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2. Executive Summary

- The University is progressing well against its Equality Objectives and staff and student engagement with equality and diversity has improved over the past year;
- The BME Success Project has demonstrated that focused activity to tackle the BME attainment gap can reduce the differential in student attainment. The gap has been reduced by 5% since the start of the project;
- The age profile of the University shows that there are proportionately more staff aged 46-55 than any other age group, and this is slightly older than the rest of the Higher Education sector in the UK (see Figure 2);
- Academic staff have an older age profile that professional services staff, mainly due in part to the wide variety of roles available to staff aged under 30 (see Figure 3);
- Academic Senior Managers (SM) are aged 56-65 Professional Senior Managers are aged 41-55 (see Figures 4 and 5 respectively);
- Three percent of staff declared a disability, which is slightly lower than the higher education sector (3.8%). A significant proportion of staff (70%) have an ‘unknown’ status (see Figure 6);
- From the overall staff profile, 12% of staff have declared that they are from a Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) background, which is comparable to the UK higher education sector. There is a marginally better representation amongst academic staff (13%) than professional services staff (12%);
- Asian staff make up the majority (41%) of staff that identify as being from a BME background (see Figure 8);
- BME staff are a younger cohort than White staff (see Figure 10), and amongst academic staff there are higher proportions of BME staff up to grade UH8 than White staff. There are higher proportions of White staff in grades UH9-AM (Academic Manager) and there are no BME academic Senior Managers (see Figure 11);
- There is no BME professional staff representation at Senior Manager (SM) level (see Figure 11), nor from staff that declared their ethnic background are there any Black professional staff at AM level;
- In professional services, there are higher proportions of BME staff on fixed term contracts (28%) than White staff (11%) (see Figure 15);
- The overall gender profile shows that 60% of the workforce is female;
- The highest proportion of women in professional services are employed at grades UH4 and UH5 and the highest proportion of men are employed at UH6 (see Figure 17);
- For academic staff, higher proportions of men are positioned at AM (Academic Manager) and SM (Senior Manager) levels than women (see Figure 18);
- From the overall student population, 49% are aged 18-20;
- The best performing age groups to be awarded a ‘good degree’ (2:1 and above) were students aged 25 and over;
- The proportion of students with a declared disability has increased to 6.8%, but is lower than the rate of declaration across the Higher Education sector (9.5%);
• The highest proportion of students with a declared disability identified as having a Specific Learning Disability, e.g. dyslexia than any other type of disability and the proportion of students declaring this type of impairment has increased over three years;
• 47.4% of the total student population declared that they were from a BME background and from our UK-domiciled students 41.6% identified as being from a BME background;
• The attainment gap between White and BME students was 19% compared with 16.8% in the sector in England. Work will be continuing through our BME Success Project and incorporated within the University’s involvement with the pilot of the Race Equality Charter Mark;
• The University’s student gender profile mirrors the rest of the sector, where 56% of students are female;
• Women continue to marginally outperform men in degree attainment with 66% of women gaining a ‘good degree’ as opposed to 61% of men.

Through our work, the University has identified areas related to gender and race equality that require further consideration, and has begun to formulate working groups and action plans to address a number of issues. These include the way we gather and analyse data; understanding the barriers that affect specific groups through qualitative exercises, such as focus groups; and reviewing our policies and practices to reduce any adverse impact to working or learning with us. The University, and its STEMM academic schools will shortly publish its action plans in relation to its Athena SWAN work and a University-wide action plan will be formulated by April 2015 to address its work under the Race Equality Charter Mark.

As a result of undertaking the analysis in this report we have recommended the following actions for this coming year:

Equality Objectives

• The University feels that as progress has been made against our existing objectives and work is sustainable, yet still challenging, that no changes will be made to our these objectives at this time. A full review of our Equality Objectives is scheduled for summer 2015 in preparation of setting new objectives to cover the period 2016-2020. These objectives will be in line with our new strategic plan, which is currently in consultation stage and will be reviewed by the Board of Governors in early 2016.

Succession planning

• The University has an ageing workforce with peaks between the ages of 46-60 across the institution (academic and professional services). It will be necessary to consider how the institution can attract young academics across a range of roles, as well as support all younger staff to develop and prepare them for future senior roles.

