest concentration at lecturer level (13.6%, 15) followed by professors at 12.6% (24), then 7.9% (11) of senior lecturers and 5% (3) of readers.

**Leavers by contract type**
Part-time staff were 44% (123) of leavers, an increase of 6% over last year.
2.2 GENDER

Nationally in 2011/12, 53.8% of all HEI staff in the UK were women (46.9% of full-time staff and 78.5% of part-time professional and support staff). Women comprised 44.5% of academic staff. A higher proportion of staff in professorial roles were male (79.5%) and men also comprised 52.7% of academic staff in non-professor roles and 72.5% of academic staff in senior management roles (ECU, 2013, p. 53).

The percentage of female staff in RHUL has maintained its advance for the past three years at around 52% (from 49.7% in 2007), with only minor variations across the staff groups.

**Table 3 Percentage of female staff since 2007/08, benchmarked with HESA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% in 2013</th>
<th>% in 2012</th>
<th>% in 2011</th>
<th>% in 2010</th>
<th>% in 2009</th>
<th>% in 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women staff – RHUL</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(856)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women staff – HESA</td>
<td>53.8%*</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The HESA data is from the Equality Challenge Unit’s annual report Equality in Higher Education statistical report, 2013, which reports data for 2011/12.

**Table 4 Percentage of female staff by staff group, benchmarked with HESA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff group</th>
<th>% Royal Holloway female staff</th>
<th>% HESA Statistics for female staff²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and research</td>
<td>34.2% (220)</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Support staff (RHUL – Admin, M&amp;A and Technical)</td>
<td>63.1% (636)</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² HESA define academic staff as those responsible for planning, directing and undertaking academic research and teaching in HEIs. This may also include vice-chancellors, principals, and clinical and healthcare professionals who undertake teaching or research activities. They define professional and support staff as those who do not have an academic employment function, such as managers, non-academic professionals, student welfare workers, cleaners, caterers and secretaries. For the RHUL data we have grouped ‘Academic and Research’ together and then the ‘Admin, M&A and technical’ staff together.
Figure 5 Staff profile by gender in each job type - 2012/13

All staff

- Male: 48.2% (796)
- Female: 51.8% (856)

Academic

- Male: 68.0% (340)
- Female: 32.0% (160)

Research

- Male: 58.3% (84)
- Female: 41.7% (60)

Admin 1 - 5

- Male: 15.3% (43)
- Female: 84.7% (238)

Admin 6 - 10

- Male: 37.4% (169)
- Female: 62.6% (283)

M & A

- Male: 54.5% (108)
- Female: 45.5% (90)

Technical

- Male: 67.5% (52)
- Female: 32.5% (25)
2.2.1 Academic staff

There has been little change in the overall proportions of male to female academic staff and in their proportions at various levels. There is a mix of approximately three men to two women at Lecturer and Senior Lecturer levels and approximately three to one at Reader and Professor levels.

The distribution across faculties shows up several differences between them. Management and Economics follows the overall College pattern almost exactly at Lecturer and Senior Lecturer and has a higher percentage of female Readers and a lower percentage of Female professors, while Arts and Social Science, despite having an exact gender balance at Lecturer and Reader levels, has imbalances at Senior Lecturer and Professor levels and consequently result in an overall imbalance of three to two in favour of men. The Science Faculty, however, has more dramatic imbalances with an overall proportion of three to one in favour of men, with particularly low percentages of women at Reader and Professor levels. This is a barely unchanged picture over the recent monitoring period. Nationally, the majority of female academic staff work in non-Science subject areas (51.4%) and the majority of male academic staff predominate in SET subjects (57.6%) (ECU, 2013, p. 47).

This picture in the College is reversed when casual staff are considered, almost 60% of whom are women, and a kind of balance is achieved in visiting teaching staff, 46% of whom are women – resulting in an overall 55:45 ratio of women to men in this cohort of staff. This may go some way (if these members of staff were situated in certain at present ‘unbalanced’ departments and faculties) to balancing the gender intake at the lower end of the positional hierarchy, but that data is not available for this report.
Figure 7 Gender profile of academic staff, 2012/13

Table 5 Female academic staff at different levels, over a four year period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Female academic staff</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>40.0% (44)</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td>38.1% (53)</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>28.3% (17)</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>24.1% (46)</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Academic staff by gender comparison in each Faculty, 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job category</th>
<th>Arts and Social Science</th>
<th>Management and Economics</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>50.0% (19)</td>
<td>50.0% (19)</td>
<td>40.0% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>40.7% (24)</td>
<td>59.3% (35)</td>
<td>36.0% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>50.0% (9)</td>
<td>50.0% (9)</td>
<td>36.4% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>33.3% (23)</td>
<td>66.7% (46)</td>
<td>22.7% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40.8% (75)</td>
<td>59.2% (109)</td>
<td>31.4% (33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 Recruitment

Figure 8 All job applicants and success rates by gender, 2012/13

Based on 8,103 applicants (gender data unknown for an additional 116 applicants)

In contrast with last year, the percentage of gender applicants was reversed to more closely reflect the current gender balance amongst staff. Women were also more likely to be shortlisted and to be successful in the recruitment process. Even in staff groups where more men applied than women, the women were often more likely to be shortlisted and/or appointed. This is most dramatically demonstrated in the Technical group; one in ten male applicants were shortlisted compared with one in seven of women; and all three appointments this year went to women. In the academic group, despite female applicants being only around half that of the male, appointments were almost exactly balanced between men and women. In Admin 1-5, male applicants were less than half those of women, men were only a quarter of those shortlisted and only one in five of those appointed. A much more balanced picture emerges in the recruitment for Admin 6-10 posts.
Figure 9 Applicants by gender for different job types, 2012/13

Academic

Based on 1,647 applicants (gender data unknown for an additional 51 applicants)

Research

Based on 734 applicants (gender data for an additional 21 applicants)

Admin 1 - 5

Based on 3,131 applicants (gender data unknown for an additional 31 applicants)

Admin 6 - 10

Based on 2,058 applicants (gender data unknown for an additional 35 applicants)

M & A

Based on 367 applicants (gender data unknown for an additional 5 applicants)

Technical

Based on 166 applicants (gender data unknown for an additional 3 applicants)
2.2.3 Starters

As in previous years, women formed over half of new starters (197 of 344), including 80% (74) of Admin 1 - 5 and 70% (134) of all Admin posts. Half of M&A starters (21) and over half of Technical starters (6) were women.

Male academic starters (32) slipped back to just under 70% but male researchers rose to 61% (35) from 46% of new starters last year.

