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## Executive Summary

The University of Strathclyde is a socially progressive employer, committed to ensuring diversity, equality and inclusion within our staffing population. The 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.

The report is based on data as of 31 October 2021. Where corresponding data is available for October 2020, this is presented in brackets next to the 2021 figure to enable a year-on-year comparison. A significant part of the reporting period has been impacted by the Covid-19 global pandemic and this should be taken into account when reflecting on the data presented.

The University has a 4322 (4166 in 2020) headcount of staff, of which $78 \%$ hold full-time posts. This is an increase in the staffing population of $4 \%$.

There are 954 (928 in 2020) part-time staff at the University making up $22 \%$ of all staff.
$66 \%$ of staff are based within the four Faculties (Business, Humanities and Social Sciences, Engineering and Science) with the remaining 34\% in the Professional Services Directorates.

363 staff were promoted during the period 1 November 2020 to 31 October 2021. This is an increase from 297 promotions in 2019-20. 14\% of promotions were BME staff which remains the same as the number reported in 2021. $4 \%$ of promotions were from those who identified with disabilities which was a slight increase from the previous year (3\%).

In terms of protected characteristics at the University:

- The gender composition of the staffing profile has remained consistent since the October 2020 Monitoring Report with an overall staffing profile of $50 \%$ female staff and $50 \%$ male.
- There has been an increase of $7 \%$ in the number of female professors since last year.
- The declared Disability status of the staffing profile has remained static at 4\%. Disabled women are slightly more represented than disabled men.
- The percentage of BME (Black Minority Ethnic) staff has remained static at 9\% this year. There continues to be a higher percentage of male BME staff than female staff although the female percentage has increased by 1 percentage point.
- The age profile indicates that women between age 40 and 59 outnumber men in these age groups. Men are more represented in the 30-39 and 60 plus age groups. The 20-29 age category has seen a decrease in men over the last year.
- $25 \%$ ( $26 \%$ ) of staff voluntarily describe themselves as Christians, $35 \%$ ( $35 \%$ ) have stated 'no religion'.
- Declared disclosure by Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) staff comprise $4 \%$ of all staff which is an increase of $1 \%$ since 2020.
- $0.2 \%$ ( 10 individuals) of employees have disclosed that they have a different gender to that which they had at birth. This figure has remained static since 2020.

For part time staff, a significant proportion are female (69\%) compared with male staff (31\%) although this reflects a $5 \%$ increase in part-time male staff from the 2021 report. There is also a $1 \%$ increase in the number of part-time staff from a Black Minority Ethnic background ( $6 \%$ in 2022 compared to $5 \%$ in 2021) and $5 \%$ have disclosed disability status (this figure remains static).

[^0]Between 1 November 2020 and 31 October 2021, the University received 12,009 applications. Whilst this is a slight increase on the previous year ( 11,970 reported in 2020 ) there is a continuing impact of COVID on recruitment activities. The University received significantly more applications from male applicants this year (57\% compared to $48 \%$ in 2021). $2 \%$ of applicants preferred not to disclose their gender. $38 \%$ of applicants were BME (a significant increase from $27 \%$ 2020) and $5 \%$ of applicants disclosed a disability (comparable with 2020).

Between November 2020 and October 2021, 551 staff left the University ( 552 staff left last year). $55 \%$ of leavers were male and $45 \%$ female (an increase in male leavers by $2 \%$ ). $12 \%$ were BME staff (an increase of $3 \%$ ) and $3 \%$ were staff with disabilities (increase of $1 \%$ ).

During the year the University provided 339 centrally facilitated staff development programmes. A significantly higher proportion of female staff participated in training programmes compared with male staff ( $60 \%$ versus 40\%). $13 \%$ of participants were BME staff, remaining static from the previous year, and $5 \%$ were staff with declared disabilities, a $1 \%$ increase from last year.

The University received and addressed 15 formal staff related grievances, dignity and respect complaints and disciplinary cases during 2020-2021. This is a slight decrease from 16 formal cases in 2019-2020.

In this report, to prevent the possibility of any individual being identified, all figures less than 5 have been replaced with an asterisk.

## 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, diversity and inclusion and set out our plans going forward within our People Strategy 2020-2025. This strategy outlines how, as a University, we will achieve our people vision and within this we have pledged to ensure our leaders continue to champion a positive, and inclusive culture and that we develop and implement a 'best in class' EDI programme. We are also heavily focused on delivering the actions from our Gender Pay report which include:

- Enhancing our training provision around unconscious bias
- Introducing diversity action plans for our Academic Professional vacancies
- Enhancing our mentoring and training for internal promotions
- Reviewing our Learning \& Teaching promotion criteria

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.

Since March 2020 the University has been operating in the midst of the global pandemic and there are aspects of the data that reflect this and should be taken into account.

The current staff profile is consistent with the staff monitoring report from the previous year. The overall headcount of employees increased by 156 between 1 November 2020 and 31 October 2021.

The University as of October 2021 employs a4322 headcount of (4166) staff, of which 50\% are female and 50\% male. This gender distribution remains an equal split between male and female staff compared to the 2020 data.

9\% of staff considered themselves to be Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) and 4\% disclosed a disability (Table 1), this is the same as last year.