Equality monitoring

• Continue to improve the way we collect information from staff and students. We currently gather information from our workforce at the point of recruitment only and provide little explanation about the reasons we collect information related to protected characteristics. Our move to introduce a self-service through our HR system should improve the levels of
declaration, particularly in relation to disability, religion or belief and sexual orientation. The way in which we encourage staff to declare this information will be crucial to raising awareness and improving confidence levels to declare, and reduce the proportion of ‘unknown’ status across a broad range of protected characteristics.
2. Introduction
This report provides an overview of the University’s achievements and progress made since its 2013 report and in respect of the commitments made against our Equality Objectives 2012-2016.

The report will also summarise the University’s staff and student demographics across a range of protected characteristics\(^1\), including age, disability, gender and race and any findings from this analysis will be used to inform the University’s future action plans and objectives.

3. Legislative context
As a public authority, the University of Hertfordshire is subject to the additional duties set out in the Equality Act 2010. The Public Sector Equality Duty\(^2\) sets out a requirement that we must have due regard to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

In practice this means that the University needs to demonstrate how it considers the barriers and disadvantage experienced by different groups of people in relation to employment and service delivery, and how it plans to overcome those barriers or disadvantage.

The Equality Act 2010 explains that having due regard to advancing equality of opportunity will involve the need to:

- Remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- Take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
- Encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

This annual report has been approved by the Chief Executive’s Group and the Board of Governors, and explains how the University is addressing the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty, and where gaps exist, what the University intends to do about them. This annual report must be published by 31\(^{st}\) January 2015 and subsequently at intervals of no more than one year from the date of last publication.

---

\(^1\) A protected characteristic includes age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion, sex and sexual orientation

\(^2\) S.149 Equality Act 2010
4. Progress towards our Equality Objectives

The University set its Equality Objectives in April 2012 in response to the statutory requirement set out in the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) Regulations 2011, stating that a public authority must prepare and publish one or more objectives it thinks it should achieve to do any of the aspects mentioned in the Public Sector Equality Duty. These objectives were reviewed and strengthened in 2013.

Our equality objectives cover a four-year period up to April 2016 and are as follows:

- **Objective 1** - Provide effective equality advice, guidance and support to all staff and students.
- **Objective 2** - Enhance engagement and communication with staff and students on equality matters.
- **Objective 3** - Work towards reducing the differential in degree attainment between White and Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) students by 10 percentage points by 2014/15.
- **Objective 4** - Enhance employment opportunities and identify and address barriers to the recruitment and career progression of staff.
- **Objective 5** - Collect and analyse monitoring information effectively to advance equality of opportunity for diverse groups.

**Progress against our objectives**

To date, the University is meeting the objectives set out above. Some of the outcomes from initiatives have been difficult to monitor or even measure, such as enhancing engagement with equality matters. However staff responses in the Staff Survey 2013 showed that a high proportion of staff (95%) agreed that they were satisfied with their level of awareness of diversity issues and how to react appropriately.

We believe that this has been as a result of increasing the amount of activity across the institution amongst staff and students by raising awareness of equality and diversity related issues and delivering events across the institution with internal and external stakeholders. The University has also become fully immersed with the Athena SWAN awards scheme in the development of its Bronze award submission in November 2014, and is now working towards the Race Equality Charter Mark as part of a national pilot.

Activities have included the following:

- Equality & Diversity Essentials (half-day workshop) delivered monthly as a mandatory requirement for new staff and voluntary for existing staff;
- Wellbeing Wednesdays have included ‘Focus on disability’ run in collaboration with Mind in Herts, Disability Services and Human Resources;
- Unconscious bias training rolled out to staff across the institution at regular intervals since October 2014, and disability awareness has been delivered to the Business School;
Updates to external web pages and StaffNet/StudyNet pages so that staff, students and anyone interested in the University are aware of our initiatives;

