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**Introduction**

In May 2013 HPRC adopted Athena SWAN Charter type principles and processes in support of the Faculty staff equality and diversity agenda. The terms of reference and the working group membership are appended (**appendix 1**).

The Athena SWAN Charter is co-owned by the Higher Education Sector’s Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) and the UKRC. It focuses upon the underrepresentation of women in STEMM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Maths and Medicine) subjects. It recognises commitment to the recruitment, retention and progression of women in STEMM areas through three levels of awards: Bronze (planning), Silver (doing) and Gold (sustaining). All Awards work towards equality in terms of the career progression of women in STEMM and are committed to evidencing a real culture change with the University and its individual Schools.

We agreed that the scope of the Humanities scheme would be widened to address the underrepresentation of BME staff as well as women, and to include professional support services (PSS) staff as well as academic and research staff.

The action plan provides a systematic framework for promoting and advancing the Faculty’s equality and diversity agenda and objectives to meet its headline 2020 staff diversity targets (**Box1**)

**Box 1. The Faculty of Humanities headline staff diversity targets for 2020**

* A minimum of 47 per cent of female staff at senior lecturer/professorial level and in academic leadership and management roles;
* A minimum of 15 per cent of BME staff at senior lecturer/professorial level and in academic leadership and management roles;
* To increase the BME representation amongst PSS staff from 7 per cent to 12 per cent, which is the proportion of BME men and women in the working population of Greater Manchester.

We adapted and supplemented the Athena SWAN processes in order to streamline effort across Schools and unit boundaries and to share the learning which had already taken place with the implementation of Athena in the STEMM subjects and from local equality initiatives which had been introduced in some parts of the Faculty.

The work plan was devised in two stages with the aim of combining efficient economics of scale (Stage one: Faculty-wide Working Group) with School level granularity and ownership of the resulting action plan (Stage two: School focus), as detailed in appendix one. In the period November 2013-September 2014 the Working Group (WG) completed the majority of Stage one tasks and devised the work plan for Stage 2. Over the next six months we will finalise the policy review and communication (from Stage one) while progressing the implementation of School action plans (Stage two).

**Update: The Equality Challenge Unit has announced that new gender equality and race equality marks are to be introduced and extended to all subjects, see box 2 below for detail.**

* Our work to date means we are well-placed to respond to these new sector-wide initiatives. We will pay close attention to the developments at the ECU to ensure we remain aligned and to take advantage of new guidance as it is developed.

**Box 2. The Equality Challenge Unit’s gender equality and race equality charter marks**

In November 2014 the Equality Challenge Unit announced that the Athena SWAN charter will be expanding in 2015 to include arts, humanities, social science, business and law departments alongside the current focus on STEMM subjects. This follows a successful gender equality charter mark trial (October 2013-September 2014) with a small number of institutions.

The gender equality charter make will encompass equality for men and trans staff as well as women, professional and support staff, honorary staff and those on atypical (non-standard contracts such as fixed-term or part-time) contracts. Athena SWAN will be extended to cover these areas.

The ECU is currently running a trial of its race equality charter, due to finish in July 2015; after this the ECU will further review the Athena SWAN and gender equality charter mark materials and processes.

The ECU is in the process of consulting with a number of key stakeholders, including ECU funders, the royal societies and BIS on the future shape and direction of the charter marks.

*Equality Challenge Unit press release, 11 November 2014*

1. **Progress Report on Working Group activity (November 2013-October 2014)**

The Working Group commenced in November 2013. Following the completion of the preparation work undertaken by HR and the WG chair the meetings of the Working Group took place on 5 March, 15 May, 23 June, 24 September and 20 October 2014. By the end of October 2014, the following had been completed.

**2.1 Data and policy audit**

HR assembled the following information to inform the work programme:

* ***Sector context***
* Data for the diversity profile of the UK HE sector were collected where readily available to benchmark the position at the University of Manchester and in the Faculty of Humanities.
* ***The gender and BME profile of academics, PSS staff and students at the Faculty and School level***
* Staff gender and BME profile for academic/research and PSS staff by grade for 2012/13 and comparable data for 2011/12 and 2012/13
* Student profile by gender and ethnicity for UG, PGT and PGR cohorts for each School
* Comparative student profile data for the five years from 2008/09 to 2012/13
* Student-staff “pipeline” for women for each School by an analysis of proportion of females, at UG, PGT, PGR, Researcher, Lecturer, SL, Professorial level.
* ***A list of the University’s employment-related policies and procedures, with url links (appendix 2)***
* ***Guidelines for advancing Equality and Diversity in Organizations (url links at appendix 2)***
* Equality and Human Rights Commission’s (EHRC): *An employer's guide to... Creating an inclusive workplace*
* Business in the Community’s (BITC) Opportunity Now *Exemplar employer best practice*
* BITC’s Race for Opportunity *Getting Started with Race Diversity*
* Equality Challenge Unit’s (ECU) *Gender equality and race equality charter marks*
* ***Pay Gap data***
  + The University’s equal pay audit for all staff groups (i.e. both academic and non-academic) below professorial and Grade 9 level conducted in 2013 and the equal pay audit for professorial staff in 2012. An article about, and summary report of, the University’s equal pay audit of its staff, was published on StaffNet: <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=19997>
  + HR carried out an up-to-date professorial pay audit within Humanities as at 1 May 2014 for the Working Group.
* ***Staff recruitment data***

HR invested in new software early in 2014 to improve reporting capability on job applicants so that granular reports could be generated that show the progress of candidates through the recruitment cycle by gender and ethnicity. It was intended that this would show this information by vacancy, occupational group, level and School. Reports were produced by School/Faculty Administration that showed the progress of applicants by ethnicity and gender at application, shortlisting and appointment stages at each level/grade. As the samples at unit level were small, the data was aggregated at each level by occupational group and level across the Faculty so that the WG could consider broader trends (**appendix 3**).

* ***Academic promotions data***

The summary of the numbers of cases in 2013/14 at each stage by gender and ethnicity was circulated to the WG on 1 July (see **appendix 4**), as well as a table showing comparisons for the previous three years.

**2.2 Interim analysis**

The Working Group used the data audit to start to identify the particular issues in relation to gender and BME inequalities at the School and Faculty PSS level, with the University policy framework as a background resource at this first step in the analysis. An interim report was presented in May 2014.

* 1. **Communications and consultation**

The WG remit and membership has been communicated within Schools by the Head of School, in *Humanities eNews* (no.26, April 2014), and as an item in the April *PSS CoreMunicate*.

The results from the interim report were presented to the Faculty Senior Management Team and the Heads of Schools’ leadership teams at the Faculty core brief in May 2014.

This communication, and the President’s Q&A event on 1 April 2014, triggered a modest flow of email queries and suggestions, which have been handled by HR.

The working group is now developing a communications plan for:

(a) The results of this first stage of work, presented in this report

(b) A campaign in the Faculty to raise awareness and use of the policies we already have in place to promote Equality and Diversity (listed in appendix 2)

(c) The School level action plans being developed in order to inform and engage staff in the activity being taken forward in their School.

The proposal for staff consultation and engagement in Stage is presented in section 6.

1. **Equality and Diversity Headlines for Humanities**

This section presents the results of the first stage analysis which audits the Faculty’s gender and BME profile.

**3.1 Sector context and benchmarking of The University of Manchester**

There are some institutional benchmarking data for the gender and BME profile of academic staff but not for the gender and BME profile of PSS staff in the HEI sector.

Women have increased their presence at each academic level in the sector in the UK; and by 2011/12 held 21 per cent of professorial compared with 7 per cent in 1994/5. Women have gained ground at the senior management positions in higher education as well, and by 2011 17 per cent of vice-chancellors were women, up from 14 per cent in 2007/8[[1]](#footnote-1). Yet this is still an under-representation given that 39 per cent of all academics and 47% of non-professorial academics are now women; and some distance from 50/50 gender parity in the sector.

Statistics for the UK Higher Education sector indicate that some institutions have made more progress than others in closing the gender gap, and international comparisons reveal salient differences between countries even if the over-riding picture is still one of women’s underrepresentation in academic life[[2]](#footnote-2).

BME people are under-represented as well; across the sector they hold 13% of non-professorial positions but only 7.3% of professorial ones (Box 3).

In the sector’s JNCHES negotiating guidelines for equal pay a pay gap greater than 5% is considered significant[[3]](#footnote-3). Among professors, the pay gap between BME and White staff is even higher than the gender pay gap, and both exceed this 5% threshold (Box 3).

An analysis of the gender pay gap for 2011/12 provides a comparison for The University of Manchester against the sector average (Box 4). There is no comparable data available to benchmark performance for the White:BME pay gap among academics.

**Box 3. Gender and BME under-representation in the Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) of the UK**

* BME staff hold 13% of non-professorial positions and 7.3% of professorial positions in the UK’s HEIs
* Women hold 46.8% of non-professorial positions and 19.8% of professorial positions
* On average, BME professors earn 9.4% less than their white counterparts
* On average, female professors earn 6.3% less than their white counterparts
* At the current pace of change it is estimated that it will take 38.8 years for women to be represented at the same proportion at professorial level as they are at on-professorial level; for BME staff it will take 15.8 years

*Source: University and College Union (2012) ‘The position of women and BME staff in professional roles in HEIs in the UK, calculations based on HESA staff records 2010/11*

**Box 4. Benchmarking the gender pay gap for The University of Manchester against the UK HEI sector average, 2011-12**

* The average gender pay gap for all full-time academics in the UK’s Higher Education Sector was 12% for all full-time academics, 5.3% for non-professorial full-time academics and 6.2% for professors.
* The comparable gender pay gap figures for The University of Manchester were slightly wider than the sector average for all full-time and non-professorial staff but similar for professorial staff: 15.9% for all full-time academics, 6.1% for non-professorial full-time academics and 6.3% for professorial staff.
* Ranking the 15 Russell Group Universities for which data were available according to which had the smallest gender pay gap The University of Manchester ranked 5th for the average gender pay gap for all full-time academic staff, equal 7th for non-professorial staff and 9th for professorial staff.