Table 1: Strathclyde staff profile

| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $2,154(50 \%)$ | $2,096(50 \%)$ |
| Male | $2,168(50 \%)$ | $2,070(50 \%)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 , 3 2 2}(\mathbf{1 0 0 \%})$ | $\mathbf{4 , 1 6 6 ( 1 0 0 \% )}$ |
|  |  |  |
| BME | $394(9 \%)$ | $382(9 \%)$ |
| Disability | $177(4 \%)$ | $161(4 \%)$ |

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

Female staff represent the same proportion of male staff at the University. The percentage of male staff at Strathclyde remains higher (by five percentage points) than the Scottish average and four percentage points higher than the UK sector average (Table 2).

The proportion of BME staff at Strathclyde is significantly higher than the Scottish sector average
( $9 \%$ compared to $4.5 \%$ ) and only marginally lower than the UK HE sector average.

In terms of disability status, the University's employment profile is comparable with the Scottish sector average but slightly lower than the UK HE sector average.

Table 2: Strathclyde staff profile compared with Scottish and UK Universities 2020

|  | Strathclyde | Scottish Universities | All UK |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $2,154(50 \%)$ | $27,945(55 \%)$ | $227,180(54.2 \%)$ |
| Male | $2,168(50 \%)$ | $22,920(45 \%)$ | $191,890(45.8 \%)$ |
| Total | $4,322(100 \%)$ | $49,510(100 \%)$ | $419,070(100 \%)$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| BME* | $382(9 \%)$ | $1,550(4.5 \%)$ | $32,930(10.8 \%)$ |
| Disability | $161(4 \%)$ | $2,000(3.9 \%)$ | $23,170(5.5 \%)$ |

https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/equality-higher-education-statistical-report-2020
3. Strathclyde staff profile by full and part-time status and staff category

The University staff profile indicates that $78 \%$ of employees hold full-time posts and $22 \%$ part-time posts (Table 3 ).

For part-time staff, the highest proportion are in Operational (53\%), followed by APS 3-5 (29\%) staff categories.
Within all of our job categories, the majority of staff hold full-time posts, with the except of our operational staff category.

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

| Grade | Full Time |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | $487(11 \%)$ | $25(1 \%)$ | $512(12 \%)$ |  |
| APS 3-5 | $403(9 \%)$ | $168(4 \%)$ | $571(13 \%)$ |  |
| APS 6+ | $887(21 \%)$ | $194(4 \%)$ | $1081(25 \%)$ |  |
| Director/Professor | $256(6 \%)$ | $48(1 \%)$ | $304(7 \%)$ |  |
| Operational | $238(6 \%)$ | $268(6 \%)$ | $506(12 \%)$ |  |
| Research \& KE | $669(15 \%)$ | $131(3 \%)$ | $800(19 \%)$ |  |
| Teaching | $240(6 \%)$ | $96(2 \%)$ | $336(8 \%)$ |  |
| Technical | $188(4 \%)$ | $24(1 \%)$ | $212(5 \%)$ |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 , 3 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 3 2 2}$ |  |
| Total \% | $\mathbf{7 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |  |

Diagram 1 represents the distribution of staff by staff category.

## Diagram 1: Staff Profile by job category

| $\begin{gathered} 12 \% \\ 512 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \% \\ & 571 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \% \\ 1,081 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \% \\ & 304 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \% \\ 506 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \% \\ 800 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \% \\ & 336 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & 212 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

[^1][^2]studies.

## 4. Staff by Faculty/Professional Services Directorates

Staff analysis by organisational area is reflected below (Diagram 2).
Between November 2020 and October 2021, the proportion of staff in Engineering increased by 1 percentage point. Conversely the proportion of staff in Professional Services fell by 1 percentage point.

Between November 2020 and October 2021, the proportion of staff in Science, HaSS and SBS 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 3-5 staff are based in Professional Services Directorates;
- Nearly all Operational Services staff are based in the Professional Services Directorates;
- The highest proportion 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 | Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | 165 (15\%) | 131 (20\%) | 0 (0\%) | 79 (24\%) | 137 (18\%) | 512 (12\%) |
| APS 3-5 | 82 (7\%) | 109 (17\%) | 283 (19\%) | 44 (14\%) | 53 (7\%) | 571 (13\%) |
| APS 6+ | 142 (13\%) | 112 (17\%) | 661 (45\%) | 80 (25\%) | 86 (12\%) | 1081 (25\%) |
| Director/Professor | 95 (8\%) | 57 (9\%) | 28 (2\%) | 40 (12\%) | 84 (11\%) | 304 (7\%) |
| Operational | 27 (2\%) | 0 (0\%) | 474 (32\%) | * | * | 501 (12\%) |
| Research \& KE | 448 (40\%) | 82 (13\%) | 0 (0\%) | 42 (13\%) | 228 (31\%) | 800 (19\%) |
| Teaching | 75 (7\%) | 147 (23\%) | 13 (1\%) | 38 (12\%) | 63 (9\%) | 336 (8\%) |
| Technical | 99 (9\%) | 6 (1\%) | 17 (1\%) | 0 (0\%) | 90 (12\%) | 212 (5\%) |
| Totals (row\%) | 1133 (26\%) | 644 (15\%) | 1476 (34\%) | 323 (7\%) | 741 (17\%) |  |

N.B The total staff count has not been included as the * do not allow for a total of 4166 to be reached.

## 5. Gender

The following section provides information by gender.

Overall, the representation of men and women remains stable with an equal population of male and female staff in the University.

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 (70\%) and the lowest percentage is in the Faculty of Engineering (29\%). This pattern of distribution largely mirrors the trends reported in the 2020 report, although there has been a $2 \%$ increase in female staff in Science and a $1 \%$ decrease in male staff in SBS.