Organised events to celebrate LGBT History Month; this year has seen a marked increase in the number of students (most who are not LGBT) who attended this year’s film screenings. This year academic involvement significantly enhanced the University’s offer as participants were able to enjoy a theoretical explanation and analysis of queer cinema and the portrayal of sexuality and gender identity of the film being screened;

We hosted a national conference focusing on ‘Race equality in higher education’ – the event was well attended by people from across the higher education sector and received positive feedback;

We flew the rainbow flag on campus for the second year running (at the start and end of LGBT History Month) following some very positive feedback last year. This was met with equally positive feedback this year;

We supported Herts Pride with a stall at Cassiobury Park, Watford, which drew some positive reactions from local residents that attended the event;

We have worked consistently with the Students’ Union (SU) to increase engagement from students in relation to equality and diversity. We co-arranged and delivered ‘UHOne: One place, multiple identities’ a celebration of the University’s diversity. Events included a deaf awareness and BSL introduction, trans awareness session, film screenings and speakers, and these events were well attended by staff and students;

Stakeholders from across the institution are involved in a working group being led by the Students’ Union to plan for diversity-related events throughout the academic year;

We are continuing our work on the BME Success Project, an initiative to tackle the BME attainment gap, through training and awareness raising sessions across the institution;

We are progressing our work against the Athena SWAN Charter and STEMM schools across the institution are now working towards implementing action plans to support the submission of institutional and departmental Bronze awards made in November 2014;

The Equality Office has had a presence at Freshers’ Fair and the University open days to raise awareness of the University’s commitment to equality and diversity;

We are continuing to monitor and analyse data related to students and the workforce on a regular basis to understand where there might be adverse trends and work with colleagues across the institution to reduce disadvantage;

We continue to provide advice and guidance to staff and students on a range of issues, including bullying and harassment and other equality and diversity related issues.

Objective 3 - Work towards reducing the differential in degree attainment between White and Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) students by 10 percentage points by 2014/15.

Progress against Objective 3 has been steady – the University has moved from a position at the time the objective was set from having a 24% attainment gap, to what is now in 2012/13 a 19% gap (data last available). This is compared to a 16.8% gap in England, (ECU, 2014). The gap has widened slightly from 2011/12, which stood at 17%, which we believe was as a result of changes made across the institution that have since levelled out. We are awaiting data for 2013/14 to provide an update on our progress in this area.
Work will continue to address factors that impact upon student attainment, e.g. marking and assessment, curriculum design and pedagogy, induction and transition into higher education and previous educational experience.

Conversations will continue with academic Strategic Business Units in light of this data and we are collating the entries from reports made at Student Educational Experience Committee (SEEC) and the Student Performance Monitoring Group (SPMG) that are related to the BME Success Project. The work we have undertaken under the BME Success Project will be incorporated within the University's work towards the Race Equality Charter Mark and actions will be identified within the University’s submission in April 2015.

5. Equality monitoring
The University has been gathering and analysing data in relation to age, disability, race and sex for many years, and it is within those boundaries that this report has been compiled. The University has also collected data related to religion or belief and sexual orientation at the point of recruitment, however there is not enough critical mass to provide a worthwhile analysis. The Equality Act 2010 does not oblige the University to collect data across all the protected characteristics, rather as a public body, the institution is required to take a reasonable and proportionate approach with data collection and analysis that will enable it to pay due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty.

For the purpose of this report, data at 31st July 2014 has been used for reporting against staff profiles and data for the 2012/13 academic year has been used for student reporting. Where relevant, comparisons have been made against national sector data, which have been drawn from the HESA and HEIDI databases. Workforce analysis across the protected characteristics covered in this report does not include the staff employed through the University’s subsidiary companies.

6. Staff
The staff data is based upon head count of staff in post at 31st July 2014. At the point the data was analysed, there were 2451 staff, excluding Visiting Lecturers in post made up of 1057 academic contracts; 136 research contracts; and 1258 professional contracts. The University has 19 Strategic Business Units (SBU), of which 10 are academic schools. There is a mixture of all contract types within each academic school SBU and staff numbers have been illustrated according to contract type in each SBU in Table 1, however for the purpose of analysis professional staff contracts will be reported on within the heading of ‘Professional’ staff and the heading of staff employed on an academic or research contract will be reported on within the heading of ‘Academic’ staff when looking more closely at staff profiles by protected characteristics.

