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## Executive Summary

The University of Strathclyde annual staff equality monitoring report provides comprehensive information on the protected characteristics ${ }^{1}$ of staff in recruitment, promotions, development, discipline, grievance, dignity and respect cases and turnover. In addition, some high level information is provided on other characteristics where data gathering commenced in 2013.

Information on comparison with the Higher Education sector is provided.

The report is based on data as of 31 October 2016.

The University has 3591 staff, of which 77\% hold full-time posts.

There are 826 part-time staff at the University making up 23\% of all staff.

64\% of staff are based within the four Faculties (Business, Humanities and Social Sciences, Engineering and Science) with the remaining 36\% in the Professional Services Directorates.

The profile for gender by staff category reveals that a proportionately greater percentage of female staff than male are concentrated in Administrative and Professional Services (APS) and Operational Services (Table 5). The majority of male staff are based within Research and Knowledge Exchange, Academic and Administrative \& Professional Services Grade 6+ categories (with an equal split of men across the latter two).

In terms of protected characteristics at the University:

- The gender composition of the staffing profile has remained static, with a 50/50 split.
- The declared Disability status of the staffing profile has increased from a rounded 3\% to a rounded 4\%. Disabled women are slighted more represented than disabled men.
- The BME (Black Minority Ethnic) component of the staffing profile initially appears 'unchanged' at a rounded $7 \%$ - but has in fact decreased ( 251 out of 3591 , down from 251 out of 3429 ). There are twice as many BME male staff as there are BME female staff.
- The age profile indicates that women outnumber men in all age groups between 40 and 59, with men marginally more represented in the 20-29 and 60 plus age groups
- 19\% of staff voluntarily describe themselves as Christians, 23\% stated 'no religion'.
- Declared disclosure by Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) staff comprise three percent of all staff.
- $0.3 \%$ (11) of employees have disclosed that they have a different gender to that which they had at birth.
- Staff from 74 nationalities are employed at the University.

216 staff were promoted during the period 1 November 2015 to 31 October 2016. Equal proportions of female and male staff were promoted, $10 \%$ of promotions were BME staff and $3 \%$ staff with disabilities.

For part time staff, a significant proportion are female (75\%) compared with male staff (25\%), 3\% are from a Black Minority Ethnic background and 5\% have disclosed disability status.

[^0]Between 1 November 2015 and 31 October 2016 the University received 13063 (up 8\% from 20142015) applications for 700 posts. Equal numbers of applications ( $49 \%$ respectively) were received from women and men. $23 \%$ of the applicants were BME (a decrease of one percent from 2016) and $4 \%$ of applicants disclosed a disability (a decrease of one percent from 2016).

Between November 2015 and October 2016, 540 staff left the University (up from 520 in the previous year). $52 \%$ of leavers were male and $48 \%$ female. $13 \%$ were BME staff (one percent increase from 2016) and $3 \%$ were staff with disabilities (the same as the 2016 report).

During the year the University provided 424 centrally facilitated staff development courses. This is an increase of $13 \%$ in staff development programmes ( 57 courses) from the previous report.
A higher proportion of female staff participated in training programmes compared with male staff. 7\% of participants were BME staff and $3 \%$ were staff with declared disabilities.

The University received and addressed 26 formal staff related grievances, dignity and respect complaints and disciplinary cases. This was a decrease of $19 \%$ when compared with 2015.

## 1. Introduction

The University of Strathclyde aims to be an employer of choice locally and globally and aspires to reflect the diversity of people from all protected characteristic backgrounds in our staff community. We are firmly committed to equality and diversity.

The annual staff Equality Monitoring report provides information on the profile of staff and meets the requirement of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) of the 2010 Equality Act.

The current staff profile is broadly consistent with the staff monitoring report from the previous year. The overall headcount of employees increased by 162 between 1 November 2015 and 31 October 2016.

The University as of October 2016 employed 3,591 staff, of which $50 \%$ are female and $50 \%$ male. This gender distribution is similar to the October 2015 data reported in the 2016 report.

7\% of staff considered themselves to be Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) and 4\% disclosed a disability (Table 1). For BME staff this trend is similar to the 2016 report. The trend for staff declaring a disability has increased by one percentage point from 2016.

Table 1: Strathclyde staff profile

| 2016 | Strathclyde | 2015 | Strathclyde |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 1,800 (50\%) | Female | 1,728 (50\%) |
| Male | 1,791 (50\%) | Male | 1,701 (50\%) |
| Total | 3,591 (100\%) | Total | 3,429 (100\%) |
| BME | 251 (7\%) | BME | 251 (7\%) |
| Disability | 129 (4\%) | Disability | 117 (3\%) |

## 2. University of Strathclyde and the Higher Education sector

There is equal representation of male and female staff at the University. The percentage of male staff at Strathclyde is higher (by four percentage points) than the Scottish and UK sector averages (Table 2).

The proportion of BME staff at Strathclyde is significantly higher than the Scottish sector average ( $7 \%$ compared to $3 \%$ ) and slightly lower than the UK HE sector average.

In terms of disability status, the University's employment profile is slightly higher than the Scottish sector and proportionate to that of the UK HE sector.

Table 2: Strathclyde staff profile compared with Scottish and UK Universities 2016

|  | Strathclyde | Scottish Universities | All UK |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $1800(50 \%)$ | $23,365(54.5 \%)$ | $218,030(54 \%)$ |
| Male | $1791(50 \%)$ | $19,535(45.5 \%)$ | $185,805(46 \%)$ |
| Total | $3591(100 \%)$ | $42,900(100 \%)$ | $403,835(100 \%)$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| BME* | $251(7 \%)$ | $1100(3 \%)$ | $25925(8 \%)$ |
| Disability | $129(4 \%)$ | $1430(3 \%)$ | $18075(4 \%)$ |

* BME data excludes non UK national staff
http://www.ecu.ac.uk/publications/equality-in-higher-education-statistical-report-2016/


## 3. Strathclyde staff profile by full and part-time status and staff category

The University staff profile indicates that $77 \%$ of employees hold full-time posts and $23 \%$ part-time posts (Table 3).