![Figure 10 New starters by gender by staff group, 2012/13](image)

2.2.4 Training

Repeating the recent pattern, women formed the majority of staff who completed training (66%, 1121), enhanced by large numbers from the Admin grades and casual staff (in themselves, 47% of training places). Women were also 53% (169) of those taking H&S training.

Again, a relatively high percentage of those taking IT training were women (72.6%, 225), largely from the Admin staff groups (61% of the total).

Of those undertaking ADS training, 42% (32) of the academics and 52% (36) of the visiting teachers were female, along with big percentages of Admin staff which, combined, resulted in women taking up 59% (144) of ADS training places.
Figure 11 Overall training completed by gender, 2012/13

Female | Male
--- | ---
65.5% (91) | 27.4% (42)
87.4% (292) | 52.9% (241)
34.5% (48) | 27.1% (146)
72.9% (393) | 54.5% (12)
52.9% (215) | 42.9% (9)
68.4% (119) | 31.6% (65)
52.9% (9) | 47.1% (8)
65.9% (1121) | 34.1% (581)

Figure 12 Take up of different types of training by gender, 2012/13

Female | Male
--- | ---
72.6% (225) | 27.4% (85)
56.0% (470) | 44.0% (389)
53.5% (169) | 46.5% (147)
59.3% (144) | 40.7% (99)
2.2.5 Appraisals

Appraisals are reported for 9.5% (157) of staff. The rate of appraisals for this reporting year reflects last year’s pattern and runs from 3.5% (5) of researchers to 15.7% (44) of Admin 1-5 staff.

Table 7 Appraisals by staff group, 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff group</th>
<th>% within each group reported as having an appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>12.8% (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin 1–5</td>
<td>15.7% (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin 6-10</td>
<td>8.8% (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;A</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3.5% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>5.2% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9.5% (157)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 157 appraisals reported here (30 fewer than last year), 53.5% (84) were of female staff, i.e. similar to their overall representation in the College.

Figure 13 Appraisals by gender, 2012/13

---

3 None for M&A
2.2.6 Promotions

Of the 28 non-Academic regradings, 64% (18) were to women, all but one in Admin groups. Of the 41 Academic promotions, 61% (25) were to men (their representation overall amongst academic staff being 68%, 340).

2.2.7 Grievances and disciplinaries

Three grievance and two disciplinary cases were recorded. Partly due to the small number, there is no indication of any concerns relating to the gender profile but this should continue to be monitored over time.

2.2.8 Maternity leave

The data covers those who started maternity leave on or after 1 September 2010 and returned from maternity leave between 1 September 2010 and 31 August 2013. Five of the 50 staff on maternity leave over that period did not return to work after their leave expired (three due to the completion of their fixed term contracts and two resignations) and six others resigned within a year of returning. Ten others returned to reduced contracts after a period of weeks or months, three moved to variable contracts and three full-timers returned as part-time. The remainder, 23 staff (19 full-time and four part-time) returned to their previous contracts.

Sixteen of those on maternity leave were academic staff (all but one full-time). Of the sixteen, two resigned within a year, one went on to a 60% contract two months after her return, and the remainder returned to their previous contract.

2.2.9 Leavers

A total of 280 staff left in 2012/13, with over 20% more women leaving than men. The number of women who left from academic roles almost matches the number that started, but seven more men started than left, further skewing the male/female imbalance amongst academics.
2.3 ETHNICITY

The percentage of all minority ethnic staff at 13.5% (217) is virtually unchanged and the minority ethnic staff of UK nationality continues its upward trend to 10.4%, 123, (from 9.7% last year). As a comparison, 7.6% of UK national staff in UK higher education identified themselves as of minority ethnic background (ECU, 2013, p. 74).

All job categories are within a point of the college average, apart from M&A which is 3.2% above (see Figure 19). When considering minority ethnic staff of UK nationality the variation is somewhat greater, but only affecting Research and Technical, the two smallest staff groups, which are 5% and 2% respectively below the college average. Staff of Asian ethnicity are still the largest minority ethnic grouping, with those of Chinese ethnicity the largest within that category.

Figure 15 All staff and UK staff - known ethnicity, 2012/13

Nationally (aside from the ‘other’ ethnic group) women comprised the majority in all ethnic groups among UK staff (ECU, p. 218). Overall at RHUL there is a reasonable balance of women and men in the main ethnic groups, with the exception of Chinese staff of whom 58% (29) are women and Black staff, which has the largest difference of 62% (16) women and 38% (10) men. At RHUL amongst full-time staff minority ethnic men equalled or outnumbered women in the Asian and White groups. Amongst part-time staff women in the majority of ethnic groups far outnumber men, the exceptions being the Mixed group and the Black groups, where women are 46% and 50% respectively.

18% (211) of casual and 12% (73) of visiting teachers of UK nationality (16% of these combined) are minority ethnic staff, a decrease of 5% overall compared to last year.

---

4 When referring to ethnicity, we indicate if we are referring to all staff, or to those of UK nationality. All data relating to ethnicity throughout the report refers to ‘known ethnicity’ – i.e. 98.6% of staff – unless otherwise stipulated.
5 It is also reported there (p. 75) that 30.7% of non-UK nationals in English HE institutions were of minority ethnic background.
6 Nationally (ECU, p. 76), Chinese staff are also a sizeable minority ethnic group in HEIs (17.3% of all minority ethnic staff), second only to Asians of Indian background (20.9%).
About 46% (98) of minority ethnic casual staff of UK nationality are of Asian background, as are about 41% (30) of minority ethnic visiting teachers.

Figure 16 Minority ethnic staff by main ethnic groups, 2012/13

The two age bands comprising ages 31-50 account for 55% of staff, and 64.5% of minority ethnic staff are distributed most numerously in that age group. There are small numbers of staff aged below 21 and over 60, with a particularly low percentage of minority ethnic staff in the age group 16-20.