---

3 Age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation
4 The Higher Education Database for Institutions
The table below illustrates the number of staff in academic SBUs according to their contract type. For ease of reporting, all staff on professional contracts in professional service SBUs have been included in the heading ‘professional services’.

Table 1: Staff profile according to SBU and contract type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBUs</th>
<th>Academic/Research</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSW</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAM</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic SBU</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>2451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[5\] Non-academic SBUs include Academic Registry; Conference Hertfordshire; Enterprise and Business Development; Estates, Hospitality and Contract Services; Finance; Herts Sports Partnership; Human Resources; Marketing and Communications; Office of the Chief Information Officer; Office of the Dean of Students; Office of the Vice-Chancellor; and University Alliance.
Age

The age profile of staff at the University shows that there are proportionately more staff aged 46-50 and 51-55 than any other age group, and the least proportion of staff aged 66 and over. This is higher than the sector where 13.6% of staff are 46-50 and 12.4% are aged 51-55 years, (ECU, 2014). The rest of the HE sector has slightly higher proportions of staff aged 31-35 (14.1% as opposed to 10% at UH); staff aged 36-40 (12.8% as opposed to 11% at UH); and staff aged 41-45 (13.2% as opposed to 11% at UH), (ECU, 2014).

**Figure 2: Age profile of all staff**

The comparison between the age profiles of academic and professional staff (Figure 3) show that academic staff are an older cohort than their professional services colleagues. This is also conversely mirrored in the proportion of staff aged under 30 years of age. This latter point is not necessarily a negative issue for the University to address, as academic roles are affected by the age of staff at entry level to academia.

There are considerably higher proportions of younger staff in professional services roles, and this will be a reflection of the variety of work across the institution, which is not necessarily dependent on qualification levels, as they are in academic SBUs.
According to age, Figure 4 illustrates clearly how this protected characteristic impacts upon placement on the grading structure, i.e. higher proportions of younger academic staff (aged 30 and under) concentrated across grades UH3-UH5, and conversely staff aged over 51 and over in higher grades UH8 and above. This profile is a reflection of the nature of the roles in academia, where age and experience are linked to the role an academic plays within the institution. The AM grade is perhaps the most diverse, with virtually every age group represented except staff aged 25 and under. Staff on academic contracts at Senior Manager (SM) level are all aged 56 to 65.

Figure 4: Academic staff according to age and grade structure
In contrast, professional staff appear to be much more distributed according to their age profile. There are specific age profiles attributed to more senior grades, such as UH9, where staff are only aged 31 and over; AM (Academic Manager) where the highest proportion of staff is aged 36 and over; and SM (Senior Manager) where the highest proportion of staff is aged 41 and over.

As well as at the lower end of the pay structure, there is a higher proportion of staff aged 25 and under in the ‘Other’ category, which captures staff on contracts that are Adhoc and National Minimum Wage. Conversely, there are higher proportions of staff aged 66 and over; however staff of this age group are isolated to grades UH3-UH6, which is in contrast to academic staff.

Figure 5: Professional staff according to age and grade structure

Disability

Disability status at the University is under-declared by staff. Three percent of all staff declared a disability, which compares slightly less well against the rest of the higher education sector, where 3.8% of staff in the UK have declared a disability, (ECU, 2014). However, this may very well be affected by the high proportion (70%) of staff that have an ‘unknown’ disability status. A very small proportion of staff (3%) have declared a ‘prefer not to say’ status.

There are a number of issues that might affect the disclosure of a disability for individuals at the University, which range from the way we capture information (usually at the point of recruitment); fear of discrimination; and staff not wishing to identify as disabled despite having a disability or impairment.

The high proportion of staff with unknown data on disability status presents the University with a challenge to encourage staff to update their details on the HR system. The University has begun to address disability disclosure in a number of ways, including raising awareness of disability amongst
staff; working with external organisations to deliver events; and changing the staff online portal to facilitate staff declaration. This latter action will be implemented in January 2015 supported by appropriate promotion around disability disclosure and support for staff declaring a disability for the first time. It is hoped that these actions will raise confidence around disability disclosure and ensure that we continue to meet the needs of disabled staff in the workplace.