The highest proportion of full time staff are within the Administrative and Professional Services (APS $6+$ ) staff category (24\%) followed by the Research/Knowledge Exchange (20\%) and Academic (16\%) staff categories.

For part-time staff, the highest proportion are in Operational (32\%), followed by APS 3-5 (21\%) staff categories.

Within all of our job categories, the majority of staff hold full-time posts. The exception is within the Operational staff category, in which 55\% hold part-time posts.

Table 3: Staff profile by full and part-time status

|  | FT | \% | PT | \% | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | 451 | 16\% | 25 | 3\% | 476 | 13\% |
| APS 3-5 | 369 | 13\% | 174 | 21\% | 543 | 15\% |
| APS 6+ | 654 | 24\% | 138 | 17\% | 792 | 22\% |
| Director/Professor | 213 | 8\% | 34 | 4\% | 247 | 7\% |
| Operational | 207 | 7\% | 261 | 32\% | 468 | 13\% |
| Research \& KE | 549 | 20\% | 94 | 11\% | 643 | 18\% |
| Teaching | 134 | 5\% | 89 | 11\% | 223 | 6\% |
| Technical | 188 | 7\% | 11 | 1\% | 199 | 6\% |
| Total numbers | 2765 | 100\% | 826 | 100\% | 3591 | 100\% |
|  | 77\% |  | 23\% |  | 100\% |  |

Diagram 1 represents the distribution of staff by staff category and full/ part time status. The highest numbers of staff (37\%) are found in the Administrative and Professional Services (APS) staff category followed by Research/Knowledge Exchange (18\%), Academic (13\%) and Operational Services (13\%). There are smaller numbers employed within the staff categories of Directors/ Professors (7\%), Teaching (6\%) and Technical Services (6\%).

Diagram 1: Staff Profile by job category


## 4. Staff by Faculty/Professional Services Directorates

Staff analysis by organisational area (Diagram 2) shows that the highest proportion of staff are based within Professional Services Directorates which report to the Chief Financial Officer and to the Chief Operating Officer (PS-36\%), followed by the Faculties of Engineering (23\%), Science (18\%) and Humanities and Social Sciences (16\%). The Strathclyde Business School has the smallest proportion of staff (7\%).

Between 2015 and 2016, the proportion of staff in HaSS increased by 1 percentage point. Conversely the proportion of staff in Professional Services Directorates fell by 1 percentage point.

During the same period the proportion of staff in Engineering, Science and the Business School has remained constant.

Diagram 2: Staff profile by Faculty/ Professional Services Directorates


Within the staff populations in the Faculties and Professional Services Directorates (Table 4):

- Strathclyde Business School has the highest proportion of academic staff and Directors/Professors as a percentage of their overall staff numbers when compared with the other faculties;
- The highest percentage of APS Grade 3-6 staff are based in Professional Services Directorates;
- All Operational Services staff are based in the Professional Services Directorates;
- The majority of Research and Knowledge Exchange staff are located in the Faculty of Engineering;
- The highest percentage of Teaching focused staff are based in HaSS .

Table 4: Staff numbers by job category and Faculty/ Professional Services Directorates (* denotes value <5)

|  | Eng | HaSS | PS | SBS | Sci | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | 145 | 125 | 0 | 66 | 140 | 476 |
| APS 3-5 | 63 | 103 | 285 | 43 | 49 | 543 |
| APS 6+ | 95 | 72 | 503 | 58 | 64 | 792 |
| Director/Professor | 69 | 57 | 14 | 37 | 70 | 247 |
| Operational | 0 | 0 | 465 | $*$ | 0 | 465 |
| Research \& KE | 335 | 86 | $*$ | 30 | 191 | 642 |
| Teaching | 45 | 111 | 8 | 25 | 34 | 223 |
| Technical | 88 | 6 | 21 | 0 | 84 | 199 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Academic | Eng | HaSS | PS | SBS | Sci | Total |
| APS 3-5 | $17 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| APS 6+ | $8 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Director/Professor | $11 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Operational | $0 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Research \& KE | $40 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $*$ | $0 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Teaching | $5 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $*$ | $12 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Technical | $10 \%$ | $1 \% \%$ | $1 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Total numbers | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

## 5. Gender

The following section provides information by gender.
Overall the representation of men and women is equal and similar to the 2016 report.
However, this gender pattern varies within the Faculties and Professional Services Directorates. Diagram 3 indicates that the highest concentration of women is within Humanities and Social Sciences (66\%) and the lowest percentage is in the Faculty of Engineering (30\%).

This pattern of distribution largely mirrors the trends reported in the 2016 report, although there has been a decrease of two percentage points in the HaSS female population and of one percentage point in Engineering.

Diagram 3: Gender profile by Faculties and Professional Services Directorates


The profile for gender by staff category reveals that a proportionately greater percentage of female staff than male are concentrated in the APS and Operational Services categories (Table 5). The majority of male staff are based within the Research and Knowledge Exchange, Academic and APS 6+ categories (with an equal split of men across the latter two).