Note: This excludes some institutions which refused to provide the data.

*Source: The Times Higher Education, March 28th 2013*.

Research on organisational diversity identifies how organisational policies and practices (‘structure’) interact with organisational culture (normative expectations about behaviour; attitudes and stereotypes) and the size and shape of the recruitment pool (the ambitions, aspirations and skills of the ‘pipeline’) to obstruct or promote workforce diversity[[4]](#footnote-4).

This variation is evident among academic staff within The University of Manchester:

* Overall 22 per cent of professors are women (slightly better than the 19 per cent average for the Russell Group), but the rate is somewhat higher, at 29 per cent, in the Faculty of Humanities.
* Similarly 8 per cent of Manchester professoriate are BME status (compared to the 7 per cent average for the Russell Group), while the figure for Humanities is 10 per cent.

Our analysis within the Faculty has revealed further variation, which underscores the importance of combining effective organisational-wide policies with local focus for policy design and evaluation.

**3.2 Overview of the gender and BME profile in the Faculty of Humanities**

An overview is presented below of the gender and BME profile of PSS across the Faculty (Table 3.1), academic staff disaggregated by School (Table 3.2A-E3) and home students disaggregated by School and level of study (Table 3.3). These overviews are extracted from a more detailed analysis provided in separate reports for each School and the Faculty completed by the Working Group members (available on request).

In relation to the data on BME staff it is important to note that this category encompasses different ethnic groups who face different labour market prospects (Box 5).

**Box 5. Ethnic Inequalities in Labour Market Participation in the UK**

Ethnic minority groups in England and Wales have a history of lower rates of employment and higher rates of unemployment than the White majority population.

Within this overall picture for the UK there are pronounced differences in unemployment rates and in the occupational profiles of the BME population. The picture varies further between men and women once the intersection of gender and ethnicity is taken into account.

So, for example among men aged 25-49 years men who are from the White, Indian or Chinese ethnic group have the highest employment rate; while it is lower for men in the Black African or Caribbean ethnic group and lower still for men from Bangladeshi, Pakistani or White Gypsy/Irish Traveller ethnic groups. Similarly, among women aged 25-49 years the highest employment rates are for women from White, Indian and Black-Caribbean ethnic groups. Part-time employment is more common for White women and women from the Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic groups than for women from other ethnic groups.

Source: ESRC Centre on Dynamics of Ethnicity, University of Manchester “Ethnic Inequalities in labour market participation?” Briefing, September 2013 <http://www.ethnicity.ac.uk/research/outputs/briefings/>

For the analysis of BME academic staff and students there is a further important distinction to take into account: between UK and international recruits. We explore this issue further where the data is available and assessed to be of reliable quality.

***PSS staff in The Faculty of Humanities – gender and BME profile***

The Faculty Professional Support Service (PSS) staff is predominantly female but women are less well-represented at the senior grades **(Table 3.1).** Women occupy three quarters of positions in grades 1-4 and two thirds in Grades 5-6 and 7, but their representation falls to just over half at Grades 8-9 (55.8%).

BME men and women hold only 7 per cent of positions in grades 1-4, and their representation is lower still at the higher grades and falls to only 3.4% of PSS staff at Grades 8-9. These figures are below the 12 per cent Faculty target (BME men and women represent 12 per cent of the working age population of Greater Manchester). The representation of BME women among the PSS staff profile is even lower than the overall figure for BME men and women.

**Table 3.2** presents the profile of PSS staff across our Schools and shows that the largest pool of BME PSS staff is in MBS (21 out of 254 PSS staff are BME). The highest representation of BME staff in the PSS entry grades (Grade 1-4) are in SoSS (11%) and MBS (10%), and MBS also has the better representation of BME staff at Grades 5-6 and 7-9 where BME 6% and 5% of staff are BME status.

**Table 3.1 The gender and BME profile of PSS staff in the Faculty of Humanities**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Faculty of Humanities** | | | | **Total number (row count)** |
|  | **The % of staff in each grade who are…** | | |
| **% Female** | **% BME** | **% Female & BME** |
| **Grade 1-4** | 73.6 | 7.2 | 5.9 | 307 |
| **Grade 5-6** | 68.4 | 5.5 | 3.2 | 253 |
| **Grade 7** | 66.1 | 6.5 | 3.2 | 62 |
| **Grade 8-9** | 55.8 | 3.4 | 0 | 29 |

Note: % BME is the percentage of staff who self-defined as BME, the count includes staff who are white/BME/status unknown.

***Academic staff in The Faculty of Humanities - gender and BME profile***

Taking 2008/9 as a baseline, the proportion of women has risen at each academic grade. By 2012/13 women held 38% of research positions (up from 32%), 47% of lectureship positions (up from 40%), 35% of senior lecturer/readerships (up from 30%) and 28% of professorships (up from 26%).

By 2012/13 there was also some improvement against the 2008/9 baseline in the representation of BME men and women at the various academic grades: research staff remained the same (14%) but for the other grades there was a slight increase to 15% for lecturers (up from 14%), to 12% for senior lecturers/readers (up from 10%) and to 10% for professors (up from 9%).

Women and BME staff have a higher representation among teaching-only staff than lecturers on teaching and research contracts. In 2012/13 62% of teaching only staff were women and 18% were BME status.

Among research staff in 2012/13 just over half of the junior research positions were filled by women (56%) and 13% by BME men and women, but there representation was lower in the higher grades and among the senior research fellows there were no BME staff and only a third were women.

Turning to the gender and BME profile of academic staff we see some variation across Schools (**Table 3.2**). Note that the School of Law is smaller than the other four Schools and the small number of people at each grade level precludes the calculation of reliable percentages, so the data for this school is presented slightly differently, which is explained in the Table column titles and notes.

In the research on gender inequalities an occupation is considered mixed or ‘balanced’ if men and women each hold at least 40% of the positions; i.e neither hold more than 60%. On this measure the lecturer grade is gender mixed in every School except SoSS, where only 31% of lecturers are women.

Women’s representation is lower at senior lecturer/reader level and lower still at professorial level. The Faculty target of women holding 47% of the senior lecturer/reader/professor positions has not been reached in any of our Schools.

* Only one in five of the SL/Readers in SOSS are women and one in three of those in Law and MBS, rising to 39% in SEED and 42% in SALC.
* Women’s representation at professorial level is lowest in Law (three of the 20 professors, circa 15 per cent) and MBS (19 per cent) rising to 25 per cent in SEED, 36 per cent in SOSS and 37 per cent in SALC.
* Hence the professoriate in SOSS and SALC are close to reaching a balanced gender profile. However, this may disguise pronounced variation within Schools by discipline areas, for example in economics compared to sociology.
* Research positions are generally less secure than lecturer posts but can provide a career stepping stone into a lectureship. The gender profile of research staff is similar to that for lecturer grades in SALC and SEED. In MBS and SOSS there are more women among research staff than among lecturers. (In Law there is only three research staff and so no reliable conclusion can be drawn).

This fall-off in women’s representation at more senior grades can result from two processes. It may be due in part to a cohort effect if women are more recent entrants and hence are less ready, on average, for promotion compared to the men at the comparable grade. But it may also be that women are slower to apply for promotion, or if they apply are less successful. This is analysed later in section 3.6 below.

The Faculty target that a minimum of 15% of senior lecturer/reader/professional staff should be BME men and women has not been met in any of the five Schools. Between 12-14 per cent of lecturers are BME in SALC, SEED and SOSS, just over a quarter in MBS (27%) and one third in LAW. BME Representation is lower at SL/reader and lower still among the professoriate.

* The fall-off in BME presence at senior lecturer/reader compared to lecturer level seems to be more pronounced in LAW, MBS and SEED than in SALC and SOSS.
* In SOSS and SALC the fall-off in BME presence appears to be at entry to the professoriate. In SEED the profile is different: the proportion of professoriate who are BME is similar to the proportion of lecturers, but with a low BME presence at senior lecturer grades. This may reflect two points of entry: at the junior lecturer grades and external recruitment of BME professors.
* The representation of BME men and women at professorial level is lowest in SALC (6 per cent of professors are BME status), SOSS (9 per cent) and MBS (10 per cent), reaching 13 per cent in SEED and slightly higher in Law (three of the 20 professors, circa 15 per cent).
* When we examine gender and BME status together we see that BME women are less likely to hold senior positions compared to either white women or the aggregate for BME men and women. SEED performs best on this indicator, for 8 per cent of their professoriate are BME women.
* The BME profile of research staff is lower than for lecturer grades in every school except SALC, where the proportion is similar (12%). There are very few BME women among research staff.