Figure 17 Ethnicity by age group (all nationalities), 2012/13

* = five or fewer people; when only one figure is five or fewer a second small number is also not revealed
Figure 18 Main ethnic groups by age groups (all nationalities), 2012/13

Table 8 Minority ethnic staff by job groups (all staff), 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff group</th>
<th>% Royal Holloway minority ethnic staff (all staff)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.6% (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Support staff (RHUL – Admin, M&amp;A and Technical)</td>
<td>14.0% (139)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Minority ethnic staff by job groups (UK nationality), 2008/09 to 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff group</th>
<th>% Royal Holloway minority ethnic staff (UK nationality)</th>
<th>HESA data (HESA 2011/12 data), published in 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.7% (35)</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Support staff (RHUL – Admin, M&amp;A and Technical)</td>
<td>10.7% (88)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECU, 2013, p.78
Figure 19 Staff profile in each job type: 2012/13 (all staff)

- **All staff**
  - White, 86.5% (1390)
  - Minority Ethnic, 13.5% (217)

- **Academic**
  - White, 87.4% (422)
  - Minority Ethnic, 12.6% (61)

- **Research**
  - White, 87.4% (118)
  - Minority Ethnic, 12.6% (17)

- **Admin 1 - 5**
  - White, 87.0% (241)
  - Minority Ethnic, 13.0% (36)

- **Admin 6 - 10**
  - White, 86.3% (383)
  - Minority Ethnic, 13.7% (61)

- **M & A**
  - White, 83.3% (160)
  - Minority Ethnic, 16.7% (32)

- **Technical**
  - White, 86.8% (66)
  - Minority Ethnic, 13.2% (10)
Figure 20 Staff profile in each job type, 2012/13 (UK nationality)

All staff

- White: 89.6% (1062)
- Minority Ethnic: 10.4% (123)

Academic

- White: 89.5% (274)
- Minority Ethnic: 10.5% (32)

Research

- White: 94.5% (52)
- Minority Ethnic: 5.5% (3)

Admin 1 - 5

- White: 88.4% (220)
- Minority Ethnic: 11.6% (29)

Admin 6 - 10

- White: 89.3% (316)
- Minority Ethnic: 10.7% (38)

M & A

- White: 89.9% (143)
- Minority Ethnic: 10.1% (16)

Technical

- White: 91.9% (57)
- Minority Ethnic: 8.1% (5)
Table 10 Percentage minority ethnic* staff by staff group from 2004/05 to 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC (as from 2008/09, classified as Admin 6 – 10)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical (as from 2008/09, classified as Admin 1 – 5)</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual (as from 2008/09, classified as M&amp;A)</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known/ refused</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total minority ethnic</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is all staff – all nationalities. For comparability with previous years, percentages for each job type include the numbers of ‘unknown’ ethnicity. The College does not use the same job categories as HESA for monitoring purposes and therefore the HESA data is not included.

Table 11 Staff by ethnicity by staff groups (all staff), 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Admin 1 - 5</th>
<th>Admin 6 - 10</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = five or fewer people; when only one figure is five or fewer a second small number is also not revealed

Table 12 Staff by ethnicity by staff groups (UK nationality), 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Admin 1 - 5</th>
<th>Admin 6 - 10</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = five or fewer people; when only one figure is five or fewer a second small number is also not revealed
2.3.1 Academic staff

Nationally (ECU, 2013, p. 78), as a percentage of the whole academic staff group, the proportion of UK BME academic staff increased from 4.8% in 2003/04 to 5.8% in 2011/12. The proportion of non-UK BME staff also rose from 5.6% to 6.8% in the same period. At RHUL, overall, 12.6% (61) of all academic staff and 10.5% (32) of academic staff of UK nationality are of minority ethnic origin, figures which continue to mark a steady increase in numbers and proportion. Whereas minority ethnic academic staff (all nationalities) are, at twice the College strength (24.5%, 26), well represented at Lecturer level, that reduces to 12.4% (17), 10.2% (6) and 6.6% (12) of Senior Lecturer, Reader and Professorial levels respectively.

Of the 61 minority ethnic academic staff, around 67% (41) are of Asian, Chinese or mixed white and Asian background and only 11% (7) are of Black ethnicity.

This year the ECU reiterated (with slightly raised numbers) its 2012 conclusion of national levels:

The proportion of black academic staff who were professors was lower than for any other ethnic group, with 4.1% of UK black academic staff and 2.4% of non-UK black academic staff holding professorial status. In contrast, 13.8% of UK Chinese academic staff and 8.5% of non-UK white academic staff were professors (p. 73).

Of the twelve minority ethnic professors at the College 42% (5) are Asian and 25% (3) Chinese. In total, while 45% (123) of White academics at the college with UK nationality are at professorial level, only 28% (9) of UK nationality minority ethnic academics are at that level.

The three Faculties maintain their different positions with regard to their minority ethnic staff with Management and Economics at 26.7% (27) at the highest overall percentage, Arts and Social Science, at 9.4% (17), and Science, at 8.6% (18). The proportions of minority ethnic staff at each level differs considerably across the faculties, from Lecturer to Professor level, with a steady and relatively low 8-10% at all levels in Science, a stepped decline from 43% to 12% in Management and Economics, and a more precipitous decline from 32% to a mere 1.5% in Arts and Social Science (See Table 14).

---

8 Ten of the professoriate (half of whom have UK nationality) preferred 'not to say' their ethnicity.
Figure 21 Percentage of all minority ethnic academic staff by level, 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>24.5% (26)</td>
<td>12.4% (17)</td>
<td>10.2% (6)</td>
<td>6.6% (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22 Percentage of UK nationality minority ethnic staff by level, 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>12.2% (11)</td>
<td>13.3% (*)</td>
<td>6.8% (*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = five or fewer people; when only one figure is five or fewer a second small number is also not revealed

Table 13 Minority ethnic staff (academic) 2012/13 compared to previous years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% minority ethnic academic staff</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>24.5% (14.8%)</td>
<td>20.0% (12.3%)</td>
<td>18.9% (13.8%)</td>
<td>15.0% (14.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td>12.4% (12.2%)</td>
<td>14.1% (14.0%)</td>
<td>14.4% (12.5%)</td>
<td>13.7% (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>10.2% (13.3%)</td>
<td>13.1% (14.3%)</td>
<td>15.4% (16.1%)</td>
<td>11.9% (12.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>6.6% (6.8%)</td>
<td>5.3% (6.3%)</td>
<td>5.5% (6.3%)</td>
<td>4.4% (5.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures in brackets are for staff with UK nationality. For actual numbers at each level (2012/13) see Figures 21 and 22 above.
Table 14 Academic staff by ethnicity comparison in each Faculty, 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job category</th>
<th>Arts and Social Science</th>
<th>Management and Economics</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White (26)</td>
<td>Minority ethnic (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>(* *)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = numbers not provided as they are either five or fewer in the minority ethnic column

2.3.2 Recruitment

Figure 23 All job applicants by ethnicity, 2012/13

Based on 7,808 applications. Ethnicity data is unknown for an additional 441 applicants.