**Figure 6: Disability profile of all staff**

Of the 3% of staff that declared a disability a slightly higher proportion of women (58%) declared than men (42%). The ethnic profile showed that 85% of staff are of a white ethnic background, and the remaining 15% are of a Black ethnic background. 77% of staff that declared a disability are aged 40 years and under. Due to the low number of staff that declared a disability, it is not possible to offer a meaningful profile of academic/professional staff.

**Ethnicity**

Staff from a White ethnic background make up 78% of staff and 12% are from a Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) background. There is a sizeable proportion of staff that have not declared their ethnic background (7%)\(^6\). This calculation is based on all UK and non-UK staff and is comparable to the sector, which reports a BME representation of 11% across the UK, or more relevantly to the University; 12% in England (ECU, 2014). Internal data did not allow for analysis across UK and non-UK staff at this time.

**Figure 7: Ethnic profile of all staff**

\(^6\) The remaining 2% is made up of staff that have refused to provide their ethnicity information
From the total BME staff population at the University, the largest proportion is from an Asian background (41%), which mirrors the UK higher education sector (41.1% of staff from an Asian background), (ECU, 2014). Staff from a Black background represent 27% of all BME staff, and is higher than the proportion of Black staff in the higher education sector from all BME staff (19.7%) (ECU, 2014).

**Figure 8: Profile of all BME staff**

When comparing the ethnic profile between staff on academic contracts with staff on professional contracts, there is very little difference between them, as Figure 9 demonstrates below. There is marginally better BME representation amongst staff on academic contracts than amongst professional staff 13% compared with 12% respectively. Further work will be undertaken as part of the Race Equality Charter Mark to analyse workforce data in greater detail to identify the proportions of staff that are UK and non-UK nationals.
The age distribution amongst academic staff according to their ethnic background is striking; higher proportions of BME staff at the University are younger (proportions peaking at age 46-50) than their White colleagues, whose proportions peak at 51-55.

The age profile of BME academics appears to correlate with the posts occupied and which lie at the lower ends of the pay and grading structure. Figure 11 illustrates that there are higher proportions of BME academic staff in grades UH3-UH7. Figure 4 illustrated that there were higher proportions of younger staff at these levels of the pay and grading structure. The academic and research pay and grading structure are shown in Table 3 below.
Table 3: Pay and grading structure for academic staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Academic posts</th>
<th>Research posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic manager/Professor</td>
<td>Academic managers inc. Heads of Department/Deans of School</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH9</td>
<td>Principal Lecturer</td>
<td>Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH8</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Senior Research Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH7</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11 below, does illustrate that there are higher proportions of BME academic staff up to grade UH8, where it reaches its peak. After this point the proportion of White academic staff begins to dominate, particularly at grades UH9 and AM (Academic Manager) levels. This analysis has treated BME academic staff as a homogenous group, yet on closer analysis of BME academic staff their profile across the grading structure mirrors the profile illustrated in Figure 11 at varying degrees; with some ethnic groups better represented at AM level than others. There are no BME academic staff at Senior Manager (SM) level. This is illustrated in Figure 12 below.

Figure 11: Academic staff ethnic profile and pay and grading structure
When analysing the contract status of academic staff according to their ethnic background, BME academic staff are only slightly more likely to be on a fixed-term contract, however the difference is small at 5%. Fixed-term contracts tend only to be used in research-funded jobs, so this may indicate where BME staff are employed. The profile of men and women on permanent and fixed-term contracts according to their ethnic breakdown provides no discernible difference; 58% of BME academics on permanent contracts are female as opposed to 55% of White female academics. The same proportion of men and women are on fixed-term contracts regardless of ethnic background (48% female: 52% male).