**Table 3.2 The gender and BME profile of academic staff, by School**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A. LAW** | | | | **Total number (row count)** |
|  | **The proportion of staff in each grade *[and number]* who are…** | | |
| **Female** | **BME** | **Female & BME** |
| **Lecturer** | Half [12] | One third [8] | One | 24 |
| **Senior Lecturer/Reader** | *~ one in three* [8] | *~19%* [4] | Nil | 21 |
| **Professor** | ~15% [3] | *~15%* [3] | Nil | 20 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Researcher** | One out of three | Nil | Nil | 3 |
| **PSS** |  |  |  |  |
| **Grade 1-4** | All except 1 | Nil | Nil | 17 |
| **Grade 5-6** | All except 1 | Nil | Nil | 7 |
| **Grade 7-9** | All | Nil | Nil | 2 |

Notes:

1. For the School of LAW the small total number of staff in each grade means it is not possible to calculate actual percentages, see the note to the overall table for further explanation.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B. Manchester Business School** | | | | **Total number (row count)** |
|  | **The % of staff in each grade who are…** | | |
| **% Female** | **% BME** | **% Female & BME** |
| **Lecturer** | 42 | 27 | 11 | 74 |
| **Senior Lecturer/Reader** | 31 | 13 | 1 | 70 |
| **Professor** | 19 | 10 | 4 | 77 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Researcher** | 48 | 18 | 9 | 44 |
| **PSS** |  |  |  |  |
| **Grade 1-4** | 66 | 10 | 9 | 116 |
| **Grade 5-6** | 72 | 6 | 4 | 98 |
| **Grade 7-9** | 68 | 5 | 0 | 40 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C. SALC** | | | | **Total number (row count)** |
|  | **The % of staff in each grade who are…** | | |
| **% Female** | **% BME** | **% Female & BME** |
| **Lecturer** | 57 | 12 | 9 | 118 |
| **Senior Lecturer/Reader** | 42 | 10 | 4 | 73 |
| **Professor** | 37 | 6 | 3 | 70 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Researcher** | 56 | 12 | 3 | 34 |
| **PSS** |  |  |  |  |
| **Grade 1-4** | 71 | 4 | 1 | 73 |
| **Grade 5-6** | 82 | 3 | 3 | 33 |
| **Grade 7-9** | .. | .. | .. | 6 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D. SEED** | | | | **Total number (row count)** |
|  | **The % of staff in each grade who are…** | | |
| **% Female** | **% BME** | **% Female & BME** |
| **Lecturer** | 51 | 14 | 12 | 76 |
| **Senior Lecturer/Reader** | 39 | 4 | 2 | 46 |
| **Professor** | 25 | 13 | 8 | 40 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Researcher** | 52 | 6 | 0 | 33 |
| **PSS** |  |  |  |  |
| **Grade 1-4** | 78 | 8 | 5 | 40 |
| **Grade 5-6** | .. | .. | .. | 25 |
| **Grade 7-9** | .. | .. | .. | 7 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **E. SOSS** | | | | **Total number (row count)** |
|  | **The % of staff in each grade who are…** | | |
| **% Female** | **% BME** | **% Female & BME** |
| **Lecturer** | 31 | 13 | 3 | 77 |
| **Senior Lecturer/Reader** | 22 | 17 | 2 | 41 |
| **Professor** | 36 | 9 | 1 | 70 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Researcher** | 55 | 5 | 2 | 58 |
| **PSS** |  |  |  |  |
| **Grade 1-4** | 86 | 11 | 11 | 36 |
| **Grade 5-6** | All except 3 | Nil | Nil | 17 |
| **Grade 7-9** | 2 of the 3 | Nil | Nil | 3 |

Notes:

1. The number of BME is the staff who self-defined as BME, the count includes staff who are white/BME/status unknown.
2. The percentage is not shown when the total number of staff in the grade (row count) is less than thirty because the calculation becomes unreliable. Hence for the School of LAW it is only possible to show the actual numerical count, not the percentage, given the small number of staff in each grade.

***Students in the Faculty of Humanities – gender and BME profile***

It is relevant to assess the profile at lecturer and researcher grades by reference to the gender and BME profile in the pipeline – the students who are studying different degree subjects. Table 3.3 provides a basic indicator of this pipeline by presenting the gender and UK-BME profile of our students. We recognise that a more accurate picture would require national and international student profile data.

**Table 3.3 The gender, BME and UK/non-UK profile of students by School as at \*\* pending final data check\*\***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **The % of students at each level of study who are…** | | | **Total count** |
| **% Female** | **% UK- BME** | **% Non-UK** |
| **LAW** |  |  |  |  |
| Undergraduate | 65 | 18 | 34 | 1175 |
| Postgraduate (taught) | 63 | 11 | 38 | 189 |
| Postgraduate research | 43 | 11 | 38 | 72 |
| **MBS** |  |  |  |  |
| Undergraduate | 47 | 11 | 53 | 1678 |
| Postgraduate (taught) | 54 | 7 | 70 | 1661 |
| Postgraduate research | 45 | 9 | 70 | 203 |
| **SALC** |  |  |  |  |
| Undergraduate | 62 | 11 | 8 | 4377 |
| Postgraduate (taught) | 69 | 7 | 30 | 500 |
| Postgraduate research | 61 | 6 | 28 | 309 |
| **SEED** |  |  |  |  |
| Undergraduate | 57 | 12 | 12 | 1114 |
| Postgraduate (taught) | 67 | 7 | 33 | 1625 |
| Postgraduate research | 64 | 6 | 40 | 342 |
| **SOSS** |  |  |  |  |
| Undergraduate | 46 | 15 | 38 | 2827 |
| Postgraduate (taught) | 51 | 9 | 50 | 321 |
| Postgraduate research | 51 | 6 | 49 | 178 |

Women are well-represented among the student population in the Faculty of Humanities. In some parts of the Faculty women account for more than 60 per cent of the student population which indicates ‘gender imbalance’ according to the definition explained earlier in the discussion of the academic staff profile:

* Women account for more than half of the undergraduate students in LAW (65 per cent), SALC (62 per cent) and SEED (57 per cent) and just under half in MBS and SOSS (46-7 per cent).
* More than half of our PGT students are women in every School (51 per cent in SOSS, rising to 69 per cent in SALC).
* At PGR level women the majority of students are women in SALC and SEED (61-64 per cent) while the picture is roughly fifty-fifty in SOSS and less than half in MBS and LAW (43-45per cent).
* The representation of women at PGT and PGR is similar or higher than at UG level in all Schools except for PGR in Law, where the proportion of students who are women is markedly lower than at UG or PGT level.

If we focus on the BME students who are home students (UK) the headlines are that:

* BME representation among home student undergraduates is highest in LAW (18 per cent) and lowest in SALC (11 per cent).
* BME representation among home students is lower at PGT and PGR than at UG level in every School.
* There is a lower proportion of UK BME students than non-UK students at every level of study in every school except among undergraduates in SALC and SEED.

These aggregate School data may hide more pronounced gender and BMW differences between disciplines and degree programmes within Schools.

**3.3 The University of Manchester’s Equal Pay Audits**

A pay gap by gender or ethnicity in any occupation is caused by two aspects in the application of payment systems:

* ***Equal treatment but lower ‘human capital’ (qualifications, skills, experience, productivity)***: the lower-paid group command lower salaries because they are more recent entrants (less experienced), have fewer qualifications or are less productive
* ***Unequal treatment despite similar ‘human capital:*** the lower-paid group tend to be appointed to a lower starting salary and/or progress more slowly through the pay and promotion scale despite having similar skills, productivity and experience to their better-paid counterparts

In the sector’s JNCHES negotiating guidelines for equal pay a pay gap greater than 5% within a grade is considered significant[[5]](#footnote-5).

The main findings of the University’s equal pay audit in 2013 of all staff below professorial and Grade 9 level (excluding casual staff and those employed in subsidiaries) were that the pay gaps within grades were small and less than the 5%. However, the underrepresentation of women and BME staff at senior grades meant that the overall pay gaps for staff in Grades 1-8 exceeded 5%:

* ***Gender:*** There is an overall gender pay gap across Grades 1-8 of 9.7 per cent in favour of male staff. At no grade does male staff pay exceed female staff pay by more than 1.9 per cent.
* ***Ethnicity:*** There is an overall pay gap of 6.3 per cent between BME staff and white staff, in favour of white staff. At no grade does the pay of white staff exceed that of BME staff by more than 2.6 per cent.

What does this mean in monetary terms? Across all full-time staff at grades 1-8 the average annual salary in 2013 was £33,678. Among staff at this grade

* Men in full-time positions were paid an average £2,926.59 more per annum than women.
* Among part-timers the pay gap is smaller, with women earning just over £221.07 less per annum than the minority of men on part-time contracts.
* BME staff were paid an average £1,222.43 less than White staff.
* The 2 per cent of staff who do not declare that ethnic status are lower paid than both BME and White staff.