Diagram 3: Gender profile by Faculties and Professional Services Directorates


The profile for gender by job category confirms 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, Director/Professor and Academic staff categories; these being the higher levels of our grading structure and with a corresponding impact on our overall gender pay gap. There is also a significantly greater proportion of male staff within the technical staff category but this staff category has the smallest total population.

Table 5: Gender by job category

|  | Female |  |  | Male |  |  | Totals |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \# | \% | *\% | \# | \% | *\% | \# | \% |
| Academic | 195 | 9\% | 38\% | 317 | 15\% | 62\% | 512 | 12\% |
| APS 3-5 | 463 | 21\% | 81\% | 108 | 5\% | 19\% | 571 | 13\% |
| APS 6+ | 687 | 32\% | 64\% | 394 | 18\% | 36\% | 1,081 | 25\% |
| Director/Professor | 80 | 4\% | 26\% | 224 | 10\% | 74\% | 304 | 7\% |
| Operational | 260 | 12\% | 51\% | 246 | 11\% | 49\% | 506 | 12\% |
| Research \& KE | 236 | 11\% | 30\% | 564 | 26\% | 71\% | 800 | 19\% |
| Teaching | 179 | 8\% | 53\% | 157 | 7\% | 47\% | 336 | 8\% |
| Technical | 54 | 3\% | 25\% | 158 | 7\% | 75\% | 212 | 5\% |


| Total | 2,154 | $100 \%$ | $50 \%$ | 2,168 | $100 \%$ | $50 \%$ | 4,322 | $100 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

*\% denotes percentage of job category

### 5.1 Gender Analysis - Academic category

Diagram 4: Gender profile for Academic staff


There is a higher concentration of male staff (67\%) compared with female staff (33\%) in the academic category (Diagram 4/Table 6). There is an increase of 1 percentage point within the female academic staff population when compared to 2020.

Staff holding posts at Professorial level form the largest group of Academic Staff (34\%), followed by staff at Senior Lecturer level ( $26 \%$ - consistent with last year), Lecturer B level ( $23 \%$ - a decrease of 1 percentage point), Readers ( $14 \%$ - an increase of 2 percentage points) and Lecturer A's ( $3 \%$ - consistent with last year).

The proportion of professors who are female has increased by $1 \%$ to $24 \%$ since last year and the Reader population remains consistent from last year at $35 \%$. In last year's report, we confirmed that there were 59 female Professors. This year this has increased to 63, a $7 \%$ increase showing a continuing, positive trajectory in our bid to appoint and promote female Academics to Professorial posts. The SGTP continues to run annually with a continued focus attracting a diverse pool of candidates including the best female talent. This includes the recruitment of senior female academics as well as Chancellor's Fellows to improve the pipeline for female promotions.

Table 6: Gender by Academic staff

|  | Female |  | Male |  | Totals |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \# | \% | \# | \% | \# | \% |
| Professor | 63 | 24\% | 203 | 39\% | 266 | 34\% |
| Reader | 38 | 15\% | 70 | 13\% | 108 | 14\% |
| Senior Lecturer | 82 | 32\% | 122 | 23\% | 204 | 26\% |
| Lecturer B | 66 | 26\% | 113 | 22\% | 179 | 23\% |
| Lecturer A | 9 | 3\% | 12 | 2\% | 21 | 3\% |
| Total | 258 (33\%) | 100\% | 520 (67\%) | 100\% | 778 | 100\% |

Table 7 illustrates year on year progression of female academic staff between 2011 and 2021. Only the Lecturer B category reflects a decrease in the percentage of female staff.

The percentage of females holding Professorial posts in recent years has risen from $16 \%$ in 2011 to $24 \%$ in 2021.

Efforts to encourage both external recruitment and internal promotions of senior female staff, where appropriate, will continue. Given the higher proportion of female staff within the teaching focused staff category (179 of the 336 teaching staff are female), it is hoped that the role of Professor of Learning and Teaching will continue to have an impact on the number of females at professorial level in the years ahead. We have a number of initiatives aimed at improving the gender balance, detailed in our 2021 Gender Pay Report. For more information, please see the link below:

Equal Pay and Gender Pay Gap Report 2021.pdf (strath.ac.uk)

There has continued to be an increase in the percentage of females in the Senior Lecturer category with a rise from $38 \%$ to $40 \%$ between 2020 and 2021.

Table 7: Percentage of female staff by Academic grade

|  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professor | 16\% | 17\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 18\% | 21\% | 23\% | 24\% |
| Reader | 27\% | 28\% | 27\% | 26\% | 23\% | 25\% | 27\% | 33\% | 33\% | 35\% | 35\% |
| Senior Lecturer | 23\% | 27\% | 29\% | 31\% | 33\% | 32\% | 34\% | 35\% | 35\% | 38\% | 40\% |
| Lecturer B | 43\% | 38\% | 39\% | 38\% | 40\% | 40\% | 42\% | 41\% | 40\% | 37\% | 37\% |
| Lecturer A | 37\% | 50\% | 41\% | 50\% | 50\% | 47\% | 36\% | 33\% | 42\% | 46\% | 43\% |

## 6. Staff profile by Ethnicity

The University invites all staff on an annual basis to update their information, including personal characteristics. Regular reminders are also included in Inside Strathclyde to encourage increased disclosure rates.