Table 5: Gender by job category

|  | Female | F\% | Male | M\% | Total | T\% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | 169 | $9 \%$ | 307 | $17 \%$ | 476 | $13 \%$ |
| APS 3-5 | 458 | $25 \%$ | 85 | $5 \%$ | 543 | $15 \%$ |
| APS 6+ | 495 | $28 \%$ | 297 | $17 \%$ | 792 | $22 \%$ |
| Director/Professor | 46 | $3 \%$ | 201 | $11 \%$ | 247 | $7 \%$ |
| Operational | 266 | $15 \%$ | 202 | $11 \%$ | 468 | $13 \%$ |
| Research \& KE | 208 | $12 \%$ | 435 | $24 \%$ | 643 | $18 \%$ |
| Teaching | 110 | $6 \%$ | 113 | $6 \%$ | 223 | $6 \%$ |
| Technical | 48 | $3 \%$ | 151 | $8 \%$ | 199 | $6 \%$ |
| Total | 1800 | $100 \%$ | 1791 | $100 \%$ | 3591 | $100 \%$ |

### 5.1 Gender Analysis - Academic category

Diagram 4: Gender profile for Academic staff


There is a higher concentration of male staff ( $70 \%$ ) compared with female staff ( $30 \%$ ) in the academic category (Diagram 4/ Table 6). This trend is similar to the proportion of academic staff as reported in 2016.

Staff holding posts at professorial level form the largest group of Academic Staff (31\%), followed by staff at Lecturer B and Senior Lecturer levels ( $25 \%$ respectively), Readers (10\%) and Lecturer A's (8\%).

The upward trend of female professorial staff has continued; the female reader population has also increased on the previous year.

Table 6: Gender by Academic staff

|  | Female |  | Male |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professor | 42 | $20 \%$ | 174 | $36 \%$ | 216 | $31 \%$ |
| Reader | 18 | $9 \%$ | 54 | $11 \%$ | 72 | $10 \%$ |
| Senior Lecturer | 55 | $26 \%$ | 119 | $25 \%$ | 174 | $25 \%$ |
| Lecturer B | 69 | $33 \%$ | 103 | $21 \%$ | 172 | $25 \%$ |
| Lecturer A | 27 | $13 \%$ | 31 | $6 \%$ | 58 | $8 \%$ |
| Grand Total | 211 (30\%) | $100 \%$ | 481 (70\%) | $100 \%$ | 692 | $100 \%$ |

Table 7 below provides an overview of year on year progression of female academic staff between 2002 and 2016.

There is a notable increase in the percentage of females holding Professorial posts in recent years from 11\% in 2010 to $19 \%$ in 2016.

There have been progressive increases in the female percentage at Senior Lecturer level since 2010; from $24 \%$ to $32 \%$. There has been a drop in the number of female staff at Reader and Lecturer A levels in recent years, partially resulting from the internal promotion of females to the higher grades (Diagram 5).

Trends observed since 2002 for Lecturer A are the most fluctuating - however, the actual numbers of staff in this category are small.

Table 7: Percentage of female staff by Academic grade

|  | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professor | 10\% | 13\% | 14\% | 14\% | 15\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 11\% | 16\% | 17\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 19\% |
| Reader | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 15\% | 20\% | 25\% | 30\% | 32\% | 34\% | 27\% | 28\% | 27\% | 26\% | 23\% | 25\% |
| Senior Lecturer | 25\% | 25\% | 28\% | 25\% | 29\% | 28\% | 27\% | 26\% | 24\% | 23\% | 27\% | 29\% | 31\% | 33\% | 32\% |
| Lecturer B | 37\% | 39\% | 38\% | 45\% | 44\% | 45\% | 46\% | 45\% | 44\% | 43\% | 38\% | 39\% | 38\% | 40\% | 40\% |
| Lecturer A | 46\% | 45\% | 46\% | 38\% | 65\% | 47\% | 60\% | 48\% | 45\% | 37\% | 50\% | 41\% | 50\% | 50\% | 47\% |

Diagram 5: Percentage of Academic female staff


## 6. Staff profile by Ethnicity

The University invites all staff on an annual basis to update their information, including personal characteristics.

The profile for ethnicity confirms that $89 \%$ of staff have disclosed information on their ethnic heritage.

Of those staff who have disclosed their ethnicity, $81 \%$ are white and $7 \%$ are Black and Minority Ethnic (BME).

There are almost twice as many BME male staff as there are BME female staff (Table 8). However, the percentage of BME male staff has decreased by $1 \%$ compared to 2016 (White staff has also decreased by 2\% and Not Known has increased by 2\%)

As a rounded figure, the percentage of BME staff is unchanged at 7\%. As an unrounded figure, the percentage has decreased slightly ( 251 BME staff out of a total population of 3591 compared with 251 from a total population of 3429 in October 2015).

Table 8: BME staff by gender

|  | 2016 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BME | Not known | Prefer not to say | White |
| Female | $4 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
| Male | $10 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $76 \%$ |
| Total \% | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $81 \%$ |
| Total Count | $\mathbf{2 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 9 2 4}$ |

Table 8.1: Proportion of BME staff per job category

|  | BME | Not known | Prefer not to say | White |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | $14 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $76 \%$ |
| APS 3-5 | $2 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| APS 6+ | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $91 \%$ |
| Director/Professor | $6 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| Operational | $1 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $85 \%$ |
| Research \& KE | $18 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| Teaching | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| Technical | $2 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| Total $\%$ | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{1} \%$ | $\mathbf{8 1 \%}$ |
| Total Count | $\mathbf{2 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 9 2 4}$ |

Analysis by staff categories (Table 8.1) indicates that BME staff are primarily concentrated in the Research/Knowledge Exchange (18\%) and Academic (14\%) staff categories.