**Table 3.4 Extract of the Equal Pay Audit for PSS and academic staff grades 1-8**

1. ***Gender pay gap***[[6]](#footnote-6)

| *Grades 1-8* | FT Average Salary | FT Pay Gap % | PT Average Salary | PT Pay Gap % | All Average Salary | All Pay Gap % |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | £33,678.23 |  | £28,255.42 |  | £32,645.00 |  |
| Women | £32,112.34 | -8.3 | £28,199.80 | 0.78 | £31,037.26 | **-9.7** |
| Men | £35,038.93 |  | £28,420.87 |  | £34,379.45 |  |

1. ***Ethnicity pay gap***[[7]](#footnote-7)

| *Grades 1-8* | FT Average Salary | FT Pay Gap % | PT Average Salary | PT Pay Gap | All Average Salary | All Pay Gap |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grand Total | £33,678.23 |  | £28,255.42 |  | £32,645.00 |  |
| BME | £32,699.60 | -3.6 | £22,687.10 | -21.9 | £30,914.35 | **-6.3** |
| Not known | £28,597.67 |  | £26,235.95 |  | £28,225.75 |  |
| White | £33,922.03 |  | £29,053.67 |  | £32,982.66 |  |

**3.4 The University and Faculty Professorial Pay Gap**

Table 3.5 presents the pay gaps for the professoriate at Manchester in 2012. The size of the pay gaps in 2012 were smaller than the sector average calculated by UCU for that year (see box 3 above) and the gender pay gap was slightly lower than the data published in the THE for the following year (see box 4 above). These pay gaps equate to a median gender pay gap among the professoriate of £3,320 per annum; the equivalent gap between white and BME professoriate is £2,507 per annum.

**Table 3.5 The average and median pay gaps for the University of Manchester professoriate, 2012**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Mean** | **Median** |
| **Gender pay gap** | 4% | 5% |
| **White: BME** | 1% | 3% |

Source: analyse conducted by the University of Manchester Equality and Diversity Unit

Table 3.6 provides an update for the situation in 2014, but only for the Faculty of Humanities. It shows that the average gender pay gap for professors was 5.6 per cent in favour of men as at 1 May 2014. This is wider than at University level in 2012.

The gender pay gap among the professoriate is negligible in percentage terms at the entry grade of promotion to a professor (9E) but then starts to widen in Grade D and is wider still at Grade C. While there is similar numbers of male and female professors at Grade E, there are many fewer female than male professors at Grades D and C. And those women who are zoned at that grade are lower paid on average than men in the same salary zone.

Table 3.7 shows that in May 2014 a 0.36 per cent pay gap in favour of White professors when compared to BME professors. This is narrower than at University level in 2012. Not only is the BME:White pay gap narrower than the gender pay gap, unlike the gender pay gap is shows no clear pattern of widening at the high paid professorial zones.

**Table 3.6: Average Annual Professorial FTE Salary in Humanities by Zones C to E and Gender, 1 May 1st 2014 (including pay gap information)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Zone/Grade** | **Number of Professors** | | | **Annual salary average** | | | **Female: Male**  **Pay Gap** |
|  | **Men** | **Women** | **Total** | **Women** | **Men** | **Total** |
| **Grade 9C** | 51 | 11 | 62 | £91,313 | £95,777 | £94,985 | -4.66% |
| **Grade 9D** | 112 | 41 | 153 | £73,284 | £74,475 | £74,156 | -1.6% |
| **Grade 9E** | 33 | 29 | 62 | £63,864 | £64,255 | £64,072 | -0.61% |
| **Total** | 196 | 81 | 277 | £72,359 | £76,651 | £76,561 | -5.6% |

**Table 3.7: Average Annual Professorial FTE Salary in Humanities by Zones C to E and Ethnicity, May 1st 2014 (including pay gap Information)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Zone/Grade** | **Number of Professors** | | | **Annual salary average** | | | **BME: White**  **Pay Gap** |
|  | **BME** | **White** | **Total** | **BME** | **White** | **Total** |
| **Grade 9C** | 6 | 56 | 62 | £96,652 | £94,806 | £94,985 | 1.95% |
| **Grade 9D** | 15 | 138 | 153 | £73,839 | £74,190 | £74,156 | -0.48% |
| **Grade 9E** | 5 | 56 | 62 | £66,322 | £63,959 | £64,072 | 2.13% |
| **Total** | 26 | 250 | 277 | £77,465 | £77,743 | £76,561 | -0.36% |

Note: Data for 8 staff paid in zones A and B is not included.

The potential points of unequal treatment in the professorial payment system are:

* Internal and External Entry points: Internal promotions are usually to zone ‘E’. There is more discretion in the starting salaries for external appointments, and bargaining will be influenced by the current salary position of the person being recruited. Entry points for external appointments might cleave according to whether the recruit is joining from a Russell Group or other research-intensive University where salaries are generally higher than elsewhere in the sector in the UK; and negotiating positions will also be affected if the recruit is joining from a higher-paying system outside the UK, for example North America.
* Progression: Decisions about incremental progression or rezoning zones D-A rest on a performance case being submitted and assessed against criteria and with some managerial discretion. The lower representation of female professors at these higher pay zones may be for three reasons.
  + Women have joined the professorial ranks more recently on average, and so the lower salary reflects a more junior career stage.
  + Women and men join the professorial ranks on different starting salaries which do not necessarily reflect differences in career stage or the strength of their c.v. (see entry points above)
  + Women may progress more slowly if they make fewer or more modest applications, of if their applications are less successful.
* Segregation: Pay norms may vary across Faculties (which may or may not be attributed to actual market conditions or reflected formally in market supplements). If women or BME professors are concentrated in the lower paid disciplines/Schools then this will contribute to a pay gap across the overall professoriate.
* Market supplements: Market supplements are paid in some discipline areas where external market conditions make it difficult to recruit. This occurs for some appointments in some business, law and economics specialisms; it is less common in other disciplines. Beyond the Faculty the clinical and non-clinical distinctions is particularly salient.

**3.5 Recruitment and promotion data**

Fine grained recruitment data is needed to understand where and how underrepresented groups are failing in the process (i.e. are they attracted to apply, do they fail to get shortlisted or do they fail once interviewed?).

The academic staff recruitment data for the Faculty for the period January 1 to December 31 2013 are presented in appendix 3. This new analysis reveals important insights about progression from application to appointment, summarised below.

***Recruitment to academic positions***

* Women are still less likely to apply for academic positions: they formed 41 per cent of applicants at Lecturer level and 34 per cent at SL level.
* However, of those who do apply a similar percentage of men and women were shortlisted for interview at Lecturer and SL level.
* Furthermore, a broadly similar proportion of men and women were successful at the interview stage for Lecturers (22% of women and 29% of men). Of those interviewed for an SL appointment the success rate was twice as high for women as for men.
* There is no problem attracting BME candidates to apply for academic posts at any level with the figure representing 31 per cent of the total;
* However, while 14 per cent of white candidates were shortlisted the rate was lower for BME candidates at 10 per cent;
* Of those called for interview, success rates at interview for White and BME candidates are 24 and 22 per cent respectively; a slightly smaller difference than in the probability of being shortlisted.
* Overall, 22 per cent of appointments were BME.
* Figures suggest that there is no problem with the BME pipeline in terms of volume of applicants, but there is a possible issue at shortlisting stage.
* The data sample is too small to come to a reliable conclusion on shortlisting or success rates at Chair level. Of the 51 applications 16% came from women and 39% from BME candidates.

***Recruitment of Language Tutors***

* Women accounted for 74% of language tutor applicants. Of those who applied a similar proportion of men and women were shortlisted (8-9%) but of the shortlisted men and women, the men more successful at securing a position (67% of the shortlisted men compared to 25% of the shortlisted women).
* BME men and women accounted for 86% of language tutor applicants, of which 6% were shortlisted compared to 20% of White applicants. The shortlisted BME applicants were slightly less successful at securing a position (29% compared to 33% of shortlisted white applicants).

***Recruitment of Research staff***

* Similar proportions of men and women apply and are shortlisted but men are more successful at interview stage. Within this aggregate picture there is no gender gap in success rates at the entry grades 5 and 6.
* The BME applicant pipeline is fine accounting for 27 per cent of applicants, but BME candidates are much less likely to be shortlisted and appointed at interview stage than white candidates.

***Recruitment of PSS staff***

* Men form only 32 per cent of the applicant pool, but perform as well as women at shortlisting and interview stages overall. They are less likely to be successful at interview for grade 5 and 6 positions but have a higher success rate than women at interview stage for grade 7 and 8 positions.
* 17 per cent of applicants are BME, so there is no problem with the pipeline.
* BME applicants are less likely to be shortlisted than white candidates at grade 5 and above and overall are half as likely to be appointed at interview stage, so this needs further investigation.

***Academic promotions***

Data for the 2013/14 academic promotions round in the Faculty (appendix 4) showed the following.

***Gender***

* Similar proportions of men and women applied for promotion overall (5%) and with similar success rates for those who applied (80% for women, 78% for men).
* The same proportion of men and women at lecturer level applied for promotion to senior lecturer (6%). The success rate was higher for women (87%) than for men (73%).
* Of those eligible to apply for a readership or professorship men were three times more likely than women to do so, and more likely to be successful.
* The proportion and number of women promoted to SL was up from 2013 – the number promoted rose from 8 to 13 and proportionally from 47 per cent to 54 per cent of all promotions to senior lectureship. Eleven men were promoted to senior lecturer in 2014.
* Among the pool of staff eligible to apply for a Chair the rate of application was twice as high for men (7%) compared to women (3%).
* Of the 11 male applicants to Chair, 10 were successful, a success rate of 90.9 per cent, up from the results in 2013. Two of the three women who applied were successful (67%), lower than the number and proportion in 2013 (6 of the 7 applicants were successful in 2013). As a result 16% of the 12 chair promotions went to women.