The profile for ethnicity confirms that $88 \%$ of staff have disclosed information on their ethnic origin.
Of those staff who have disclosed their ethnicity, $77 \%$ are White and $9 \%$ are from a Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) background.

There is a greater percentage of BME male staff than BME female staff (Table 8).

As a rounded figure, the percentage of BME staff has remained static at $9 \%$ since the last report.

Table 8: BME staff by gender

|  | BME | Not known | Prefer not to say | White |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $7 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $82 \%$ |
| Male | $12 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| Total $\%$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 3 2 0}$ |

Table 8.1: Proportion of BME staff per job category

| Grade | BME | Not known | Prefer not to say | White |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | $18 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
| APS 3-5 | $3 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $88 \%$ |
| APS 6+ | $4 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| Director/Professor | $8 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $77 \%$ |


| Operational | $3 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Research \& KE | $22 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| Teaching | $6 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $85 \%$ |
| Technical | $5 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $81 \%$ |
| Total | $9 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ |
| Total $\%$ | 394 | 515 | 93 | $\mathbf{3 , 3 2 0}$ |

Analysis by staff categories (Table 8.1) indicates that BME staff are primarily concentrated in the Research/Knowledge Exchange (22\%) and Academic (18\%) staff categories.

Table 8.2: Ethnicity breakdown by Faculty/ Professional Services Directorates

| Grade | BME | Not known | Prefer not to say | White |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eng | $195(17 \%)$ | $163(14 \%)$ | $32(3 \%)$ | $743(66 \%)$ |
| HaSS | $36(6 \%)$ | $68(11 \%)$ | $11(2 \%)$ | $529(82 \%)$ |
| PS | $42(3 \%)$ | $143(10 \%)$ | $23(2 \%)$ | $1268(86 \%)$ |
| SBS | $34(10 \%)$ | $35(11 \%)$ | $6(2 \%)$ | $251(77 \%)$ |
| Sci | $87(12 \%)$ | $106(14 \%)$ | $21(3 \%)$ | $529(71 \%)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ |
| Total $\%$ | $\mathbf{3 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 3 2 0}$ |

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 (17\%) and the lowest within Professional Services Directorates (3\%). The University has a number of strategies to further develop equality and diversity in this area. A Race Equality Working Group was formed in 2020 with a remit to work to ensure an inclusive environment for Black, Asian and minority ethnicity (BAME) students and staff, promote racial diversity across the University and, where required, improve educational and employment outcomes for BAME students and staff. In November 2021 the Equality Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC) approved an 'anti-racist statement' and a phased action plan for the next two years. A Race Equality Steering Group (RESG) is now being set up to provide oversight to implementing the REWG recommendations and lead the University's work towards the Race Equality Charter.

## 7. Staff with disabilities

177 staff have disclosed a disability, this representing $4 \%$ of our staff population (Table 9 ). The disclosure rate has remained static since 2020.

A significant number of staff (20\%) have not provided information on their disability status, with $1 \%$ choosing the 'prefer not to say' option. The University remains committed to reducing the percentage of staff within the 'not known' category and will continue to work with the departmental Equality and Diversity contacts to encourage higher levels of disclosure.

Table 9: Staff with disabilities by Gender

|  | Yes | Not known | Prefer not to say | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $5 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 9 \%}$ |
| Male | $3 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 5 \%}$ |
| Total $\%$ | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 3 2 2}$ |

In terms of staff categories, the highest proportion of disabled staff are based within the Technical Services (6\%), Administrative \& Professional Services 3-5 (6\%) and Operational (5\%) staff categories (Table 9.1).

Table 9.1: Staff with disabilities by job category

| Yes | Not known |  | Prefer not to say | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | $4 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $81 \%$ |
| APS 3-5 | $6 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $81 \%$ |
| APS 6+ | $4 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $84 \%$ |
| Director/Professor | $4 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| Operational | $5 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Research \& KE | $2 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Teaching | $4 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| Technical | $6 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $76 \%$ |
| Total \% | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 3 2 2}$ |

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

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

|  | Yes |  | Not known | Prefer not to say |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eng | $30(3 \%)$ | $233(21 \%)$ | $12(1 \%)$ | No |
| HaSS | $34(5 \%)$ | $105(16 \%)$ | $958(76 \%)$ |  |
| PS | $68(5 \%)$ | $231(16 \%)$ | $18(1 \%)$ | $496(77 \%)$ |
| SBS | $16(5 \%)$ | $53(16 \%)$ | $*(2 \%)$ | $1159(79 \%)$ |
| Sci | $29(4 \%)$ | $145(20 \%)$ | $11(1 \%)$ | $251(77 \%)$ |
| Total \% | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $558(75 \%)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ |

## 8. Age profile

The highest proportion of Strathclyde staff are between 40 to 49 and 50 to 59 years of age. This pattern is consistent with last year's report. In recent years, there has been a steady increase in the number of staff who are 60 and above (373 staff in 2018, 417 in 2019 and 451 in 2020). However, this year has seen a slight decrease in this age group population which may be related to the pandemic and the significant changes to our ways of working.