Although almost a third of applications are from minority ethnic job seekers, only a fifth of those shortlisted are minority ethnic and 83.6% (204) of all appointments go to White candidates. For academic posts this seeming disparity is less marked and whereas a quarter of applicants are minority ethnic, they gain more than a fifth of appointments. This picture is broadly similar in Admin 1-5 recruitment, but the Technical group, despite receiving an almost equal number of applications from minority ethnic candidates and shortlisting almost equal proportions for interview, did not appoint any minority ethnic candidates for the three jobs filled.
Figure 24 All applicants by ethnicity by job category, 2012/13

Based on 1,554 applications. Ethnicity data is unknown for an additional 144 applicants.

Based on 709 applications. Ethnicity data is unknown for an additional 46 applicants.

Based on 3,040 applications. Ethnicity data is unknown for an additional 122 applicants.

Based on 1,978 applications. Ethnicity data is unknown for an additional 115 applicants.

Based on 362 applications. Ethnicity data is unknown for an additional 10 applicants.

Based on 165 applications. Ethnicity data is unknown for an additional 4 applicants.
Figure 25 UK applicants by ethnicity, 2012/13

Based on 4,428 applications. Ethnicity data unknown for an additional 136 applicants.
Figure 26 UK applicants by ethnicity by job category, 2012/13

**Academic**

- Applied: 80.8% (346) White, 19.2% (82) Minority Ethnic
- Shortlisted: 63.0% (51) White, 16.4% (10) Minority Ethnic
- Appointed: 90.9% (9) White, 9.1% (1) Minority Ethnic

Based on 428 applications. Ethnicity data is unknown for an additional 22 applicants.

**Research**

- Applied: 69.7% (214) White, 30.3% (93) Minority Ethnic
- Shortlisted: 84.1% (37) White, 15.9% (7) Minority Ethnic
- Appointed: 62.5% (5) White, 37.5% (3) Minority Ethnic

Based on 307 applications. Ethnicity data is unknown for an additional 10 applicants.

**Admin 1 - 5**

- Applied: 72.7% (1635) White, 27.3% (615) Minority Ethnic
- Shortlisted: 80.4% (291) White, 19.6% (71) Minority Ethnic
- Appointed: 81.3% (65) White, 18.8% (15) Minority Ethnic

Based on 2,250 applications. Ethnicity data is unknown for an additional 66 applicants.

**Admin 6 - 10**

- Applied: 73.0% (818) White, 26.4% (294) Minority Ethnic
- Shortlisted: 82.8% (193) White, 17.2% (40) Minority Ethnic
- Appointed: 94.1% (48) White, 5.9% (3) Minority Ethnic

Based on 1,112 applications. Ethnicity data is unknown for an additional 34 applicants.

**M & A**

- Applied: 72.3% (172) White, 27.7% (66) Minority Ethnic
- Shortlisted: 77.0% (47) White, 23.0% (14) Minority Ethnic
- Appointed: 90.9% (10) White, 9.1% (1) Minority Ethnic

Based on 238 applications. Ethnicity data is unknown for an additional 4 applicants.

**Technical**

- Applied: 55.9% (52) White, 44.1% (41) Minority Ethnic
- Shortlisted: 58.8% (10) White, 41.2% (7) Minority Ethnic
- Appointed: 100.0% (3) White

Based on 93 applications.
2.3.3 Starters

Overall, 18.9\% (62) of all new starters and 18.3\% (40) of those of UK nationality were of minority ethnic origin – most highly represented in the Admin posts and least so in the Academic and Research posts. The highest percentage of all minority ethnic starters (40\%, 25) were of Asian origin, followed by those of Mixed origin (21\%, 13), then by those of Black ethnic origin (17.7\%, 11).

Figure 27 Percentage of minority ethnic starters in each job category (all nationalities), 2012/13

Figure 28 Percentage of minority ethnic starters in each job category (UK nationality), 2012/13

* = five or fewer people

* = five or fewer people
2.3.4 Training

**Figure 29 Overall training completed by ethnicity, 2012/13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Minority Ethnic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic (132)</td>
<td>88.6% (117)</td>
<td>11.4% (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin 1 - 5 (334)</td>
<td>89.2% (298)</td>
<td>10.8% (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin 6 - 10 (534)</td>
<td>84.1% (449)</td>
<td>15.9% (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;A (450)</td>
<td>88.9% (391)</td>
<td>13.1% (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research (20)</td>
<td>90.0% (18)</td>
<td>10.0% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical (19)</td>
<td>89.5% (17)</td>
<td>10.5% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual staff (170)</td>
<td>87.6% (149)</td>
<td>12.4% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting teachers</td>
<td>75.0% (12)</td>
<td>25.0% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (1675)</td>
<td>86.6% (1451)</td>
<td>13.4% (244)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 30 Take up of training by ethnicity, 2012/13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Type</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Minority Ethnic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT training</td>
<td>86.0% (258)</td>
<td>14.0% (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus services training</td>
<td>88.9% (740)</td>
<td>11.1% (92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;S training</td>
<td>86.7% (267)</td>
<td>13.3% (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic development services training</td>
<td>84.8% (195)</td>
<td>15.2% (35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 13.4% (244) of those who completed training were of minority ethnic origin. This is in line with their representation in the College. Take-up varied across the different job types, broadly reflecting representation in the different job categories. The figures for Campus Services Training were slightly less (11.1%, 92), but were higher for ADS (15.2%, 35) and for IT training (14%, 42). In general, minority ethnic staff seem are taking up training in proportion to their numbers in the College.
2.3.5 Appraisals

There are only small numbers of appraisals across the different types of job category in the College, and the fourteen minority ethnic appraisees represent 9% of the total, i.e. below their proportions on the staff.

2.3.6 Promotions

There were seven non-academic regradings (25%) that went to minority ethnic staff in three staff groups. About 7% of promotions went to minority ethnic academics (three individuals), contrasting with their 12.6% of all academic staff.

2.3.7 Grievances and disciplinaries

The overall number of grievances and disciplinaries (five in total) is too small to show anything of concern in relation to ethnicity.

2.3.8 Leavers

Minority ethnic staff were 18.1% (50) of all leavers, higher than their representation in the College and 15.5% (31) of leavers were minority ethnic staff of UK nationality, but this proportion was higher among staff in the Admin groups (between 20-25%), which is higher than their representation in those staff groups of UK nationality (11.6% of the Admin 1-5 group and 10.7% of the Admin 6-10 group).

Figure 31 Leavers by ethnicity, all staff, 2012/13

* = five or fewer people
2.4 NATIONALITY

Just under three quarters of RHUL staff have UK nationality and the remainder are drawn from over 60 countries across the globe. However, more than half of these are only represented by one and two people (constituting 10% of the total), whereas the nationals of Germany, Italy and the USA alone account for almost a third of the non-UK total.