***BME***

* The number of BME promotion applicants was 6 (4 to SL, 1 to Reader and 1 to Chair), which is 4% of the total eligible BME staff; slightly lower than the 5% of eligible white applicants who applied.
* However, the success rates were much lower at 33 per cent for BME applicants compared to 85 per cent for white applicants. The two successful cases were to SL.

As a result of this first stage of the analysis members of the Working Group made a number of suggestions for further analysis to be considered in Stage 2 of the work programme. These are listed in section 6 below.

**4. School and Faculty Office Action plans**

The Working Group members have completed the preparation for the Stage 2 of the work programme.

**4.1 Faculty Office and School data analysis to inform the Action Plans**

The Working Group members undertook an analysis focussed on the results presented in section 3 for their School, and for PSS staff in the Faculty Office. The key points from this level of analysis are summarised below.

***Headline data picture across the Faculty***

* The fall off of women moving through the academic ranks is pronounced even in discipline areas that do better overall
* In those parts of the Faculty where women’s representation is better in the higher academic ranks, there are still pipeline issues to address in order to sustain and improve the position.
* BME staff are generally underrepresented at all levels for both PSS and academic staff, but the problem is more pronounced at senior levels and is worse for BME women.
* Men are underrepresented at most levels of PSS staff. In Schools where men are increasingly entering the lower grades (e.g. MBS), perhaps due to diminishing employment opportunities and job losses elsewhere in the region (particularly in the public sector) this may squeeze the promotion opportunities for women due to the ‘glass elevator’ effect which is often observed for men in female-dominated occupations[[8]](#footnote-8).
* Men‘s presence among PSS staff is higher in MBS and in the Faculty office than in the rest of the Faculty.

***School specific headlines***

* SOSS and SALC have made the most progress towards gender diversity in senior academic positions. In SOSS this was in part stimulated by the Gender Research Network which has led as the diversity champion in the School for nearly ten years. In SALC there is a strong culture of support via PDR and promotion processes.
* SOSS has identified sustainability concerns: for while it has a strong record of promotion of women to chair positions the internal pipeline is somewhat weak with women comprising just 35 per cent of lecturers and 25 per cent of senior lecturers.
* SOSS performs above the University average in terms of the BME share of senior lecturer and professorial positions but below the University average at lecturer and research positions.
* It is important to examine the gender and BME profile of senior leadership positions. For example in SALC three of the seven division heads, three of the six School functional directors and the Chair of the School Board are women.
* It seems that the decline in female representation from Senior Lecturer to Professor is more pronounced in Law and in MBS than in the other Schools (although the smaller size of Law means the percentage scores are more affected by a change in one or more members of staff).
* The BME profile in academic positions in LAW is different from the other Schools. There is a better representation at senior levels, but a particularly low representation of BME women. This merits further investigation to establish whether male colleagues are securing these senior positions through internal promotion channels or primarily through external appointments (including international recruitment). It is also likely to be shaped by the distinct career routes for lawyers, whereby the majority of graduates proceed to practice law and some may then take academic positions later in their career.
* Similarly, in education it is usual that PGT and PGR students are full-time professionals who resume study after a number of years of professional practice.
* SEED is one example of where women predominate among teaching focussed contracts.
* SALC is undertaking further analysis of its ‘teaching only’ staff given the specific situation of language tutors in this School.
* SALC propose to run an awareness raising communication plan to explain the elements of the existing policy framework to support equality and diversity, in conjunction with ‘role model’ exemplars.

**4.2 School Action Plans**

Members of the WG are taking forward the development of work within their respective areas. In each School an action plan has been devised and a working group formed with the sponsorship of the relevant Head of School. HR Partners have also been involved in working with their client Schools and will continue to do so as action plans are developed and implemented.

**5. Policy Audit and review**

Members of the WG have conducted a review of key current employment policies to identify gaps, and to consider awareness and effectiveness. Specifically, the following policies have been reviewed to date, and others are underway:

* Promotions polices, guidelines and procedures;
* Recruitment and appointments policy and procedures including honorary appointments and internal appointments to academic management roles;
* Working conditions including Dignity at work, Consensual relationships, and Stress at Work.

This has produced helpful feedback and suggestions for changes to the content of the current policies and the means by which their provisions are communicated. The Deputy Director of HR will take these matters forward with HR colleagues. Where suggested changes are substantive, they will require wide consultation and, potentially, negotiation with campus trade unions. Suggestions regarding presentation are more straightforward.

**6. Next steps: Stage 2 of the work programme**

In line with the work programme previously approved by HPRC (**appendix 1**), the next steps for the Work Group are:

***Policy audit review***

* Complete and report on the audit of the current policy framework.

***Communications plan***

* Prepare a suitable communication of the first stage results and the plans for stage 2, with advice from the Faculty Senior Management Team, including the Head of Communications.

***Staff consultation and engagement, with a focus on organisational cultural barriers***

The audit of metrics and the Equality and Diversity policy framework provides part of the picture, but additional data collection will be needed to fill in the detail, including staff experiences of the organisational culture. This might be through carefully designed consultation channels or more systematically designed qualitative data collection. Both have significant resource implications that will need to be considered.

* We will use the results presented in this report as a basis for staff consultation and engagement to explore perceptions and experiences of organisational cultural barriers[[9]](#footnote-9) which obstruct progress towards diversity and equal treatment.
* This may take the form of running an anonymised survey or a series of qualitative focus group consultations.
* Consultation will include liaison with Humanities members of the University BME staff network and with the University’s Race Equality Charter Working Group (Chair: James Thompson, AVP for Social Responsibility).

***School and Faculty Office Action Plans***

* Support Schools and the Faculty Office in the development and implementation of their E&D action plan; including identifying comment themes and sharing good practice.

***Further analysis of the recruitment and promotions data***

It is important to understand entry points and progression profiles in order to identify where the obstacles to diversity are highest for both PSS and academic staff. For example, internal promotion may be the primary pipeline for movement into the middle grades (grade 5-6 for PSS and probation/ lectureship/senior lecturer for academics), entry to senior grades is frequently a combination of internal promotion and external recruitment channels.

* Explore the following issues arising from recruitment data and consider the different positive action interventions that might be taken in response:
* Why are BME candidates for research staff much less likely to be shortlisted and appointed at interview stage than white candidates?
* Why are women less successful than men at interview stage for research posts?
* For PSS positions, why are BME applicants less likely to be shortlisted than white candidates and half as likely to be appointed at interview stage?
* Why are women more successful in applications for senior lectureships, but less likely to apply for promotion to Chair, and less likely to secure promotion when they do apply?
* It may be useful to supplement the data on promotion applications and outcomes with information on PDR coverage and academic (sabbatical) leave.
* It may also be informative to analyse retention data and the reasons for exit by gender and BME status.

***Pay Gaps monitoring***

* Although the institutional equal pay audit of all staff is not disaggregated by Faculty, its disaggregation by grade and occupational group suggests that there are no gaps at Grades 1 to 8 (i.e. below the level of professor/Grade 9) of a magnitude that demand further investigation or action. The data should be monitored on a regular basis to ensure the situation does not deteriorate and that gaps become narrower over time.
* The overall pay gaps across all grades reflects the underrepresentation of women and BME staff at the higher grades.
* There are notable professorial pay gaps (in excess of 5%) by gender or ethnic status within certain professorial zones. The gender and BME outcomes in the cycle of professorial applications for increments and rezoning should be monitored and diagnosed as part of the annual monitoring of the outcomes from the promotions round.

***Analysis of the Gender and BME profile of school and institute leadership positions***

* Further breakdown within schools for professorial positions by discipline area where profiles are anticipated or known to vary (e.g. contrast gender profile of economics and sociology, similarly in SEED)
* The gender and BME profiles of school leadership positions (division/discipline area heads, School functional directors, chair of school board), research institutes, and of major research centres and networks.

***Analysis of fixed-term and teaching focussed contracts***

* The gender and BME profile of academic staff on fixed-term contracts and teaching focussed contracts vis-à-vis open-ended standard (teaching and research) lectureships.
* Some academic staff have moved from teaching and research contracts to ‘teaching and scholarship’ (teaching focussed) contracts. The gender and BME profile of these contract transfers should be examined to inform our understanding of career progression.

***Family responsibilities - analysis of the use of University policies and services***

* Data on care responsibilities (children, elder care) and the use of the ‘right to request reduced/flexible hours’, part-time contracts, periods of unpaid leave/career breaks and of parental leave, broken down by gender (and perhaps BME status?).
* University provision for childcare, including the nursery and support with off-site costs under the government’s childcare policy
* Review the rationale for, and communication of, the University policy concerning children on campus.

***Other recommendations for further consideration in stage 2 of the work programme***

* It would be helpful to have data showing BME status broken down by UK and non-UK nationals for academics, and for student BME data for international as well as UK students.
* The intersectionality of inequalities has been illustrated by the analysis of the data on the situation of BME women. This needs to be taken into consideration, particularly when the WG progresses to consider organisational cultural barriers to diversity, for LGBT staff for example.
* Disability is not part of the remit of this Working Group, but it is recommended that HR consider undertaking a similar audit given there are APR targets for disability as well.
* The University can play a role in progressing Equality and Diversity in society through the way that it recruits and trains it students and supports those already in professional practice (e.g. many of our postgraduates in education, law and business). The WG should liaise with the Social Responsibility Directorate in relation to its work (i) analysing student recruitment, attrition and attainment (ii) promoting social responsibility in the curriculum in relation to Equality and Diversity issues.