**Figure 13: Academic staff contract type and ethnic background**

For professional staff, the pattern across the grading structure, ranging from UH1 to Senior Manager (SM) is far more erratic with higher proportions of BME staff in grades UH2, UH4 and UH8. The highest proportion of White professional staff are grouped at UH5.
From the staff that declared their ethnic background, there is no BME representation at Senior Management (SM) level, and upon closer analysis of the ethnic grouping nor are there any Black staff employed at AM level amongst the professional staff cohort. There is a high proportion of BME staff in the ‘Other’ category, which is made up wholly of staff members on National Minimum Wage.

**Figure 14: Professional staff ethnic profile and pay and grading structure**

![Graph showing distribution of ethnic backgrounds among professional staff](image)

The profile of contract status for professional staff is different than that of academic staff, with a higher proportion of BME staff on fixed-term contracts (28%) than their White colleagues (11%). Further detailed analysis will be undertaken as part of the Race Equality Charter Mark to understand where these jobs are situated in the institution. The gender profile of professional staff shows no significant difference; 65% of permanent BME staff (62% of all professional services BME staff) are female as opposed to 68% of permanent White staff (68% of all professional services White staff) that are female. Where there is a difference is the proportion of women who are on fixed-term contracts; women from a White ethnic background account for 64% of all White staff on this contract type as opposed to 56% women from a BME background from the total BME staff on fixed-term contracts.

**Figure 15: Professional staff contract type and ethnic background**
The findings from this analysis, together with the more comprehensive investigation that will be undertaken as part of the Race Equality Charter Mark will result in the University identifying a series of actions that will be implemented over the next three years. The University’s application will be submitted for consideration of the award in April 2015.

**Gender**

The University’s overall staff profile is made up of 60% of women, which is higher than the rest of the higher education sector at 53.9%, (ECU, 2014). This profile is marginally different amongst academic and research staff, where 53% are women and is much higher than the rest of the sector, where 44.5% of academic staff are women, (ECU, 2014). Once again, the female profile of professional staff is considerably different with 66% women, as opposed to 62.6% in the rest of the sector, (ECU, 2014).

**Figure 16: Gender profile all staff**

The analysis according to the positioning of men and women within the pay and grading structure shows that for professional staff there is more of an erratic picture than their colleagues on
academic contracts. This may be due to a lack of career pathways, which are more clearly defined within academic roles.

Figure 17 below shows that the highest proportions of women are employed at grade UH4 and UH5, and the highest proportions of men employed at UH6 and UH8. Although there are higher proportions of men at UH9 than women, the proportion of women at AM level is marginally higher than their male colleagues.

Figure 17: Professional staff gender profile and pay and grading structure

For staff on academic contracts the gender profile across the pay and grading structure illustrates a more consistent pattern, with similar proportions of men and women at grades UH7 and UH9 and shared peaks at UH8. The differences begin to surface at AM level, where there are considerably higher proportions of men than women. Through its work towards the Athena SWAN charter mark, the University has begun to identify where these issues may occur and has set a comprehensive action plan to address the career development of women, especially within the STEMM\textsuperscript{7} subjects in order to address the pipeline issues that affect women reaching senior positions in academia. For more information about the University’s Athena SWAN work.

Figure 18: Academic staff gender profile and pay and grading structure

\textsuperscript{7} Science, Technology, Engineering, Medicine and Mathematics
In relation to contract type, men and women are equally likely to be employed on a permanent contract (87% of all women: 86% of all men) at the University. Of the permanent female staff at the University, 39% work part-time as opposed to 15% of all men on permanent contracts.

Of the total women that are employed on a fixed-term contract, 48% work part-time in comparison to 34% of men on fixed-term contracts.

Women on academic contracts are slightly more likely than their male counterparts to be employed on a permanent contract (87% women: 83% men). Women on academic contracts that are employed on fixed-term contracts are much more likely to work part-time than their male colleagues who are also fixed-term (57% women: 34% men). Their proportions are also slightly higher than part-time women who are employed on permanent contracts (51% of women on permanent contracts are part-time).

In contrast to academic staff, female professional staff are slightly less likely than their male counterparts to be employed on a permanent contract (87% women: 89% men). 44% of permanent professional female staff work part-time as opposed to just 17% of male permanent professional staff. Conversely, fixed-term professional men are twice as likely as their permanent male colleagues to work part-time, with 33% doing so.