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

- Men are marginally more represented in the 20-29, 30-39 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 | $\%$ | Male | $\%$ | Totals |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <20 | 9 | $0 \%$ | 10 | $0 \%$ | $19(0 \%)$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 9}$ | 231 | $11 \%$ | 278 | $13 \%$ | $509(12 \%)$ |


| $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 9}$ | 519 | $24 \%$ | 618 | $29 \%$ | $1137(26 \%)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4 0 - 4 9}$ | 610 | $28 \%$ | 481 | $22 \%$ | $1091(25 \%)$ |
| $\mathbf{5 0 - 5 9}$ | 599 | $28 \%$ | 497 | $23 \%$ | $1096(25 \%)$ |
| $\mathbf{6 0 +}$ | 186 | $9 \%$ | 284 | $13 \%$ | $470(11 \%)$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{2 , 1 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 1 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 3 2 2}$ |

## 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 post to another.

A summary of staff promotions during the period 1 November 2020 to 31 October 2021 by gender, ethnicity and disability is presented in Table 11. In this period 363 staff were promoted, compared with 297 staff in 2019-20. 51\% of those promoted this year were female and $49 \%$ were male. This is a significant increase in the percentage of female promotions when compared to last year's data which confirmed that 45\% of those promoted in 2019-20 were female.
$14 \%$ of promotions were BME staff, which is a significant increase from the last report ( $8 \%$ ). $3 \%$ of the staff who were promoted this year had declared disabilities. The actual number of declared disabled staff promoted is small, however, making meaningful analysis of this change difficult.

Table 11: An overview of promotions

|  | \# | \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 185 | $51 \%$ |
| Male | 178 | $49 \%$ |
| Total | 363 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
|  |  | $8 \%$ |
| BME | 28 | $4 \%$ |
| Disability | 16 |  |

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+ (28\%), the Academic (22\%) and the Research \& Knowledge Exchange category (15\%).

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 Director/Professor, Technical and Research/Knowledge Exchange categories.

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

|  | Female | F\% | Male | M\% | Total | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | 29 | $37 \%$ | 50 | $63 \%$ | 79 | $22 \%$ |
| APS 3-5 | 35 | $85 \%$ | 6 | $15 \%$ | 41 | $11 \%$ |
| APS 6+ | 70 | $69 \%$ | 32 | $31 \%$ | 102 | $28 \%$ |
| Director/Professor | $*$ | $24 \%$ | 13 | $76 \%$ | 17 | $5 \%$ |
| Operational | $*$ | $50 \%$ | $*$ | $50 \%$ | 10 | $3 \%$ |
| Research \& KE | 14 | $26 \%$ | 40 | $74 \%$ | 54 | $15 \%$ |
| Teaching | 24 | $65 \%$ | 13 | $35 \%$ | 37 | $10 \%$ |
| Technical | $*$ | $17 \%$ | 19 | $83 \%$ | 23 | $6 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

## 10. Part time staff profile

There are 954 part-time staff at the University making up $22 \%$ (the same proportion as last year) of all staff.
The gender profile indicates that the vast majority of part-time staff are female (69\% - a decrease from last year) compared with male staff (31\%). Of those staff who have disclosed their protected characteristics, $6 \%$ (a one percentage point increase from 2021) of part time staff are from a BME background and 5\% (unchanged from last year) of part time staff have a declared disability (Table 13).

Table 13: Part time staff diversity profile

|  | Part-time staff |
| :--- | :---: |
| Female | $663(69 \%)$ |
| Male | $291(31 \%)$ |
| Total | $954(100 \%)$ |
|  |  |
| BME | $53(6 \%)$ |
| Disability | $50(5 \%)$ |

Part-time female staff are highly represented within the Operational Services, APS 3-5 and APS 6+ staff categories (Diagram 5). There is a bias towards women within the part time staffing complement within all of the University's staff categories other than within Director/Professor category where the number of part-time males outweigh the number of females. In the Research \& KE and Technical categories there is an almost equal proportion of males and females in part-time roles.

## Diagram 5: Part time staff by gender and job category



The age profile for all part-time staff indicates a higher concentration of females in all age groups (Diagram 6). The highest concentration of part-time female staff is within the age band 40-49, whereas the highest number of parttime male staff are over 60.

## Diagram 6: Part time staff by gender and age



## 11. New staff applications and appointments

Between 1 November 2020 and 31 October 2021, the University received 12,009 applications (a slight increase on the previous year's figure of 11,970 applications) for 835 posts. The number of posts have increased significantly to a level that was previously seen prior to the pandemic. (Table 14).

There was a greater number of applications received from men than women ( $57 \%$ and $41 \%$ respectively). This is a decrease in female applications from 2020 (49\%). The gender status of the remaining applicants was 'not known' or 'prefer not to say'.
$38 \%$ of the applicants were BME (a significant increase of 11\% from last year) and 5\% of applicants disclosed a disability (comparable to last year).

As has been the case in previous years, the percentage of BME applicants was significantly higher than the \% of BME appointments. This, plus the significant percentage of successful candidates whose ethnicity is 'not known,' requires further investigation and monitoring in the year ahead.
$3 \%$ of applicants declaring a disability or disabilities were successful in gaining employment at the University. As with successful BME applicants, the disability status of a significant percentage of appointees is not known.