**7. Recommendation for the Working Group’s ongoing remit and reporting arrangements**

It is recommended that the Working Group should

* Continue to meet three or four times a year to oversee the finalisation of action plans and to monitor their progress against actions
* Submit a report to HPRC in May and November 2015 to coincide with the University HR Sub-Committee’s mid-year and end of year Staff Equality and Diversity Review as part of the APR cycle.

**Appendices**

**Appendix 1. The Faculty of Humanities’ Staff Equality and Diversity Action Plan - Terms of Reference and Working Group Membership**

1. **Introduction**

The action plan provides a systematic framework for promoting and advancing the Faculty’s equality and diversity agenda and objectives to meet its headline 2020 staff diversity targets of:

* a minimum of 47% of female staff at senior lecturer/professorial level and in academic leadership and management roles;
* a minimum of 15% of BME staff at senior lecturer/professorial level and in academic leadership and management roles.

and

* The Faculty aims to increase the BME representation amongst PSS staff from 7% to 12%, which is the proportion of BME in the working population of Greater Manchester.

The development and implementation of this action plan will make the Faculty well placed to apply for awards when ECU extends Athena Swan type accreditation into non-STEMM areas, but this is not an end in itself.

1. **Principles**

The Faculty signals its commitment in adoption of the scheme with the following principles. Specifically, the Faculty is aware that:

* The gender imbalance is particularly pronounced at senior leadership levels and in certain areas of academic activity;
* Little progress has been secured against target to redress BME under-representation;
* There may be both organisational cultural (attitudes, habits and ‘ways of doing things’ etc.) and structural obstacles to a better gender and BME representation among our workforce which require the active consideration of the organisation;
* Commitment and action is required from everyone at all levels of the organisation in order to redress gender and BME under-representation at all levels where it exists;
* Adopting demonstrably good employment and reward and recognition practices, and monitoring outcomes to establish their impact, is key to progressing fair treatment and diversity.

1. **Governance, Reporting and Working Group Membership**

Action planning at Faculty and School level will be overseen by a Working Group.

In line with the current arrangements for reporting on progress on equality and diversity measures, the Working Group will submit a mid-year progress report in May 2014 and an annual report to HPRC in November. The latter will contribute to the submission of the annual report to the HR Sub-Committee concerning progress on the HR metrics contained in the Annual Performance Review (APR).

The Working Group comprises the Deputy Dean (Project sponsor), the Head of Faculty HR (Project lead), The University Athena SWAN Coordinator and one representative from each School and one from the Faculty Administration, selected because they are knowledgeable and experienced in diversity issues through their responsibilities in their PSS role, their academic research or public engagement activities connected to advancing diversity. Additional representation was obtained from Social Sciences and MBS where particular expertise exists (i.e. through service on the University’s Athena SWAN Working Group and participation in the University’s BME staff diversity network).

The membership is as follows:

* Professor Colette Fagan, Deputy Dean-Research ( Chair)
* Andrew Mullen, Deputy Director of HR & Head of Faculty HR (Project lead)
* Dr Carolyn Abbot, Senior Lecturer, School of Law
* Professor Claire Alexander, School of Social Sciences (Sociology)
* Professor Claire Annesley, School of Social Sciences (Politics) (2013-14), to be replaced by Professor Georgina Waylen (2014-)
* Dr Helen Ryder, Athena Swan Coordinator
* Professor Helen Gunter, School of Environment, Education & Development (Education)
* Jane Hallam, Head of Faculty Planning & Compliance/Jared Ruff, Senior Research Manager, Faculty Admin.
* Jayne Hindle, Head of School Administration for Arts, Languages & Cultures
* Professor Helge Hoel, Manchester Business School (People, Management and Organisations Division)
* Dil Sidhu, Chief External Officer, Manchester Business School

1. **Approach**

We will proceed in two stages with the aim of combining efficient economics of scale (Stage one: Faculty-wide Working Group) with School level granularity and ownership of the resulting action plan (Stage two: School focus).

In Stage one the Faculty-wide Working Group will:

* Receive and analyse the relevant HR data sets.
* Prepare an overview audit of our current policies which are in place against those recommended by the Equality Challenge Unit (Athena and the Race Equality Charter), and other relevant bodies (Equality and Human Rights Commission, the Business in the Community ‘Opportunity Now’ initiative)
* Identify any gaps in the existing policy framework
* Propose innovative policies and other initiatives for consideration (and costing).

At Stage two we will use the Stage one resource to work with Schools to explore their particular local issues as well as the ones in common across the Faculty. To do this the School representative will lead on the work with the School’s designated HR Partner and the Athena SWAN Coordinator, supported by the Working Group Chair.

1. **Components of the Scheme**

The Working Group/Schools/Faculty Administration[[10]](#footnote-10) will devise action plans by considering issues under the indicative headings presented below (Box 1.).

1. **Data supply arrangements**

All data relating to student transition, current staff profile, recruitment and promotions will be provided by HR/Equality and Diversity.

1. **Action planning**

Faculty and School level actions will be devised in the form of the table. This sets out the actions to address the priorities identified by the analysis of relevant data presented, success/outcome measures, the post holder responsible for each action and a timeline for completion.

1. **Recommendation**

HPRC members are asked to note and approve this arrangement for developing the action plan.

Andrew Mullen (Head of Faculty HR)

Colette Fagan (Deputy Dean)

***Indicative headings for the Stage one audit***

An analysis of HR data – including APR metrics - and existing HR policies will provide the foundation for this assessment.

The recommendation actions that emerge from the analysis above that will be taken forward with Stage two of the Action Plan, following the interim report to SMT.

**A.1 The undergraduate/postgraduate transition**

The transition from undergraduate to postgraduate and postgraduate into the academic labour market study may be the first point of loss of female/BME talent for academic positions, the so-called ‘leaky pipeline’.

Data for our students (and national where this is available) will be analysed to identify the magnitude of the ‘leaky pipeline’ as context for understanding the academic recruitment entry pool.

Initiatives in place or planned to support and encourage female and BME students to apply for areas in which they are under-represented will be identified.

**A.2 Staff Recruitment Processes**

This will consider how staff recruitment processes ensure that female/BME candidates are attracted to apply, and how the Faculty/Schools ensures its shortlisting, selection processes and criteria comply with the University’s equality and diversity policies.

**A.3 Supporting and advancing the careers of female and BME staff**

This considers how women/BME are encouraged and supported in advancing in their careers. It is well documented that women tend to wait longer before applying for promotion and have typically achieved more before securing promotion. This section looks for evidence of action to ensure that women/BME are promoted fairly, as soon as they are ready. It will examine ratios also make use of HR’s recent Equal Pay Audit for Grades 1-8 and the audit of professorial pay gaps.

**A.4 Flexible working and managing career breaks**

This focuses on initiatives that ensure that flexible working and maternity leave are managed effectively to enable returners to progress in their careers and achieve a good work-life balance. N.B. Flexible working can refer to a wide range of options including part-time working, term time working, compressed hours, annualised hours, home working etc. It may be undertaken for a range of family responsibilities, including raising children and caring for elderly or ill parents, partners and other family members.

**A.5 Organisation and culture**

This focuses on the organisation culture and how women and BME staff are enabled to undertake additional responsibilities and raise their profile in order to enhance their career progression prospects.

The data to be examined to inform this part of the audit includes:

* committee representation and process of recruitment;
* the workload allocation and valuation of responsibilities across teaching, research, academic advising and pastoral roles; outreach and engagement activities ;
* REF2014 inclusion – equality and diversity audit;
* The timing of the ‘normal’ working day (core hours) for school meetings, and social gatherings, in relation to those with family responsibilities.

It will also consider

* the visibility of women/BME as role models;
* how we create and demonstrate cultural inclusiveness, where ‘culture’ refers to the language, behaviours and other informal interactions that characterise the atmosphere of the School, and includes all staff and students.

**A.6 Any other issues**

The Working Group will also consider any other elements which are relevant to advancing staff gender and race equality and diversity matters in the Faculty, e.g. other female/BME - specific initiatives of special interest that have not been covered in the previous sections.

It will include any other relevant data (e.g. results from the staff survey), provide a commentary on it and propose recommendations for the Stage two school level focus.