Just over 60% (271) of non-UK nationals are employed as academics or researchers. The decline in number of UK academics (to under two-thirds) and researchers (to two out of five) has been steady since 2008/09 and is similar to drops in other staff groups apart from Admin 1-5.

Table 15 Staff by UK or non-UK nationality, 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Admin 1 – 5</th>
<th>Admin 6 - 10</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(314)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(359)</td>
<td>(160)</td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(1207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(186)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(93)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(443)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 Staff by UK or non-UK nationality, 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Admin 1 – 5</th>
<th>Admin 6 - 10</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 Staff by UK or non-UK nationality, 2010/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Admin 1-5</th>
<th>Admin 6-10</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 Staff by UK or non-UK nationality, 2009/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Admin 1-5</th>
<th>Admin 6-10</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 Staff by UK or non-UK nationality, 2008/09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Admin 1-5</th>
<th>Admin 6-10</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, almost a quarter of casual staff and a third of visiting teachers are of non-UK nationality.

2.4.1 Academic staff

Academic staff are drawn from 38 countries, and after the UK this is most notably from Germany and the USA (5.8%, 29, and 5.4% 27, respectively). At lecturer and then at reader levels, staff of non-UK nationality equal or are more or less the number of those of UK nationality, at professorial level they are more than a quarter and around a third at senior lecturer level.

Figure 33 Percentage of academic staff by nationality (UK and non-UK), 2012/13

2.4.2 Recruitment

The College received applications from people of at least 109 nationalities (220 applicants preferred not to provide data on their country of origin). Outside the UK, the most applications were received from Italy, India and Greece, but only 2.4% of Italians (and 1.6% of Indian and 1.7% of Greek applicants) were successful in gaining a post, i.e. below the 3.2% overall average. More successful were the 6.7% of German and 6.1% of Irish applicants. Almost three quarters of applicants for the 33
academic posts appointed were of non-UK nationality and they were successful in two-thirds of appointments.

Table 20 Recruitment by all job types by nationality (UK and non-UK), 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>% known nationality</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Shortlisted</th>
<th>Appointed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Non UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57% (4564)</td>
<td>43% (3465)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71% (798)</td>
<td>29% (329)</td>
<td>67% (171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>% known nationality</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>Shortlisted</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Non UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28% (450)</td>
<td>72% (1179)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43% (63)</td>
<td>57% (82)</td>
<td>34% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>% known nationality</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>Shortlisted</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Non UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44% (317)</td>
<td>56% (408)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47% (63)</td>
<td>53% (51)</td>
<td>28% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin 1 - 5</td>
<td>% known nationality</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>Shortlisted</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Non UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75% (2316)</td>
<td>25% (791)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86% (371)</td>
<td>14% (58)</td>
<td>90% (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin 6 - 10</td>
<td>% known nationality</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>Shortlisted</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Non UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56% (1146)</td>
<td>44% (890)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68% (238)</td>
<td>32% (110)</td>
<td>65% (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; A</td>
<td>% known nationality</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>Shortlisted</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Non UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66% (242)</td>
<td>34% (124)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72% (63)</td>
<td>28% (24)</td>
<td>80% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>% known nationality</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>Shortlisted</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Non UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56% (93)</td>
<td>44% (73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81% (17)</td>
<td>19% (4)</td>
<td>100% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.3 Starters

Just over a third (118) of new starters in 2012/13 were of non-UK nationality. They were most highly represented in the Research and Academic jobs where they represented 64% (36) and 61% (28) of starters respectively.

Table 21 New starters by nationality (UK and non-UK) by job type, 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Admin 1 - 5</th>
<th>Admin 6 - 10</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>39.1% (18)</td>
<td>84.9% (79)</td>
<td>69.5% (66)</td>
<td>78.6% (33)</td>
<td>35.7% (20)</td>
<td>81.8% (9)</td>
<td>65.6% (225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK</td>
<td>60.9% (28)</td>
<td>15.1% (14)</td>
<td>30.5% (29)</td>
<td>21.4% (9)</td>
<td>64.3% (36)</td>
<td>18.2% (2)</td>
<td>34.4% (118)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.4 Leavers by nationality

Over a quarter of leavers (78) were of non-UK nationality; most notably a half of Research leavers and two-fifths of Academic leavers.

Figure 34 Leavers by nationality, 2012/13
2.5 DISABILITY

Nationally, 3.4% of those who declared a disability status indicated that they were disabled (ECU, 2013, p. 146). At RHUL there is very little change in the percentage of disabled staff, which has hovered around the 2% level for some years (1.9% (32) this year; two fewer people than last year). M&A and Admin 6-10 registered figures around or nearing 3% (6 and 12 respectively) and amongst Casual and Visiting teaching staff figures are between 2.2% (34) and 2.3% (22), but all other staff groups register less than 2%, with none in the Technical staff.

Table 22 Disabled staff compared to HESA statistics, 2005 - 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% in 2013</th>
<th>% in 2012</th>
<th>% in 2011</th>
<th>% in 2010</th>
<th>% in 2009</th>
<th>% in 2008</th>
<th>% in 2007</th>
<th>% in 2006</th>
<th>% in 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled staff - RHUL</td>
<td>1.9% (32)</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled staff - HESA</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 Disabled staff by broad job groups, 2009 to 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff group</th>
<th>% Royal Holloway disabled staff, 2013</th>
<th>% Royal Holloway disabled staff, 2012</th>
<th>% Royal Holloway disabled staff, 2011</th>
<th>% Royal Holloway disabled staff, 2010</th>
<th>% Royal Holloway disabled staff, 2009</th>
<th>% HESA Statistics disabled staff (HESA 2011/12 data), published in 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic and research</td>
<td>1.4% (9)</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and support</td>
<td>2.3% (23)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 35 Disabled staff by job category, 2012/13

* = five or fewer people
2.5.1 Academic staff

Nationally, 2.9% of academic staff declared a disability, though this is lower (2.4%) in professorial roles than the 3% in the non-professorial roles (ECU, 2013, p.160). At RHUL 1.6% (8) of academic staff are disabled. The proportions are fairly consistent across academic levels, all below 2%, with small overall numbers (all fewer than 5 in each category).

Figure 36 Percentage of disabled staff in academic posts, 2012/13

Note: the numbers are not put in brackets for the categories of academic staff in this Figure as they are fewer than 5 in each category.

2.5.2 Recruitment

The percentage of disabled applicants, at 2.5% (204), is higher than the percentage in the existing staff. Disabled applicants were 2.7% (7) of those appointed overall, into three of the six staff groups (the Academic and the two Admin groups).