Table 14: Applications and Appointments

| Applications | Shortlisted | Offer |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $4,971(41 \%)$ | $1,170(46 \%)$ | $416(50 \%)$ |
| Male | $6,821(57 \%)$ | $1,343(53 \%)$ | $411(49 \%)$ |
| Not known | $18(0 \%)$ | - | - |
| Prefer not to specify | $199(2 \%)$ | $35(1 \%)$ | $8(1 \%)$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 , 0 0 9 ( 1 0 0 \% )}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 5 4 8}(\mathbf{1 0 0 \% )}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 5 ( 1 0 0 \% )}$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| BME | $4,515(38 \%)$ | $636(25 \%)$ | $153(18 \%)$ |
| Not known | $100(1 \%)$ | $14(1 \%)$ | $5(1 \%)$ |
| Prefer not to say | $497(4 \%)$ | $98(4 \%)$ | $29(3 \%)$ |


| Disability | $566(5 \%)$ | $165(6 \%)$ | $35(4 \%)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Not known | - | - | - |
| Prefer not to specify | $2063(17 \%)$ | $407(16 \%)$ | $145(17 \%)$ |

### 11.1 Appointments

Diagram 7 provides an overview of all appointments made. The highest percentage of appointments made were in the Research and Knowledge Exchange staff categories. ( $41 \%$ - which is the same percentage reported last year). There is a decline in the number of appointments across the Teaching, Academic and Director/Professor staff categories.

Diagram 7: Appointments by job category


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

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

|  | Female | Male | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eng | $62(23 \%)$ | $205(77 \%)$ | $267(38 \%)$ |
| HaSS | $58(67 \%)$ | $29(33 \%)$ | $87(12 \%)$ |
| PS | $99(60 \%)$ | $65(40 \%)$ | $164(24 \%)$ |
| SBS | $23(62 \%)$ | $14(38 \%)$ | $37(5 \%)$ |
| Sci | $69(49 \%)$ | $73(51 \%)$ | $142(20 \%)$ |
| Total | 311 | 386 | 697 |
| Total $\%$ | $45 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

### 11.2 Appointments by ethnicity

In terms of ethnicity, the highest percentage of BME candidates appointed were within the Academic, Director/Professor and Research and Knowledge Exchange staff categories. 17\% of appointments made at Director/Professor level were BME candidates which is a significant increase from last year where only 3\% of appointments were made at this level. There were no BME appointments in our APS 3-5 staff category compared to $10 \%$ of appointments reported last year. 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 | $28 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| APS 3-5 | $0 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| APS 6t | $8 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Director/Professor | $17 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Operational | $3 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Research \& KE | $15 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $41 \%$ |
| Teaching | $5 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Technical | $9 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Total \% | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 7}$ |

The highest percentage of BME applicants were appointed within the Faculty of Engineering and Science(Table 16.1).
Table 16.1: Appointments by ethnicity and Faculty/Professional Services Directorates

|  | BME | Not known | Prefer not to say | White | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eng | $13 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| HaSS | $8 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| PS | $4 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| SBS | $8 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Sci | $13 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Total $\%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 7}$ |

### 11.3 Appointments for staff declaring a disability

Tables 17 and 17.1 provide information on the appointment of staff with declared disabilities.
There were 23 successful applicants with a known disability appointed across all four Faculties and Professional Services. This is an increase from 17 appointed in 2020.

- Overall appointments where staff declared a disability remained static at 3\% of appointees (rounded).
- Appointments where staff have declared a disability has increased by 3\% in Professional Services and Science. There has been a slight decrease of $2 \%$ in HASS and $1 \%$ in SBS. The figures have remained static in Engineering (although figures for declared disabilities are low, impacting upon statistical significance).
- Appointments where staff have declared a disability increased by 4\% for the Academic category and 3\% in the Teaching category but decreased by $3 \%$ for the Teaching staff category, $2 \%$ for the APS 3-5 category and $3 \%$ in the Director/Professor staff category (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 | $1 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| HaSS | $5 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| PS | $6 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| SBS | $3 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Sci | $4 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Total $\%$ | $\mathbf{3 \%}$ | $49 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |


| Total | 23 | 341 | 5 | 328 | 697 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table 17.1: Appointments by disability and job category

|  | Yes | Not known | Prefer not to say | No | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | 7\% | 21\% | 0\% | 72\% | 4\% |
| APS 3-5 | 7\% | 46\% | 0\% | 47\% | 13\% |
| APS 6+ | 3\% | 29\% | 3\% | 66\% | 17\% |
| Director/Professor | 0\% | 50\% | 0\% | 50\% | 2\% |
| Operational | 2\% | 70\% | 0\% | 28\% | 13\% |
| Research \& KE | 2\% | 54\% | 1\% | 43\% | 41\% |
| Teaching | 3\% | 38\% | 0\% | 59\% | 5\% |
| Technical | 6\% | 61\% | 0\% | 33\% | 5\% |
| Total \% | 3\% | 49\% | 1\% | 47\% | 100\% |
| Total | 23 | 341 | 5 | 328 | 697 |

12. Staff Leavers

Table 18 provides information on staff leavers. Between November 2020 and October 2021, 551 staff left the University. $55 \%$ of leavers were male and $45 \%$ female. $12 \%$ were BME staff and $3 \%$ were staff with disabilities

Table 18: Overview of staff leavers by protected characteristics

|  | Leavers |
| :--- | :---: |
| Female | $250(45 \%)$ |
| Male | $301(55 \%)$ |
| Total | $551(100 \%)$ |
|  |  |
| BME | $67(12 \%)$ |
| Disability | $19(3 \%)$ |

The highest numbers of staff leavers were based in the Research/Knowledge Exchange (where most of our fixed term staff are located) and our APS staff categories (Diagram 8).

The highest numbers of female leavers were based in the APS staff categories. The highest numbers of male leavers were within the Director/Professor and Technical staff categories.