**Appendix 2. The Institutional Equality and Diversity policy framework – The University** **of Manchester Employment policies and procedures as at February 2014**

* [Academic Leave Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=7)
* [Academic Leave Procedures](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=472)
* [Academic Promotions Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=11)
* [Adoption Leave Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=474)
* [Appeals against Dismissal Procedure for Support Staff](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=8)
* [Appeals Procedure for the Final Implementation of the National Framework Agreement](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=8464)
* [Assimilation to New Pay Structure Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=797)
* [Career Break Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=477)
* [Casuals Policy and Procedure for the Engagement and Use of Casual Staff](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=740)
* [Consensual Relationships Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=2752)
* [Contracts of Employment Policy and Procedure](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=9623)
* [CRB Data Storage Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=478)
* [Death in Service Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=479)
* Dignity at Work Policy:

<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=2753>

* [Disciplinary and Dismissal Procedure for Support Staff](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=480)
* [Drug and Alcohol Abuse Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=481)
* [Drug and Alcohol Abuse Procedures](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=482)
* Equality and Diversity Policy

<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=8361>

* [Flexible Working Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=9)
* [Grievance Procedure](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=840)
* [Head of School Appointment Procedure](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=476)
* [HIV/AIDS Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=485)
* [Honorary Appointments Policy and Procedures](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=9798)
* [Interview Expenses Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=17858)
* [Market Pay Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=489)
* [Maternity Leave Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=10)
* [Non-Business Staff Entertaining Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=17960)
* [Non-Clinical Professorial Salary Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=839)
* Outside work and consultancy policy

<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=7929>

* [Parental Leave Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=491)
* [Paternity Leave Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=796)
* [Pay Protection Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=8493)
* [Performance and Development Review Procedure and Guidance Notes for Academic and Related Staff](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=42)
* [Performance and Development Review Procedure and Guidance Notes for Support Staff](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=41)
* [Pre-retirement Leave](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=19054)
* [Probationary Arrangements for Newly Appointed Academic Staff](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=40)
* [Public Service Leave Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=39)
* [Recognising and Rewarding Exceptional Performance Policy and Procedure](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=948)
* [Recruitment and Employment of Ex-Offenders Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=13)
* [Recruitment and Selection Policy and Procedures](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=37)
* [Redeployment Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=12)
* [References: Policy on Providing Employment References for Employees/Former Employees](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=15719)
* [Re-grading Policy and Procedure](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=8494)
* [Relocation Expenses Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=34)
* [Resignation Procedure](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=33)
* [Retirement Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=11679)
* [Right to Request Training Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=10981)
* [Severe Weather and Disruption to Public Transport Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=7616)
* [Sickness Absence Policy and Procedures (Management of)](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=14)
* [Special Leave Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=32)
* [Staff Training and Development Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=851)
* [Stress at Work Policy](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=31)
* [Vacancy Management Procedure](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=29)

**Useful Links to Equality and Diversity policy frameworks for action plans**

1. Equality and Human Rights Commission’s (EHRC): “An employer's guide to... Creating an inclusive workplace” N.B. pages 6-13 are most relevant

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/publications/an_employer_s_guide_to_creating_an_inclusive_workplace.pdf>

1. Business in the Community’s (BITC) *Opportunity Now* Exemplar employer best practice

<http://opportunitynow.bitc.org.uk/tools_case_studies/exemplar_recommendations>

1. BITC’s *Race for Opportunity* Getting Started with Race Diversity

<http://raceforopportunity.bitc.org.uk/tools-case-studies/toolkits/getting-sta>

1. Equality Challenge Unit’s (ECU) gender equality and race equality charter marks

<http://www.ecu.ac.uk/our-projects/ecus-charter-marks>

**Appendix 3. Academic Staff Recruitment data by gender and ethnicity for the period 1 January to 31 December 2013**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | **Faculty of Humanities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Job Grade** | | **Ethnicity** | **Application** | | | | | **Shortlisted** | | | | | **Successful** | | | | |
| **Female** | **Male** | **Other** | **Total** | | **Female** | **Male** | **Other** | **Total** | | **Female** | **Male** | **Other** | **Total** | |
| **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **%** | **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **%\*** | **Count** | **Count** |  | **Count** | **%^** |
| **Academic** | **Language Tutor** | **White** | 9 | 6 | 0 | 15 | 11% | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 20% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33% |
| **BME** | 91 | 26 | 0 | 117 | **86%** | 6 | 1 | 0 | 7 | **6%** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | **29%** |
| **Not Known** | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 25% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100% |
| **Count** | 101 | 33 | 2 | 136 |  | 8 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 8% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 36% |
| **%** | **74%** | 24% | 1% |  |  | **8%** | 9% | 0% |  |  | **25%** | 67% |  |  |  |
| **Lecturer** | **White** | 651 | 839 | 4 | 1494 | 69% | 101 | 115 | 0 | 216 | 14% | 25 | 31 | 0 | 56 | 26% |
| **BME** | 191 | 282 | 1 | 474 | **22%** | 22 | 39 | 0 | 61 | **13%** | 1 | 13 | 0 | 14 | **23%** |
| **Not Known** | 41 | 60 | 110 | 211 | 10% | 9 | 6 | 14 | 29 | 14% | 3 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 34% |
| **Count** | 883 | 1181 | 115 | 2179 |  | 132 | 160 | 14 | 306 | 14% | 29 | 46 | 5 | 80 | 26% |
| **%** | **41%** | 54% | 5% |  |  | 15% | 14% | 12% |  |  | **22%** | 29% | 36% |  |  |
| **Lecturer/ Senior Lecturer** | **White** | 272 | 487 | 0 | 759 | 52% | 38 | 65 | 0 | 103 | 14% | 12 | 9 | 0 | 21 | 20% |
| **BME** | 201 | 372 | 0 | 573 | **39%** | 14 | 39 | 0 | 53 | 9% | 5 | 6 | 0 | 11 | **21%** |
| **Not Known** | 18 | 60 | 51 | 129 | 9% | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 5% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 14% |
| **Count** | 491 | 919 | 51 | 1461 |  | 54 | 107 | 2 | 163 | 11% | 17 | 16 | 0 | 33 | 20% |
| **%** | **34%** | 63% | 3% |  |  | **11%** | 12% | 4% |  |  | **31%** | 15% | 0% |  |  |
| **Professor** | **White** | 5 | 23 | 0 | 28 | 55% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 14% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 25% |
| **BME** | 3 | 17 | 0 | 20 | **39%** | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | **5%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0%** |
| **Not Known** | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 33% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| **Count** | 8 | 41 | 2 | 51 |  | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 12% | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 33% |
| **%** | **16%** | 80% | 4% |  |  | **25%** | 7% | 50% |  |  | **0%** | 33% | 100% |  |  |
| **All staff** | **White** | 937 | 1355 | 4 | 2296 | 60% | 143 | 183 | 0 | 326 | 14% | 38 | 41 | 0 | 79 | 24% |
| **BME** | 486 | 697 | 1 | 1184 | **31%** | 42 | 80 | 0 | 122 | **10%** | 7 | 20 | 0 | 27 | 22% |
| **Not Known** | 60 | 122 | 165 | 347 | 9% | 11 | 10 | 17 | 38 | 11% | 3 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 34% |
| **Count** | 1483 | 2174 | 170 | 3827 |  | 196 | 273 | 17 | 486 | 13% | 48 | 65 | 6 | 119 | 24% |
| **%** | **39%** | 57% | 4% |  |  | **13%** | 13% | 10% |  |  | **24%** | 24% | 35% |  |  |

\* - percentage of applicants shortlisted, ^ -percentage of those shortlisted that were successful, Other gender includes (transgender, prefer not to say and not known)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  |  | **Faculty of Humanities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Job Grade** | | | **Ethnicity** | **Application** | | | | | **Shortlisted** | | | | | **Successful** | | | | |
| **Female** | **Male** | **Other** | **Total** | | **Female** | **Male** | **Other** | **Total** | | **Female** | **Male** | **Other** | **Total** | |
| **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **%** | **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **%\*** | **Count** | **Count** |  | **Count** | **%^** |
| **Research** | **Grade 5  & 6** | | **White** | 218 | 217 | 2 | 437 | 62% | 39 | 48 | 0 | 87 | 20% | 11 | 12 | 0 | 23 | 26% |
| **BME** | 93 | 99 | 1 | 193 | **27%** | 10 | 6 | 0 | 16 | **8%** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | **13%** |
| **Not Known** | 22 | 16 | 37 | 75 | 11% | 1 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 15% | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 36% |
| **Count** | 333 | 332 | 40 | 705 |  | 50 | 59 | 5 | 114 | 16% | 12 | 15 | 2 | 29 | 25% |
| **%** | **47%** | 47% | 6% |  |  | **15%** | 18% | 13% |  |  | **24%** | 25% | 40% |  |  |
| **Grade 6/7**  **Grade 7** | | **White** | 61 | 69 | 0 | 130 | 68% | 7 | 8 | 0 | 15 | 12% | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 33% |
| **BME** | 17 | 21 | 0 | 38 | **20%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0%** |
| **Not Known** | 0 | 12 | 10 | 22 | 12% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| **Count** | 78 | 102 | 10 | 190 |  | 7 | 9 | 0 | 16 | 8% | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 31% |
|  | | **%** | **52%** | 42% | 6% |  |  | **80%** | 67% | 100% |  |  | **2%** | 7% | 0% |  |  |
| **Grade 8** | | **White** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| **BME** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| **NK** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| **Count** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| **%** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Professor** | | **White** | 6 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 22% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| **BME** | 8 | 17 | 0 | 25 | **69%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0%** |
| **Not Known** | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| **Count** | 14 | 20 | 2 | 36 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| **%** | **39%** | 56% | 6% |  |  | **0%** | 0% | 0% |  |  | **0%** | 0% | 0% |  |  |
| **All staff** | | **White** | 342 | 334 | 2 | 678 | 63% | 92 | 89 | 0 | 181 | 27% | 13 | 18 | 0 | 31 | 17% |
| **BME** | 138 | 149 | 2 | 289 | **27%** | 25 | 12 | 1 | 38 | **13%** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | **5%** |
| **Not Known** | 24 | 35 | 57 | 116 | 11% | 3 | 10 | 13 | 26 | 22% | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 19% |
| **Count** | 504 | 518 | 61 | 1083 |  | 120 | 111 | 14 | 245 | 23% | 14 | 22 | 2 | 38 | 16% |
| **%** | **47%** | 48% | 6% |  |  | **24%** | 21% | 23% |  |  | **12%** | 20% | 14% |  |  |