Table 8.2: Ethnicity breakdown by Faculty/ Professional Services Directorates

|  | BME | Not known | Prefer not to say | White |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eng | $127(15 \%)$ | $109(13 \%)$ | $12(1 \%)$ | $592(70 \%)$ |
| HaSS | $20(4 \%)$ | $54(10 \%)$ | $9(2 \%)$ | $477(85 \%)$ |
| PS | $26(2 \%)$ | $95(7 \%)$ | $13(1 \%)$ | $1163(90 \%)$ |
| SBS | $19(7 \%)$ | $15(6 \%)$ | $3(1 \%)$ | $225(86 \%)$ |
| Sci | $59(9 \%)$ | $92(15 \%)$ | $14(2 \%)$ | $467(74 \%)$ |
| Total \% | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 \%}$ |
| Total Count | $\mathbf{2 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 9 2 4}$ |

Table 8.2 provides information on the distribution of BME staff by Faculties and Professional Services Directorates. The highest proportion of BME staff are based in the Faculty of Engineering (15\%) and the lowest within Professional Services Directorates (2\%).

## 7. Staff with disabilities

129 staff have disclosed a disability, this representing $4 \%$ of our staff population (Table 9). This is a one percent increase in the disclosure rate from 2016.

A significant number of staff (19\%) have not provided information on their disability status, with $1 \%$ choosing the 'prefer not to say' option. The University invites all staff on an annual basis to update their information including personal characteristics. We remain committed to reducing the percentage of staff within the 'not known' category. In the year ahead, we will work with the newly appointed departmental Equality and Diversity contacts to encourage higher levels of disclosure.

Table 9: Staff with disabilities by Gender

| Disability? | 2016 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes | Not known | Prefer not to say | No |
| Female | $4 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $79 \%$ |
| Male | $3 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $74 \%$ |
| Total \% | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $19 \%$ | $\mathbf{1} \%$ | $76 \%$ |
| Total Count | 129 | 692 | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 4 6}$ |

In terms of staff categories, the highest proportion of disabled staff are based within the Technical Services (7\%), Teaching and Operational services (both 5\%) staff categories (Table 9.1).

Table 9.1: Staff with disabilities by job category

| Disability? | Yes | Not known | Prefer not to say | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | $3 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| APS 3-5 | $3 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| APS 6+ | $3 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $84 \%$ |
| Director/Professor | $2 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
| Operational | $5 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $74 \%$ |
| Research \& KE | $2 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $66 \%$ |
| Teaching | $5 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| Technical | $7 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| Total \% | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9} \%$ | $\mathbf{7 6 \%}$ |
| Total Count | $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 4 6}$ |

The distribution of staff with disabilities within the Faculties and Professional Services Directorates indicates that HaSS and Professional Services continue to have marginally the highest representation (Table 9.2).

Table 9.2: Staff with disabilities by Faculty/ Professional Services Directorates

| Disability? | Yes | Not known | Prefer not to say | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eng | $25(3 \%)$ | $181(22 \%)$ | $4(0 \%)$ | $630(75 \%)$ |
| HaSS | $29(5 \%)$ | $116(21 \%)$ | $3(1 \%)$ | $412(74 \%)$ |
| PS | $48(4 \%)$ | $187(14 \%)$ | $12(1 \%)$ | $1050(81 \%)$ |
| SBS | $6(2 \%)$ | $50(19 \%)$ | $1(0 \%)$ | $205(78 \%)$ |
| Sci | $21(3 \%)$ | $158(25 \%)$ | $4(1 \%)$ | $449(71 \%)$ |
| Total \% | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 \%}$ |
| Total Count | $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 4 6}$ |

## 8. Age profile

The highest proportion of Strathclyde staff are between 40 and 49 years of age. Compared with the 2015 data, there has been an increase in the number of staff who are 60 and above (from 312 staff to 348 staff).

The age profile of staff by gender is provided in Table 10 and Diagram 6.
In terms of gender trends:

- Women and men are equally represented in the age groups <20 and 30-39
- Men are marginally more represented in the 20-29 and 60 plus age groups
- Women are most represented in 40-49 and 50-59 age groups.

Table 10: Staff by age and gender

| Age Group | Female | F\% | Male | M\% | Total | \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $<20$ | 17 | $1 \%$ | 12 | $1 \%$ | 29 | $1 \%$ |
| $20-29$ | 195 | $11 \%$ | 210 | $12 \%$ | 405 | $11 \%$ |
| $30-39$ | 461 | $26 \%$ | 470 | $26 \%$ | 931 | $26 \%$ |
| $40-49$ | 517 | $29 \%$ | 474 | $26 \%$ | 991 | $28 \%$ |
| $50-59$ | 462 | $26 \%$ | 425 | $24 \%$ | 887 | $25 \%$ |
| $60+$ | 148 | $8 \%$ | 200 | $11 \%$ | 348 | $10 \%$ |
| Total | 1800 | $100 \%$ | 1791 | $100 \%$ | 3591 | $100 \%$ |

Diagram 6: Staff by age and gender


## 9. Promotions

The definition of 'promotions' in the context of this report is any staff member who has moved up at least a grade, be it within an existing appointment or by moving from one appointment to another.

A summary of staff promotions during the period 1 November 2015 to 31 October 2016 by gender, ethnicity and disability is presented in Table 11. An equal proportion of female and male staff were promoted.

This differs from the 2015 data, which indicated that $51 \%$ of staff promoted were female and $49 \%$ male.
$10 \%$ of promotions were BME staff, which is a decrease of one percentage point from the 2016 report. $3 \%$ of the staff promoted had declared disabilities. The actual number of disabled staff promoted is small, however, making meaningful analysis of this change difficult.

Table 11: An overview of promotions

|  | Count | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 108 | $50 \%$ |
| Male | 108 | $50 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
|  |  |  |
| BME | 21 | $10 \%$ |
| Disability | 6 | $3 \%$ |

The breakdown for staff promotions by gender and staff category is provided in Table 12. The highest numbers of promotions occurred within the APS 6+ staff category (21\%) and the Academic and APS 3-5 staff categories (19\% respectively).

The highest percentage of female promotions were in the APS 3-5 and 6+ categories, whereas the highest percentage of male promotions were in the Academic, Research/Knowledge Exchange and Technical categories.