## Diagram 8: Leavers by gender and job category



## Alternative diagram

The reasons for staff leaving the University are presented in Diagram 8.1. 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 ill-health retirement.

Diagram 8.1: Leaving reasons by gender


Diagram 9 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. This staff category also includes the highest percentage of BME staff. A total of 316 leavers (57\%) have disclosed their ethnic heritage as white. The proportion of leavers whose ethnic status remains unknown has decreased from $34 \%$ to $30 \%$ since last year.

Diagram 9: Leavers by ethnicity


The reasons for staff leaving, analysed by ethnicity, are presented in Diagram 9.1. The majority of leavers left as a result of their fixed term contract coming to an end or due to resignation.

Diagram 9.1: Leaving reasons by ethnicity


Diagram 10 provides information on staff leavers with disability. The numbers of staff are too small to make any meaningful interpretation.

Diagram 10: Leavers by disability and staff category


The reasons for staff with disabilities leaving the University are presented in Diagram 10.1.

Diagram 10.1: Leaving reasons by disability category


## 13. Staff Development

During the year the University provided 339 centrally facilitated staff development programmes consisting of 853 sessions. Programme numbers have decreased by 70 however attendance increased across programmes by 450 participants compared to last year.

The staff development sessions are provided by different teams ${ }^{2}$.

Table 19 provides an overview of participation rates (will include multiple attendances by some staff members) by protected characteristic. As has been the case in previous years, a higher proportion of female staff (59\%) participated in development programmes compared with male staff ( $41 \%$ ). The corresponding participation rates for female and male staff were the same in 2019. 13\% of participants were BME staff ( $9 \%$ last year) and $4 \%$ were staff with declared disabilities (4\% last year).

Table 19: Participants by equality protected characteristics

|  | Participants \# | Participants \% | University Population \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 8685 | $60 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Male | 5714 | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Total | 14399 | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| BME | 1778 | $13 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Disability | 621 | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

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.

[^3]In terms of gender and age, more men aged 30-39 attended events and female staff participants were most likely to be within the 30-39 or 40-49 age ranges.

Table 20: Participants by age diversity

| Age Group | Female | \% | Male | \% | Total \# | Total \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <20 | 28 | 0\% | 15 | 0\% | 43 | 0\% |
| 20-29 | 705 | 5\% | 539 | 4\% | 1244 | 9\% |
| 30-39 | 2368 | 16\% | 2170 | 15\% | 4538 | 32\% |
| 40-49 | 2966 | 21\% | 1444 | 10\% | 4410 | 31\% |
| 50-59 | 2199 | 15\% | 1181 | 8\% | 3380 | 23\% |
| 60+ | 419 | 3\% | 365 | 3\% | 784 | 5\% |
| Totals | 8685 | 60\% | 5714 | 40\% | 14399 | 100\% |

## 14. Complaints/ Discipline/ Grievances

Table 21 shows the history of staff related complaints, grievances and disciplinary cases (Table 21). which the University has received and addressed (running total is 195 since 2012).

In 2021 there was a slight decrease in the number of formal cases compared to 2020 ( 15 cases compared to 16 cases in 2020). The number of formal cases recorded is low for an organisation of the size of Strathclyde.

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

|  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disciplinary cases | 6 | 5 | $*$ | 6 | $*$ | $*$ | 5 | $*$ | 5 | 0 |
| Female | 8 | 7 | $*$ | 13 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| Male | 14 | 12 | 8 | 19 | 17 | 15 | 14 | 11 | 12 | 6 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Grievance cases

| Female | $*$ | $*$ | 0 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 0 | $*$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 5 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 0 | $*$ |
| Total | 7 | 5 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 0 | $*$ |
| Dignity \& Respect complaints |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 8 | $*$ | 0 | $*$ | $*$ | 0 | $*$ |
| Male | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Total | $*$ | $*$ | 5 | 9 | 5 | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ | 7 |
| Grand Total | 23 | 20 | 16 | 32 | 26 | 21 | 19 | 18 | 16 | 15 |

## 15. Staff information for other 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.

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.

Table 22: Disclosure by staff on their protected characteristics

|  | Not Known | Prefer not to Say | Employees | Response Rate* | Sector |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | 0 | 0 | 4322 | 100\% | 100\% |
| BME | 515 | 93 | 4322 | 88\% | 100\% |
| Disability | 767 | 56 | 4322 | 82\% | 100\% |
| Sexual orientation | 1193 | 312 | 4322 | 72\% | 58.9\% |
| Religion | 1182 | 320 | 4322 | 73\% | 58.9\% |
| Gender reassignment | 1780 | 75 | 4322 | 59\% | 53.8\% |
| Relationship | 811 | 223 | 4322 | 81\% | - |
| Parental | 3037 | 52 | 4322 | 30\% | - |


|  |  |  |  |  | Sector <br> disclosure <br> rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020 | Not Known | Strathclyde <br> Say | Employees |  | Response Rate* <br> comparison |
| Gender | 0 | 0 | 4166 | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| BME | 393 | 86 | 4166 | $91 \%$ | $94.3 \%$ |
| Disability | 637 | 52 | 4166 | $85 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sexual orientation | 1139 | 304 | 4166 | $73 \%$ | $55.6 \%$ |
| Religion | 1127 | 302 | 4166 | $73 \%$ | $58.6 \%$ |
| Gender reassignment | 1505 | 71 | 4166 | $64 \%$ | $50.9 \%$ |
| Marital/ Civil <br> partnership | 720 | 207 | 4166 | $77 \%$ | - |
| Parental | 2730 | 56 | 4166 | $38 \%$ | - |

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

The disclosure rate for applicants is comparative with the previous year (Table 22.1). The disclosure rate for gender has increased to $100 \%$ after a slight drop to $99 \%$ last year.