\* - percentage of applicants shortlisted, ^ -percentage of those shortlisted that were successful, Other gender includes (transgender, prefer not to say and not known)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | **Faculty of Humanities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Job Grade** | | **Ethnicity** | **Application** | | | | | **Shortlisted** | | | | | **Successful** | | | | |
| **Female** | **Male** | **Other** | **Total** | | **Female** | **Male** | **Other** | **Total** | | **Female** | **Male** | **Other** | **Total** | |
| **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **%** | **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **%\*** | **Count** | **Count** |  | **Count** | **%^** |
| **Support** | **Grade 1- 4** | **White** | 583 | 216 | 1 | 800 | 68% | 144 | 78 | 1 | 223 | 28% | 34 | 14 | 0 | 48 | 22% |
| **BME** | 141 | 80 | 0 | 221 | **19%** | 42 | 17 | 0 | 59 | **27%** | 5 | 3 | 0 | 8 | **14%** |
| **Not Known** | 8 | 4 | 149 | 161 | 14% | 2 | 1 | 37 | 40 | 25% | 1 | 0 | 17 | 18 | 45% |
| **Count** | 732 | 300 | 150 | 1182 |  | 188 | 96 | 38 | 322 | 27% | 40 | 17 | 17 | 74 | 23% |
| **%** | **62%** | 25% | 13% |  |  | **26%** | 32% | 25% |  |  | **21%** | 18% | 45% |  |  |
| **Grade 5 & 6** | **White** | 517 | 352 | 1 | 870 | 74% | 79 | 58 | 1 | 138 | 16% | 32 | 18 | 0 | 50 | 36% |
| **BME** | 115 | 78 | 0 | 193 | 16% | 9 | 6 | 0 | 15 | **8%** | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | **20%** |
| **Not Known** | 20 | 13 | 83 | 116 | 10% | 2 | 3 | 15 | 20 | 17% | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 30% |
| **Count** | 652 | 443 | 84 | 1179 |  | 90 | 67 | 16 | 173 | 15% | 35 | 19 | 5 | 59 | 34% |
| **%** | **55%** | 38% | 7% |  |  | **14%** | 15% | 19% |  |  | **39%** | 28% | 31% |  |  |
| **Grade 7** | **White** | 59 | 45 | 0 | 104 | 67% | 20 | 11 | 0 | 31 | 30% | 5 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 29% |
| **BME** | 11 | 14 | 2 | 27 | **17%** | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 11% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0%** |
| **Not Known** | 2 | 2 | 21 | 25 | 16% | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 24% | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 50% |
| **Count** | 72 | 61 | 23 | 156 |  | 21 | 14 | 5 | 40 | 26% | 5 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 30% |
| **%** | **46%** | 39% | 15% |  |  | **29%** | 23% | 22% |  |  | **24%** | 36% | 40% |  |  |
| **Grade 8** | **White** | 21 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 79% | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 23% | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 43% |
| **BME** | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | **8%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| **Not Known** | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 13% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| **Count** | 22 | 13 | 4 | 39 |  | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 18% | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 43% |
| **%** | **56%** | 33% | 10% |  |  | **18%** | 23% | 0% |  |  | **50%** | 33% |  |  |  |
| **All staff** | **White** | 1180 | 623 | 2 | 1805 | 71% | 247 | 150 | 2 | 399 | 22% | 73 | 37 | 0 | 110 | 28% |
| **BME** | 268 | 174 | 2 | 444 | **17%** | 52 | 25 | 0 | 77 | **17%** | 8 | 3 | 0 | 11 | **14%** |
| **Not Known** | 30 | 20 | 257 | 307 | 12% | 4 | 5 | 57 | 66 | 21% | 1 | 2 | 24 | 27 | 41% |
| **Count** | 1478 | 817 | 261 | 2556 |  | 303 | 180 | 59 | 542 | 21% | 82 | 42 | 24 | 148 | 27% |
| **%** | **58%** | 32% | 10% |  |  | **21%** | 22% | 23% |  |  | **27%** | 23% | 41% |  |  |

\* - percentage of applicants shortlisted, ^ -percentage of those shortlisted that were successful, Other gender includes (transgender, prefer not to say and not known)

**Appendix 4 Faculty of Humanities academic promotions data 2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Promotion to** | **Ethnicity** | **% of potential applicants (pool)** | | | | **Application** | | | | **% of successful applications** | | | |
| **Female** | **Male** | **Total** |  | **Female** | **Male** | **Total** | | **Female** | **Male** | **Total** |  |
| **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **%** | **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **%** | **Count** | **Count** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Chair** | **White** | 85 | 145 | 230 | *6%* | 2 | 11 | 13 | *93%* | 2 | 10 | 12 | *92%* |
| **BME** | 6 | 23 | 29 | *3%* | 1 | 0 | 1 | *7%* | 0 | 0 | 0 | *0%* |
| **Not known** | 0 | 1 | 1 | *0%* | 0 | 0 | 0 | *0%* | 0 | 0 | 0 | *0%* |
| **Count** | *91* | *169* | 260 |  | *3* | *11* | 14 |  | *2* | *10* | 12 |  |
| ***%*** | *3%* | *7%* | *5%* |  | *21%* | *79%* |  |  | *67%* | *91%* | *86%* |  |
| **Reader** | **White** | 79 | 181 | 260 | *3%* | 2 | 5 | 7 | *88%* | 1 | 4 | 5 | *71%* |
| **BME** | 5 | 22 | 27 | *4%* | 0 | 1 | 1 | *13%* | 0 | 0 | 0 | *0%* |
| **Not known** | 0 | 1 | 1 | *0%* | 0 | 0 | 0 | *0%* | 0 | 0 | 0 | *0%* |
| **Count** | *84* | *154* | 238 |  | *2* | *6* | 8 |  | *1* | *4* | 5 |  |
| ***%*** | *2%* | *4%* | *3%* |  | *25%* | *75%* |  |  | *50%* | *67%* | *63%* |  |
| **Senior Lecturer** | **White** | 222 | 225 | 447 | *6%* | 13 | 13 | 26 | *87%* | 12 | 10 | 22 | *85%* |
| **BME** | 49 | 34 | 83 | *5%* | 2 | 2 | 4 | *13%* | 1 | 1 | 2 | *50%* |
| **Not known** | 2 | 7 | 9 | *0%* | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | *0%* |
| **Count** | *273* | *266* | 539 |  | *15* | *15* | 30 |  | *13* | *11* | 24 |  |
| ***%*** | *6%* | *6%* | *6%* |  | *50%* | *50%* |  |  | *87%* | *73%* | *80%* |  |
| **All promotions** | **White** | 386 | 551 | 937 | *5%* | 17 | 29 | 46 | *88%* | 15 | 24 | 39 | *85%* |
| **BME** | 60 | 79 | 139 | *4%* | 3 | 3 | 6 | *12%* | 1 | 1 | 2 | *33%* |
| **Not known** | 2 | 9 | 11 | *0%* | 0 | 0 | 0 | *0%* | 0 | 0 | 0 | *0%* |
| **Count** | *448* | *639* | 1087 |  | *20* | *32* | 52 |  | *16* | *25* | 41 |  |
| ***%*** | *5%* | *5%* | *5%* |  | *38%* | *62%* |  |  | *80%* | *78%* | *79%* |  |

1. Baker and Crackell (2014) “Women in Public life, the Professions and the Boardroom” *House of Commons Library Standard Note SN5170*, Social and General Statistics, 11 April [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Baker and Crackell (2014) “Women in Public life, the Professions and the Boardroom” *House of Commons Library Standard Note SN5170*, Social and General Statistics, 11 April; European Commission (2012): *She Figures: Gender in Research and Innovation – Statistics and Indicators,* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. JNCHES is the Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff; their guidance on Equal Pay Reviews can be found at: *www.ucu.org.uk/*

   *media/pdf/k/m/jnches\_equalpayguidance.pdf* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For a summary in related to gender imbalance at senior positions see Fagan C, Gonzáléz Menéndez M and Gómez Ansón S(Eds.) (2012) *Women on corporate boards and in top management: European trends and policy* Palgrave [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. JNCHES is the Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff; their guidance on Equal Pay Reviews can be found at: *www.ucu.org.uk/*

   *media/pdf/k/m/jnches\_equalpayguidance.pdf* [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Pay gap calculation is:

   Average Female Pay X 100 – 100 = Pay Gap%

   Average Male Pay [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Pay gap calculation is:

   Average BME Pay X 100 – 100 = Pay Gap%

   Average White Pay [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. For an overview of the literature on men’s career progression in female-dominated occupations see Fagan and Norman (2013) “Men and gender equality: tackling gender segregation in family roles and in social care jobs” in F. Bettio et al. (ed) Gender and the European Labour Market, Routlegde. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. These barriers include unlawful discrimination, as well as bullying/harassment as well as the wider aspects of social relationships and interactions (discriminatory attitudes and unconscious bias among staff and students; the way that work is arranged and workplace interactions take place due to our practices, habits and norms or ‘ways of doing things’). Some indicators are available from the University Staff Survey 2013. This survey recorded that 5% of staff in Humanities (4% in the University overall) believe they are currently being bullied or harassed at work (which is on a par with the rate recorded in other surveys); and 14% (12% in the University overall) do not believe that the University is committed to equality of opportunity for all staff. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. For PSS staff and Faculty Admin. aspects of the data collection and analysis are not relevant. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)