2.5.3 Starters

Eight starters (2.3%) were disabled. Five were to Admin 6-10 posts (5.3% of those who started in these posts).

2.5.4 Training

Disabled staff were 2.1% (36) of those who completed generic training. They were 1.9% (6) of those who did IT training, nearly all in Admin 6-10 posts, and similar percentages took up Campus Services training (1.8%, 15), H&S training (1.9%, 6) and ADS training (1.6%, five or fewer).
2.5.5 Appraisals

2.5% of appraisees had a disability but this relatively high figure disguises the overall low number of appraisals conducted (only 157 appraisals overall were reported).

2.5.6 Grievances and disciplinaries

There were no grievances or disciplinaries related to disabled people.

2.5.7 Leavers

Nine disabled staff (3.2%) were amongst the leavers. These were across all the job groups who have disabled staff (i.e. all except Technical).
2.6 AGE GROUPS

RHUL follows the national pattern of age bands (ECU, 2013, pp.184-5) and is broadly consistent with recent reports.

Casual staff and visiting teachers are a younger group; 82% (1271) of casual staff are aged 30 or under as are 29% (276) of visiting teachers of whom 61% (579) are aged 40 or under.

* = five or fewer people; when only one figure is five or fewer a second small number is also not revealed
Women tend to be slightly younger than the overall College population due to the marked imbalance of staff in their twenties (19%, 165, of female staff are in the 21-30 age group compared to 13%, 105, of the male staff), but the other decade age bands are relatively balanced apart from those in their sixties (only 6.8% of the College staff) where men are the higher percentage.

Age by ethnicity

Minority ethnic staff are generally a younger group than White staff, with 55% (120) of minority ethnic staff aged 40 or under and 43% (603) of White staff in this age group. There is some variation by ethnic group (see Figure 41).
2.6.1 Academic staff

Two-thirds of academic staff (332) are in the 31-50 age bracket and 92% (101) of lecturers are in that band. Less than 0.5% of academic staff are aged 30 or younger. 11% (55) of academics are 61 years of age or over, with that rising to 23% (44) of those in professorial roles.

2.6.2 Recruitment

The highest percentage of appointments overall were made in the 21 – 30 age group (over 40%, 105, of all appointments), reflecting the high percentage of applications from this age group. All of the appointments of those in the 16 - 20 age group were in
Admin 1-5 posts, while two of the appointments in the 61-70 age group were to Admin 6-10 posts.

**Figure 43 All applicants by age groups, 2012/13**

Based on 7,922 applications. Age data unknown for an additional 327 applicants.
Figure 44 Applicants by age group for different job types, 2012/13

**Academic**

- Based on 1,592 applications. Age data is unknown for an additional 106 applicants.

**Research**

- Based on 724 applications. Age data is unknown for an additional 31 applicants.

**Admin 1 - 5**

- Based on 3,064 applications. Age data is unknown for an additional 98 applicants.

**Admin 6 - 10**

- Based on 2,015 applications. Age data is unknown for an additional 78 applicants.

**M & A**

- Based on 363 applications. Age data is unknown for an additional 9 applicants.

**Technical**

- Based on 164 applications. Age data is unknown for an additional 5 applicants.
2.6.3 Starters

Over 70% (246) of starters were in the 21-40 age bracket, but this varied with staff group where, for example, over half of Academic starters (25) were 31-40 and over half of Admin 1-5 (54) and of M&A starters (24) were 21-30.

Table 24 New starters by age group by staff group, 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Admin 1 - 5</th>
<th>Admin 6 - 10</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>4.3% (*)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>19.0% (8)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3.5% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2.2% (*)</td>
<td>58.1% (54)</td>
<td>34.7% (33)</td>
<td>57.1% (24)</td>
<td>24.6% (14)</td>
<td>45.5% (*)</td>
<td>38.1% (131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>54.3% (25)</td>
<td>11.8% (11)</td>
<td>44.2% (42)</td>
<td>11.9% (*)</td>
<td>50.9% (29)</td>
<td>27.3% (*)</td>
<td>33.4% (115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>37.0% (17)</td>
<td>16.1% (15)</td>
<td>11.6% (11)</td>
<td>7.1% (*)</td>
<td>14.0% (8)</td>
<td>9.1% (*)</td>
<td>16.0% (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>4.3% (*)</td>
<td>6.5% (6)</td>
<td>6.3% (*)</td>
<td>4.8% (*)</td>
<td>8.8% (*)</td>
<td>9.1% (*)</td>
<td>6.4% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>2.2% (*)</td>
<td>3.2% (*)</td>
<td>3.2% (*)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>1.8% (*)</td>
<td>9.1% (*)</td>
<td>2.6% (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.4 Training

Overall, there is take-up of the various types of training by all age groups with a generally high percentage being in the younger age bands.

Figure 45 Take up of training by different age groups, 2012/13

IT Training

IT training was accessed by broadly equal numbers of staff across the college in the age bands up to 41-50, falling off to a fifth of the 310 trainees over 51 – generally in line with the position last year. Three-quarters of IT trainees were in Admin posts and they accounted for 83% (74) of the 89 trainees in the 21-30 age group. The majority
of Research staff are between 21 and 40 and therefore this was the age band amongst Research staff that almost exclusively accessed IT training.

**Other Training**

H&S training was taken up in largest numbers by the 21-40 age bands (63%, 198). M&A trainees were spread relatively evenly over the four age bands in the 21-60 group. Over a third of those taking ADS training were in the 31-40 age group, 40% (36) of whom were from the Academic group. The majority, 84% (59) of the visiting teacher participants in ADS training were in the age band 21-40. Campus Services Training was accessed by the major age bands, 21-60, in relatively even numbers.

### 2.6.5 Appraisals

Of the 157 appraisals completed this year, 40% (64) were for staff in the Academic group and following their age profile they centred (almost half) on the 41-50 age band. The age pattern for Admin staff is rather evenly spread across the 21-60 age bands, with relatively few appraisals reported for Research or Technical staff and none for M&A staff.

![Figure 46 Appraisals by age groups, 2012/13](attachment://figure46.png)

### 2.6.6 Grievances and disciplinaries

Grievances and disciplinaries were for staff of 41 and above, but the numbers are too low to justify significant comment.
2.6.7 **Leavers**

The largest group of leavers were in the 21-30 age band (42%, 117), with an additional 30% (84) in the 31-40 age group. As reported previously, this appears to be a natural phenomenon in organisations and in itself does not raise concerns.  