Table 22.1: Disclosure by applicants on their protected characteristics

|  | Not Known | Prefer not to Say | Applicants | Response Rate* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | 18 | 199 | 12009 | 100\% |
| BME | 100 | 497 | 12009 | 99\% |
| Disability | 0 | 2063 | 12009 | 100\% |

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

Table 22.2: Disclosure by Appointments on their protected characteristics

|  | Not Known | Prefer not to Say |  | Appointments | Response Rate* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | 0 | 0 | 697 | $100 \%$ |  |
| BME | 291 | 14 | 697 | $58 \%$ |  |
| Disability | 341 | 5 | 697 | $51 \%$ |  |

[^4]Staff provided information on religion and belief (Table 23) as follows: $25 \%$ of staff described themselves as Christians (a decrease of $1 \%$ from 2020). 35\% stated 'no religion' (comparable with 2020). $7 \%$ of staff declined to provide the information (the same as reported last year).

Table 23: Strathclyde staff profile by religion or belief

|  | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Any other religion, belief or faith | 36 | $1 \%$ |
| Buddhist | 16 | $0 \%$ |
| Christian | 1077 | $25 \%$ |
| Hindu | 41 | $1 \%$ |
| Humanist | 25 | $1 \%$ |
| Jewish | 6 | $0 \%$ |
| Muslim | 90 | $2 \%$ |
| No religion | 1498 | $35 \%$ |
| Not known | 1182 | $27 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 320 | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ |
| Sikh | $*$ | $*$ |
| Spiritual | 27 | $1 \%$ |
| Totals | 4322 | $100 \%$ |

In terms of disclosure of sexual orientation, $61 \%$ (the same as reported in 2020) of staff indicated that they are heterosexual (Table 24). Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) staff comprise 4\% of all staff (an increase of 1\% since 2020). $7 \%$ of staff preferred not to provide information. The percentage of 'not known' staff has increased slightly by $1 \%$ since 2020 (from 27\% to 28\%).

Table 24: Strathclyde staff profile by sexual orientation

|  | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Bisexual | 59 | $1 \%$ |
| Gay man | 68 | $2 \%$ |
| Gay woman/lesbian | 28 | $1 \%$ |
| Heterosexual | 2632 | $61 \%$ |
| Not known | 1193 | $28 \%$ |
| Other | 30 | $1 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 312 | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{4 3 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

For the eighth 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 $0.2 \%$ trans $^{3}$ staff ( 10 individuals). $1.7 \%$ refused to provide information.

[^5]Table 25: Strathclyde staff profile by gender reassignment

|  | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No | 10 | $0 \%$ |
| Not known | 1780 | $41 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 75 | $2 \%$ |
| Yes | 2457 | $57 \%$ |
| Totals | 4322 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |


| Gender Same as at Birth | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No | 10 | $0 \%$ |
| Not known | 1505 | $36 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 71 | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ |
| Yes | $\mathbf{2 5 8 0}$ | $62 \%$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{4 1 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

$81 \%$ of staff disclosed information on their relationship status (Table 26). The profile indicates that $41 \%$ of staff are married; $22 \%$ are single and $10 \%$ co-habiting. Only a small proportion preferred not to disclose their relationship status (5\%).

Table 26: Strathclyde staff profile by relationship status

|  | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civil Partner | 30 | $1 \%$ |
| Co habiting | 419 | $10 \%$ |
| Divorced | 66 | $2 \%$ |
| Married | 1791 | $41 \%$ |
| Not known | 811 | $19 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 223 | $5 \%$ |
| Separated | 30 | $1 \%$ |
| Single | 937 | $22 \%$ |
| Widowed | 15 | $0 \%$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{4 3 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Table 27 provides a breakdown of information on family leave requirements. 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 and has recently enhanced its parental support provision and developed a toolkit to support those that require parental leave.

Table 27: Strathclyde staff profile by family leave

|  | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Not applicable | 1198 | $28 \%$ |
| Not known | 3037 | $70 \%$ |
| On additional paternity leave | 13 | $0 \%$ |
| On adoption leave | $*$ | $*$ |
| On maternity leave | 17 | $0 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 52 | $1 \%$ |
| Pregnant | $*$ | $*$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{4 3 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

## 16. Staff by nationality

As at the end of October snapshot date, the following 83 nationalities were represented within the University's Employee population (up from 77 nationalities last year). New nationalities represented within our staff population this year include Albania, Bangladesh, Burma (Myanmar), Colombia, Honk Kong and Korea.

[^6]
[^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]:    *The Teaching staff category does not include UG or PG students who may teach on assignments or as part of their

[^3]:    2 Disability Service, Equality and Diversity Office, IT training, Learning Technology Enhancement, Organisational and Staff Development Unit and HR general, Researcher Development programme, Safety Services

[^4]:    * 'Response Rate' includes everyone except 'Not Known'.

[^5]:    ${ }^{3}$ 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'.

[^6]:    Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma (Myanmar), Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus (European Union), Cyprus (Not otherwise specified), Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hong Kong, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Islamic Republic of, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Korea, Republic of, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaya, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestinian, State of, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic (Syria), Taiwan, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, Vietnam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