APS6+ and Research/KE have seen 9\% and 7\% increases respectively, in female (versus male) promotions between 2015 and 2016.

Table 12: Staff promotions by Gender, Job category and Faulty/ Professional Service Directorates (* denotes value <5)

|  | Female | F\% | Male | M\% | Total | T\% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | 13 | $12 \%$ | 28 | $26 \%$ | 41 | $19 \%$ |
| APS 3-5 | 34 | $32 \%$ | 6 | $6 \%$ | 40 | $19 \%$ |
| APS 6+ | 34 | $32 \%$ | 11 | $10 \%$ | 45 | $21 \%$ |
| Director/Professor | $*$ | $*$ | 9 | $8 \%$ | 9 | $4 \%$ |
| Operational | $*$ | $*$ | 7 | $6 \%$ | 7 | $3 \%$ |
| Research \& KE | 13 | $12 \%$ | 24 | $22 \%$ | 37 | $17 \%$ |
| Teaching | 7 | $7 \%$ | 5 | $5 \%$ | 12 | $6 \%$ |
| Technical | 5 | $5 \%$ | 18 | $17 \%$ | 23 | $11 \%$ |
| Total | 106 | $100 \%$ | 108 | $100 \%$ | 214 | $100 \%$ |

## 10. Part time staff profile

There are 826 part-time staff at the University making up $23 \%$ of all staff.
The gender profile indicates that the vast majority of part-time staff are female ( $75 \%$ - two percent down from 2016) compared with male staff ( $25 \%$ - two percent up from 2016). Of those staff who have disclosed their protected characteristics, $3 \%$ (one percent down from 2016) of part time staff are from a BME background and $4 \%$ (one percent up from 2016) of part time staff have a declared disability (Table 13).

Table 13: Part time staff diversity profile

|  | Part-time staff |
| :--- | :---: |
| Female | $623(75 \%)$ |
| Male | $203(25 \%)$ |
| Total | $826(100 \%)$ |
|  |  |
| BME | $27(3 \%)$ |
| Disability | $39(5 \%)$ |

Part-time female staff are highly represented within the Operational Services, APS 3-5 and APS 6+ staff categories (Diagram 7). There is a bias towards women within the part time staffing complement within the Teaching, Research/ Knowledge Exchange and Academic staff categories. However, a significant majority of men hold Director/ Professorial roles on a part-time basis.

Diagram 7: Part time staff by gender and job category


The age profile for all part-time staff indicates a high concentration of females in all age groups other than under 20 years (Diagram 8). With the exception of the 60+ category (in 2016 there was an even split) the representation is similar to that reported in the 2016 report.

The highest concentration of part-time female staff is within the age band 40-49, whereas the highest number of part-time male staff are over 60.

## Diagram 8: Part time staff by gender and age



## 11. New staff applications and appointments

Between 1 November 2015 and 31 October 2016 the University received 13063 (up 8\% from 2014-2015) applications for 700 posts (Table 14).

Equal numbers of applications (49\% respectively) were received from women and men. The gender status of the remaining applicants was 'not known' or 'prefer not to say'.
$23 \%$ of the applicants were BME (a decrease of one percent from 2016 but still higher than the $21 \%$ highlighted in the 2015 report) and $4 \%$ of applicants disclosed a disability (a decrease of one percent from 2016 but still higher than the $3.5 \%$ highlighted in the 2015 report).

In terms of disclosure rates, $98 \%$ of all applicants disclosed their gender at the application stage.
With respect to appointments, more men than women were appointed ( $54 \%$ male, $46 \%$ female). This rate is slightly lower than the percentage of successful female applicants ( $47 \%$ ) in the 2016 report.

Female applications and appointments each decreased by 1\% compared with 2016.
The percentage of applications from BME applicants increased by $3 \%$, whilst overall BME appointments stayed static at a rounded $9 \%$. Overall, there has been an increase of 841 BME applications when compared with BME applications reported in 2016. There have been two additional BME appointments when compared with 2016. The University will continue to monitor the success rate of BME applicants.
$3 \%$ of applicants declaring a disability or disabilities were successful in gaining employment at the University (one percent up from 2016). As with successful BME applicants, a significant percentage (38\%) of applicants did not disclose their disability status.

Table 14: Applications and Appointments

|  | Applications | Appointed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 6,423 (49\%) | 325 (46\%) |
| Male | 6,432 (49\%) | 375 (54\%) |
| Not known | 96 (1\%) | - |
| Prefer not to say | 112 (1\%) | - |
| Total | 13,063 (100\%) | 700 (100\%) |
|  |  |  |
| BME | 3,027 (23\%) | 65 (9\%) |
| Not known | 159 (1\%) | 218 (31\%) |
| Prefer not to say | 374 (3\%) | 10 (1\%) |
| Disability | 515 (4\%) | 22 (3\%) |
| Not known | 0 (0\%) | 266 (38\%) |
| Prefer not to say | 1394 (11\%) | 3 (0\%) |

### 11.1 Appointments

Diagram 9 provides an overview of all appointments made. The highest percentage of appointments made were in the Research and Knowledge Exchange staff categories. ( $37 \%$ - similar to 2016 report).

## Diagram 9: Appointments by job categories



Table 15 provides a distribution of appointments in Faculty/ Professional Services Directorates by gender. A high proportion of male candidates were appointed in the Faculties of Engineering, SBS and Science whereas more female candidates were appointed within HaSS and the Professional Services Directorates.

74 females were appointed within HaSS this year, compared with 64 last year. Within SBS, 13 females were appointed this year, compared to 16 last year, this representing a decrease of $20 \%$ in female (versus male) appointments based on a relatively small number of appointments. Engineering and Science have seen small increases in their ratios of female appointments.