![Figure 47 Leavers by age groups, 2012/13](image)

* = numbers are not included where this may reveal individuals

2.7 **SEXUAL ORIENTATION**

Sexual orientation data is collected routinely for new staff and existing staff have been asked to provide this data. Around 72% (1184) of staff have not provided their data on this issue (3.9%, 64, prefer not to say). Of the 24% (404) who have provided data, an improved response rate from the previous figure of 9%, around 4.2% (17) are gay, lesbian or bisexual or other (i.e. not heterosexual).

2.8 **RELIGION OR BELIEF**

As another relatively new area for the College on which to collect data, the figures for religion or belief are partial and only include declarations from new staff or input from established staff who have voluntarily updated their profiles and 25% (407) of staff have provided information on religion or belief. Of those who have provided information, those of Christian (177) and 'No religion or belief' (178) are roughly equal in number and, combined, constitute 87% (355) of respondents. Six other faith systems were recorded, all with small numbers of adherents, as well as seven people who said they were of another religion or belief.

---

2.9 CARERS

Data on carer responsibilities is the third relatively new category for which data is available. It is collected from new staff whose carer status is requested on application (and from whom 97% (8030) provided data this year, a big increase since 65% last year). Of those appointed, 18% (45) had carer responsibilities; they were appointed in five of the six job categories, 44% (20) of them in Admin 6-10 posts. Comparing numbers of carer applicants to shortlistees and appointees, carer responsibility does not seem to have been an impediment to obtaining an interview or securing a post.

Figure 48 Applicants by carer responsibilities, 2012/13

![Bar Chart]

Based on 8030 applications. Carer data unknown for an additional 219 applicants.
Figure 49 Applicants by carer responsibility by different job types, 2012/13

Based on 1,684 applications. Carer data is unknown for an additional 14 applicants.

Based on 734 applications. Carer data is unknown for an additional 21 applicants.

Based on 3,069 applications. Carer data is unknown for an additional 93 applicants.

Based on 2,018 applications. Carer data is unknown for an additional 75 applicants.

Based on 358 applications. Carer data is unknown for an additional 14 applicants.

Based on 167 applications. Carer data is unknown for an additional 2 applicants.
2.10 SENIOR MANAGEMENT

All senior managers (37) are on full-time permanent contracts. 73% (27) of senior managers are male. The proportion of women senior managers has decreased in the last year so that they now represent just over a quarter of the total (27%, 10). Last year they were 31%. A very small number of senior managers declared a disability, and a very small number are of minority ethnic origin. Just under 15% are of non-UK nationality. The age profile at senior management level is higher than the age profile of staff, with around 70% in the 51+ age bracket.

Figure 50 Age profile of senior management, 2012/13
3. ANALYSIS OF MAIN ISSUES

The staff population continues its recent pattern of growth. Distribution across staff groups remains largely within a percentage point of last year’s report, although over the last three years there has been a 2.5% drop in M&A, who were 14.5% of staff in 2010/11 and are now 12% (198) of staff. The percentage of female staff has stabilised around 52% (856), still below figures for national representation of 53.8%. Around four out of five employees are on permanent contracts, though this varies from the vast majority of Academic and M&A staff being on permanent contracts to only one in five of Research staff. Part-time work is most common in the M&A and Admin 1-5 groups (at just under half). Women remain the larger percentage of staff on part-time contracts although a slightly reduced percentage since last year (now 70%, 303, compared to 73% last year).

There has been little change in the overall proportions of male to female academic staff and in their proportions at various levels. The mix of approximately three men to two women at Lecturer and Senior Lecturer levels changes to approximately three to one at Reader and Professor levels. However, the distribution across faculties shows up several anomalies. Arts and Social Science, despite having an exact gender balance at Lecturer and Reader levels, has imbalances at Senior Lecturer and Professor levels and consequently results in an overall imbalance of three to two in favour of men. The Science Faculty has even more dramatic imbalances with an overall proportion of three to one in favour of men. This is a barely unchanged picture over the recent monitoring period. Whereas, nationally, around half of academic staff working in non-Science subject areas are women, at RHUL it is around 37% (108). It may be that a more balanced proportion is achieved by including the 46% (439) of visiting teachers who are women, although this data is not available for this report split by faculty. Overall, women applied for posts at RHUL in relatively high numbers, and were more likely to be shortlisted and successful in the recruitment process. In the academic group, despite female applicants being only half that of the male, women were a slightly higher percentage of those appointed. Overall, women again formed over half of new starters, and formed the overwhelming majority of those who completed training, including on H&S, IT, and ADS training. More women left the College than men and given the gender balance of academic staff leaving compared with the increased number of male starters, the male/female imbalance is likely to be further skewed.

The percentage of all minority ethnic staff is virtually unchanged but the minority ethnic staff of UK nationality continues its slight upward trend (from 9.7% last year to 10.4%, 123, this year). Staff of Asian ethnicity are still the largest minority ethnic grouping, with those of Chinese ethnicity the largest within that. There is a higher percentage of women amongst the Black staff (62%, 16) than men (38%, 10), but the numbers of Asian staff are roughly divided equally between the genders. Overall, 12.6% (61) of all academic staff and 10.5% (32) of academic staff of UK nationality are of minority ethnic origin, figures which continue to mark a small steady increase in numbers and proportion. Whereas all minority ethnic academic staff (two thirds of whom are of Asian or Chinese background) are, at twice the College strength (24.5%, 26), well represented at Lecturer level, that reduces to 7% (12) at Professorial level; these figures vary considerably across Faculties. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the total percentage of minority ethnic academic staff including those at Lecturer
and at Professorial level, are higher than last year. While 45% (123) of White academics at the college with UK nationality are at professorial level, only 28% (9) of minority ethnic academics with UK nationality are at that level. RHUL attracts a very large number of minority ethnic job seekers (32%, 2468, of all applicants), this reduces to 16% (40) appointed (22%, 7, appointed to Academic posts; nil to Technical posts). Once appointed minority ethnic staff seem to be taking up training in proportion to their numbers in the College, although their percentage for whom appraisals are reported is well below their proportions on the staff.

Applicants from 109 countries sought employment at RHUL, and more than a quarter of RHUL staff are non-UK nationals – 57.6% from the EU; 15.8% from the Commonwealth – mostly employed as academics or researchers. The decline in the percentage of UK academics (to under two-thirds) and researchers (to two fifths) has been steady since 2009. Academic staff are drawn from 38 countries, most notably Germany and the USA. At lecturer and then at reader levels, those of non-UK nationality broadly equal those of UK nationality and at professorial level they are more than a quarter. Just over a third of new starters in 2012/13 were of non-UK nationality, with the highest percentages in Research and Academic jobs.

With regard to disability, age and carer responsibility there has been little change over this monitoring period. Disabled staff still form a smaller proportion of RHUL staff than is the case nationally although the percentage of disabled applicants and of those shortlisted is higher than the percentage in the existing staff. With regard to age, RHUL follows the general national pattern of age bands and is broadly consistent with recent reports. There were a large number of applications from and appointments of young people. On balance, carer responsibility does not seem to have been an impediment to obtaining an interview or securing a post.

The two relatively new areas for which data is collected - sexual orientation and religion/belief - have both seen an increase in response rates, but it will be some time before robust conclusions can be derived from this, as yet, very partial data.

4. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

(i) As in previous years, the equality monitoring report, including recommendations, should be discussed by the Equality Steering Group. Their discussion should inform the development of the new Equality Scheme/Strategy. The Group should also look at the progress made in implementing the recommendations from the 2011/12 equality monitoring report.

(ii) Now that the collection of equality data is incorporated into the recruitment process for College Council members, and is in the process of being collected from the existing College Council members, this should be included in the next equality monitoring report. An interim report on this could be produced during the year once the data has been collected.

(iii) Consider in future reporting looking at the visiting teaching staff data profile by faculty, in order to establish if a greater mix in that group would contribute towards achieving greater representation of any under-represented groups in faculties.
(iv) Keep under review moving towards collecting data regarding gender identity, keeping up to date with guidance on this from the Equality Challenge Unit.  

(v) Look into the reasons for the lack of appraisals reported for M&A staff.

(vi) When the MyView dashboard has been launched (planned for around Easter 2014), plan to monitor response rates on sexual orientation and on religion, two areas where there has to date been a low rate of recording data. If there remains a low provision of this data around three to four months after the launch then reinforce the message that there are new areas for staff to complete, including sexual orientation and religion, aiming for a substantial increase at the next equality monitoring reporting point.

(vii) Due to the small number of grievance and disciplinary cases each year, it may be worth looking at this data over a longer period of time, say three years, in a similar way to the way the maternity data is considered.

(viii) The recent decrease of the percentage of women at senior management level should be looked into as part of the work being carried out on women at professorial level.
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APPENDIX

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM 2011/12 AND NOTES FROM HUMAN RESOURCES ON ACTION WHICH HAS BEEN TAKEN

(a) As in previous years, the Equality Steering Group should discuss the key findings from this year’s report and incorporate recommendations into existing action plans, such as the Single Equality Scheme. This should include looking at the reported progress on action points from the previous year’s equality monitoring report.

The key findings and recommendations were discussed by the Equality Steering Group - we are also developing a new Equality Scheme/Strategy and the evidence from the report would be feeding into the setting of Equality Objectives.

(b) Further work should take place to raise awareness amongst staff of the inclusion of data on sexual orientation and religion as part of equality monitoring in the college. Staff should be encouraged to update their personal records with this information.

We have been working on improving the MyView dashboard to make access to the staff information self-service system easier and, when that is completed, there will be a launch and all staff will be encouraged to log in to update their equality data. This is planned for around Easter time (2014).

(c) Look at the grievances and disciplinaries data with a particular focus on age profile to identify if there are any common themes. Data may be too limited and this could be monitored over time.

We continue to collect and monitor the data on grievances and disciplinaries, and the numbers are small limiting identification of significant themes.

(d) Given the persistent low percentage of disabled staff across all job types, more active consideration should be given to encouraging applications from disabled people through for example making job vacancies known to disabled people’s organisations. In addition, consideration could be given, in consultation with a group of existing disabled staff, to the development of an intern programme aimed specifically at disabled people.

A Royal Holloway Disability Forum is now in place, with planned meeting taking place termly. Professor Scott Elias has agreed to be the Disability Champion and has initiated an online disability discussion forum. A guide for Disabled staff and another for Managers on supporting Disabled staff have been consulted on. A proposal to centralise the process and budget for 'making reasonable adjustment' to facilitate disabled staff to work at the College is waiting for approval for funding. However, consultation about the development of an intern programme aimed specifically at disabled people has not been raised at the forum. The Access Guide to the College has been reviewed and a new improved guide has just been published. Having laid the foundations we can jointly investigate with the forum the feasibility of developing an intern programme aimed specifically at disabled people.
The continuing relatively low representation of minority ethnic staff at the senior academic levels and senior management levels should be explored further.

The relatively low representation of minority ethnic staff at the senior academic levels and senior management levels are being looked at. We are in the process of exploring data on the time staff spent in their current grade to establish where there may be barriers to promotion. The process and procedures for applying for promotion has been reviewed and there are clear criteria set out that applicants have to meet and on which eligibility for promotion are assessed, establishing a fairer and more transparent process. Senior academics and Head of Departments also attended training to raise awareness on unconscious bias. Improvements have been made to the recruitment process and the paperwork documenting the evidence on which appointment decisions are made. This year, the College has also sponsored three BME staff to attend the Stellar HE programme; a Strategic Executive Development Programme for Diverse Leaders in Higher Education. We have indicated our intention to participate in B-MEntor, a cross-institutional mentoring scheme for BME staff when recruitment starts for the next academic year. Work is in progress to establish a race equality network.

The relatively low percentage of women at the professorial levels compared to their representation overall in academic roles should be looked into, as should the recent decrease of the percentage of women at senior management level.

Quite a lot of work has taken place over the past year to improve the representation of women at professorial levels, and the target of 30% has been achieved and increased to 35%, following the latest round of promotions (2013). Initiatives cited in e) are also relevant here. Exploring data on the time staff spent in their current grade would help us establish where there may be barriers to promotion for women as well. The process and procedures for applying for promotion has been reviewed and there are clear criteria set out that applicants have to meet and on which eligibility for promotion are assessed, establishing a fairer and more transparent process. Senior academics and Head of Departments also attended training to raise awareness on unconscious bias. Improvements have been made to the recruitment process and the paperwork documenting the evidence on which appointment decisions are made. The College has also sign up to the Aurora programme, an initiative to develop future women leaders in Higher Education institutions. An initiative to positively address the representation of women at professorial level to 35% by 2015 has just been approved and we will be implementing it.

As previously recommended, it would be useful to collect equality data from the College Council membership and include that in the regular equality monitoring report.

We have incorporated the collection of equality data as part of the recruitment process for College Council members. We are also in the process of collecting equality data from the existing College Council members. All vacancies for lay Council Members are being advertised nationally which include a sentence stating that we would welcome applications from minority groups as they are underrepresented.
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