Table 15: Appointments by gender and Faculty/ Professional Services directorates

|  | Female | Male | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eng | $51(27 \%)$ | $140(73 \%)$ | $191(27 \%)$ |
| HaSS | $74(61 \%)$ | $48(39 \%)$ | $122(17 \%)$ |
| PS | $139(59 \%)$ | $98(41 \%)$ | $237(34 \%)$ |
| SBS | $13(35 \%)$ | $24(65 \%)$ | $37(5 \%)$ |
| Sci | $48(42 \%)$ | $65(58 \%)$ | $113(16 \%)$ |
| Total Count | 325 | 375 | 700 |
| Total \% | $46 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

### 11.2 Appointments by ethnicity

In terms of ethnicity, the highest percentage of BME candidates appointed were within the Academic, Research and Knowledge Exchange staff categories. The numbers of BME staff appointed in other staff categories are too small to provide any meaningful interpretation (Table 16).

Table 16: Appointments by ethnicity and job category

|  | BME | Not known | Prefer not to say | White | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | $14 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| APS 3-5 | $3 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| APS 6+ | $5 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Director/Professor | $5 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Operational | $2 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Research \& KE | $16 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Teaching | $8 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Technical | $0 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Total \% | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $58 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Total Count | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 0}$ |

The highest percentage of BME applicants were appointed within the Faculties of Engineering, Science and the Business School (Table 16.1).

BME staff appointments increased by 7\% in SBS and 3\% in Engineering (and 2\% in Science) BME staff appointments decreased 2\% for each of HaSS and PS since the 2016 report.

Table 16.1: Appointments by ethnicity and Faculty/ Professional Services directorates

|  | BME | Not known | Prefer not to say | White | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eng | $17 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| HaSS | $4 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| PS | $3 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| SBS | $14 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Sci | $14 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| Total $\%$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $31 \%$ | $\mathbf{1} \%$ | $58 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |
| Total Count | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 0}$ |

### 11.3 Appointments by disability

Tables 17 and 17.1 provide information on the appointment of staff with declared disabilities.
The 22 successful disabled applicants were appointed in SBS, Science and in Professional Services.

- Overall Disability appointments have increased from 2\% of appointees last year to 3\% this year (rounded).
- Disability appointments have increased by $5 \%$ in SBS but have dropped $3 \%$ in HaSS (although figures for declared disabilities are low, impacting upon statistical significance).
- Disability appointments decreased by $6 \%$ for the Academic category but increased by $17 \%$ for Technical (subject to the same caveat as above).

Table 17: Appointments by disability and Faculty/ Professional Services directorates

| Disability? | Yes | Not known | Prefer not to say | No | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eng | $2 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| HaSS | $2 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| PS | $4 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| SBS | $5 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Sci | $4 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| Total $\%$ | $\mathbf{3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0} \%$ | $58 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Total Count | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 0}$ |

Table 17.1: Appointments by disability and job category

| Disability? | Yes | Not known | Prefer not to say | No | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | $2 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| APS 3-5 | $5 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| APS 6+ | $0 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Director/Professor | $0 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Operational | $6 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Research \& KE | $3 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Teaching | $3 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Technical | $17 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Total \% | $3 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Total Count | 22 | 266 | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 0}$ |

## 12. Staff Leavers

Table 18 provides information on staff leavers. Between November 2015 and October 2016, 540 staff left the University (a decrease from 583 in the previous year). $52 \%$ of leavers were male and $48 \%$ female. $13 \%$ were BME staff (one percent increase from 2016) and $3 \%$ were staff with disabilities (the same as the 2015 and 2016 reports).

Table 18: Overview of staff leavers by protected characteristics

|  | Leavers |
| :--- | :---: |
| Female | $258(48 \%)$ |
| Male | $282(52 \%)$ |
| Total | $540(100 \%)$ |
|  |  |
| BME | $68(13 \%)$ |
| Disability | $14(3 \%)$ |

The highest numbers of staff leavers were based in the Research/Knowledge Exchange, Operational and APS staff categories (Diagram 10).

The highest numbers of female leavers were based in the APS, Research/KE and Operational Services staff categories. The highest numbers of male leavers were within Research/Knowledge Exchange.

Diagram 10: Leavers by gender and job category


The reasons for staff leaving the University are presented in Diagram 10A. The majority of leavers left as a result of their fixed term contract coming to an end or due to resignation. The 'other' category covers reasons such as death in-service, mutually agreed exit and III-health retirement.

Diagram 10A: Leaving reasons by gender


Diagram 11 provides a breakdown of staff leavers by ethnicity. The majority of BME leavers were employed within the Research/Knowledge Exchange staff category, which has the highest percentage of fixed term contracts. The number of Teaching category leavers has increased from the previous year. $48 \%$ ( 30 leavers) have disclosed their ethnic heritage as white. However, there is a significant increase ( $45 \%$ compared with $10 \%$ last year) in the proportion of leavers whose ethnic status remains unknown.

## Diagram 11: Leavers by ethnicity



The reasons for staff leaving, analysed by ethnicity, are presented in Diagram 11A. The majority of leavers left as a result of their fixed term contract coming to an end or due to resignation.

Diagram 11A: Leaving reasons by ethnicity


Diagram 12 provides information on staff leavers with disability. The numbers of staff are too small to make any meaningful interpretation.

Diagram 12: Leavers by disability


The reasons for staff with disabilities leaving the University are presented in Diagram 12A.

## Diagram 12A: Leaving reasons by disability



## 13. Staff Development

During the year the University provided 424 centrally facilitated staff development courses. This is an increase of $13 \%$ staff development programmes ( 57 courses) from the previous report.

The staff development sessions are provided by different teams ${ }^{2}$.
Table 19 provides an overview of participation rates (based on multiple attendance by individual staff) by protected characteristic. As has been the case in previous years, a higher proportion of female staff ( $57 \%$ ) participated in development programmes compared with male staff (43\%). The corresponding participation rates for female and male staff in 2016 were $60 \%$ and $40 \%$ respectively. $7 \%$ of participants were BME staff and $3 \%$ were staff with declared disabilities.

[^1]Table 19: Participants by equality protected characteristics

|  | Participants |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | $\%$ |
| Female | 6077 | $57 \%$ |
| Male | 4652 | $43 \%$ |
| Total | 10729 | $100 \%$ |
| BME staff | 849 | $7 \%$ |
| Staff with disabilities | 352 | $3 \%$ |


| University Population |
| :---: |
| $\%$ |
| $50 \%$ |
| $50 \%$ |
| $100 \%$ |
| $7 \%$ |
| $4 \%$ |

Analysis by age profile confirms that there was greater participation by staff within the age ranges $30-$ 39, 40-49 and 50-59 (Table 20) which mirrors the distribution of all University staff within these age groups.

In terms of gender and age, more men aged 30-39 attended events whereas female staff participants were more or less equally split between the age ranges of 30-39 and 40-49.

Table 20: Participants by age diversity

|  | Female | \% | Male | \% | Total | \% | \% Age profile of University Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <20 | 53 | 1\% | 18 | 0\% | 72 | 1\% | 1\% |
| 20-29 | 711 | 12\% | 552 | 12\% | 1298 | 12\% | 11\% |
| 30-39 | 1771 | 29\% | 1632 | 35\% | 3448 | 32\% | 25\% |
| 40-49 | 1889 | 31\% | 1357 | 29\% | 3251 | 30\% | 28\% |
| 50-59 | 1337 | 22\% | 779 | 17\% | 2118 | 20\% | 26\% |
| 60+ | 316 | 5\% | 314 | 7\% | 630 | 6\% | 9\% |
| Total | 6077 | 100\% | 4652 | 100\% | 10729 | 100\% | 100\% |

## 14. Complaints/ Discipline/ Grievances

Between November 2010 and October 2016 the University received and addressed 152 formal staff related complaints, grievances and disciplinary cases (Table 21).
$61 \%$ were disciplinary cases; $18 \%$ grievances and $20 \%$ dignity and respect related complaints.
In 2016 there was a decrease of $19 \%$ (6) cases when compared with 2015. The number of formal cases remains low for an organisation of the size of Strathclyde.

Table 21: Breakdown of formal staff related complaints, grievances and disciplinary cases

|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disciplinary cases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 32 | 34\% |
| Male | 1 | 15 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 13 | 13 | 61 | 66\% |
| Total | 2 | 21 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 19 | 17 | 93 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grievance cases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 32\% |
| Male | - | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 19 | 68\% |
| Total | - | 5 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 28 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dignity \& Respect Complaints |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 21 | 68\% |
| Male | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 32\% |
| Total | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 31 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Total | 5 | 30 | 23 | 20 | 16 | 32 | 26 | 152 |  |
|  | 3\% | 20\% | 15\% | 13\% | 11\% | 21\% | 17\% | 100\% |  |

## 15. Staff information by new protected characteristics

All staff are invited to provide information on their 'protected characteristics' on a voluntary basis. This section provides information on the disclosure rates for protected characteristics (Table 22). Comparison with the UK sector is provided. However, not all of the 164 Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) monitor the information on gender reassignment ( 100 HEls do monitor), religion and belief ( 115 HEls do monitor) and sexual orientation ( 119 HEls do monitor).

At Strathclyde, information from staff on gender reassignment, religion and belief, sexual orientation, marital and civil partnership status was sought in September 2013 for the first time.

The disclosure rates for gender reassignment, religion and belief, sexual orientation, parental requirements, marital and civil partnerships have increased from 2015.

90\% (down 2 percent from 2015) of all staff disclosed information on their ethnic heritage and $81 \%$ (same as 2015) of staff provided information on disability.

Table 22: Disclosure by staff on their protected characteristics

| 2016 | Not Known | Prefer not to Say | Employees | Strathclyde Response Rate* | Sector disclosure rate comparison |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | 0 | 0 | 3591 | 100\% | 100\% |
| BME | 365 | 51 | 3591 | 90\% | 95\% |
| Disability | 692 | 24 | 3591 | 81\% | 94\% |
| Sexual orientation | 1768 | 203 | 3591 | 51\% | 30\% |
| Religion | 1747 | 208 | 3591 | 51\% | 41\% |
| Gender reassignment | 1768 | 48 | 3591 | 51\% | 41\% |
| Marital/ Civil partnership | 895 | 114 | 3591 | 75\% | - |
| Parental | 2541 | 48 | 3591 | 29\% | - |
| 2015 | Not Known | Prefer not to Say | Employees | Response Rate* |  |
| Gender | 0 | 0 | 3429 | 100\% | - |
| BME | 278 | 45 | 3429 | 92\% | - |
| Disability | 637 | 23 | 3429 | 81\% | - |
| Sexual orientation | 1882 | 176 | 3429 | 45\% | - |
| Religion | 1853 | 175 | 3429 | 46\% | - |
| Gender reassignment | 1876 | 38 | 3429 | 45\% | - |
| Marital/ Civil partnership | 902 | 90 | 3429 | 74\% | - |
| Parental | 2550 | 30 | 3429 | 26\% | - |

* 'Response Rate' includes everyone except 'Not Known'.

The disclosure rate for applicants is slightly lower in 2016 than the previous year (Table 22.1)
Table 22.1: Disclosure by applicants on their protected characteristics

| 2016 | Not Known | Prefer not to <br> Say | Applicants | Response Rate* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | 96 | 112 | 13063 | $99 \%$ |
| BME | 159 | 374 | 13063 | $99 \%$ |
| Disability | 0 | 1394 | 13063 | $100 \%$ |
| 2015 | Not Known | Prefer not to <br> Say | Applicants | Response Rate* |
| Gender | 18 | 154 | 10972 | $100 \%$ |
| BME | 45 | 411 | 10972 | $100 \%$ |
| Disability | 30 | 1087 | 10972 | $100 \%$ |

* 'Response Rate' includes everyone except 'Not Known'.

The disclosure rate for ethnicity and disability status for appointments is proportionately lower in 2016 than the previous year (Table 22.2)

Table 22.2: Disclosure by Appointments on their protected characteristics

| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | Not Known | Prefer not to <br> Say | Appointments | Response Rate* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | 0 | 0 | 700 | $100 \%$ |
| BME | 218 | 10 | 700 | $69 \%$ |
| Disability | 266 | 3 | 700 | $62 \%$ |
| 2015 | Not Known | Prefer not to <br> Say | Appointments | Response Rate* |
| Gender | 0 | 0 | 701 | $100 \%$ |
| BME | 199 | 10 | 701 | $72 \%$ |
| Disability | 259 | 3 | 701 | $63 \%$ |

* 'Response Rate' includes everyone except 'Not Known'.

Staff provided information on religion and belief (Table 23) as follows: 19\% of staff described themselves as Christians (an increase of $2 \%$ from 2016). $23 \%$ stated 'no religion' (increase of $3 \%$ from 2016). $6 \%$ of staff declined to provide the information.

Table 23: Strathclyde staff profile by religion or belief

| Religion or Belief | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Any other religion, belief or faith | 25 | $1 \%$ |
| Buddhist | 8 | $0 \%$ |
| Christian | 667 | $19 \%$ |
| Hindu | 22 | $1 \%$ |
| Humanist | 21 | $1 \%$ |
| Jewish | $\star$ | $\star$ |
| Muslim | 54 | $2 \%$ |
| No religion | 817 | $23 \%$ |
| Not known | 1747 | $49 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 208 | $6 \%$ |
| Sikh | $\star$ | $*$ |
| Spiritual | 15 | $0 \%$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{3 5 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

In terms of disclosure of sexual orientation, $43 \%$ (an increase of 5\% from 2016) of staff indicated that they are straight or heterosexual (Table 24). Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) staff comprise 3\% of all staff (an increase of $2 \%$ from 2016). $6 \%$ of staff preferred not to provide information.

Table 24: Strathclyde staff profile by sexual orientation

| Sexual Orientation | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Bisexual | 18 | $1 \%$ |
| Gay man | 36 | $1 \%$ |
| Gay woman/lesbian | 22 | $1 \%$ |
| Heterosexual | 1531 | $43 \%$ |
| Not known | 1768 | $49 \%$ |
| Other | 13 | $0 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 203 | $6 \%$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{3 5 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |

For the third year running, staff have been asked to disclose information about their gender identity status. Staff are asked the question: 'Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were originally assigned at birth?'

Table 25 provides information on gender reassignment. There are $0.3 \%$ trans $^{3}$ staff ( 11 individuals). $1.3 \%$ refused to provide information. Whilst almost half of the total staffing population have not disclosed any information on this, there has been a 6\% increase in disclosure levels since the 2016 report.

Table 25: Strathclyde staff profile by gender reassignment

| Gender Same as at Birth | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No | 11 | $0 \%$ |
| Not known | 1768 | $49 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 48 | $1 \%$ |
| Yes | 1764 | $49 \%$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{3 5 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

$75 \%$ of staff disclosed information on their relationship status (Table 26). The profile indicates that 40\% of staff are married; $23 \%$ are single and $6 \%$ co-habiting. Only a small proportion preferred not to disclose their relationship status (3\%).

Table 26: Strathclyde staff profile by relationship status

| Relationship Status | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Civil Partner | 16 | $0 \%$ |
| Co habiting | 203 | $6 \%$ |
| Divorced | 55 | $2 \%$ |
| Married | 1433 | $40 \%$ |
| Not known | 895 | $25 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 114 | $3 \%$ |
| Separated | 31 | $1 \%$ |
| Single | 829 | $23 \%$ |
| Widowed | 15 | $0 \%$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{3 5 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Table 27 provides a breakdown of information on parental requirements. $71 \%$ of staff have not provided information. Only a small number have refused to disclose information. The number of staff on parental leave or pregnant is too small to provide any meaningful interpretation. However, the University remains committed to meeting the diverse needs of all staff through application of policy and practice.

[^2]Table 27: Strathclyde staff profile by parental requirements

| Parental Requirements | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Not applicable | 983 | $27 \%$ |
| Not known | 2541 | $71 \%$ |
| On additional paternity leave | 7 | $0 \%$ |
| On maternity leave | 11 | $0 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 48 | $1 \%$ |
| Pregnant | ${ }^{*}$ | $\star$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{3 5 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

## 16. Staff by nationality

As at the end of October snapshot date, the following 74 nationalities (an increase of $2 \%$ in national backgrounds from 2016) were represented at the University of Strathclyde:

Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Korea (South), Latvia, Libya, Lithuania, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palestine, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Taiwan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, Vietnam.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Equality Act 2010 (Equality Act 2010 Summary) recognises the association of people and groups as belonging to diverse protected characteristics including age, disability, gender reassignment, sex, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnership and pregnancy and maternity.

[^1]:    2 Development and Innovation, Disability Service, Equality and Diversity Office, Information strategy project, IT training, Learning Technology Enhancement, Organisational and Staff Development Unit, Researcher Development programme, Safety Services

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Transgender is an umbrella term for people whose gender identity and/ or gender expression differs from their birth sex. Transgender people may or may not alter their bodies hormonally and/or surgically. The term transgender should only be used as an adjective, for example, 'transgender people'.