**Religion or belief and sexual orientation**

The University has only begun to collect information relating to staff religion or belief and sexual orientation at the point of recruitment, however despite the high numbers in unknown data in this area there are signs that staff are willing to declare these aspects of their identity. The data analysed as part of this report shows that 3% have declared a religion or belief, compared with 18.1% in the higher education sector, (ECU, 2014) and 11% have declared their sexual orientation, compared with 17% in the higher education sector. As mentioned previously in the disability section, the University will be implementing a mechanism on the HR system that will allow staff to update their personal information through self-service. It is hoped that through continuing work in this area and raising understanding of equality monitoring, staff confidence will increase so that declaration rates improve over the coming year.
7. Students

The overall student profile in 2012/13 comprised of 25,130 students.

Table 4: Students by school and level of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Postgraduate (taught)</th>
<th>Postgraduate (research)</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSK</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAM</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>20,010</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,130</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of students (79.6%) were studying for their first degree, where the highest proportion of students (79.1%) are based at the Business School (BUS). At Postgraduate Taught level the highest proportion of students (23.3%) are based within Health and Social Work (HSK), and at Postgraduate Research level, the highest proportion of students (4.8%) are based within Life and Medical Sciences (LMS).

Age

The majority of students at the University are aged 18-20 (48.9%), which is comparable to the higher education sector profile of 53.7% of students aged 21 and under, (ECU, 2014) and is a slight increase in the proportion of students aged 18-20 from 48.7% in 2011/12, (UH, 2014).

Figure 19: Student profile by age 2012/13

Of the students studying at undergraduate level, 61.4% are aged 18-20 years, followed by 19.1% who are aged 21-24. 5.9% of undergraduate students are aged 40 and over. Almost equal
proportions of students aged 21-24 (25.7%); 25-29 (25.6%); and 30-39 (25.4%) make up the bulk of the student body at postgraduate taught level. The age profile changes once again in favour of those aged over 40 (30.8%), and the remaining bulk of the student body are aged 25-29 (25.3%) and 30-39 (25.3%) studying at postgraduate research level.

The majority of students studying full-time at the University are aged 18-20 (60.8%), followed by students aged 21-24 (21.9%). Conversely, the majority of students studying part-time are aged 40 and over (28.8%), followed by students aged 30-39 (25.3%).

Attainment according to age profile

In terms of the proportion of Upper Pass grades in 2012/13, the best performing age groups were 30+ and 25-29 equally, followed by 18-20 and 21-24. A similar order was observed in 2011/12 (30+, followed by 25-29 and 18-20 equally, followed by 21-24) and 2010/11 (30+, followed by 25-29, followed by 18-20 and 21-24 equally).

As in previous years, students in the age range 21-24 were moderately less likely to get a ‘good degree’ with 56% achieving ‘good degrees’ (compared to 66% of students aged 18 -20, 66% of students aged 25-29, 68% of students aged 30-39 and 71% of students aged 40+). This is a national trend and it is also possible that in the age range 21-24 there is proportionately a greater representation of direct entrants and overseas students than in other categories.

For every age group, female students outperformed male students in gaining a ‘good degree’. However, there is considerable variation between the age categories. Female students aged 18-20 and 21-24 marginally outperform male students by 4% and 5%, whereas female students aged 30-39 moderately outperform male students by 8% and in the aged 25-29 category, females outperform male students markedly by 12%.

Disability

This year has seen an increase from 2011/12 (5.8%) to 6.8% in the proportion of students declaring a disability. This is lower than the student disability declaration across the higher education sector of 9.5%, (ECU, 2014).

Figure 20: Student profile by disability 2012/13

The rates of disability disclosure do not vary significantly according to level of study; at undergraduate level 7% of students declared a disability; at postgraduate taught level 6% of
students declared a disability; however most markedly, 8.5% of students declared a disability at postgraduate research level. Roughly the same declaration rates appeared for full and part-time students.

Across virtually all disabilities there has been an increase from 2011/12 except for multiple disabilities. This profile is broadly mirrored in the rest of the higher education sector, (ECU, 2014).

**Figure 21: Profile of students that have declared a disability 2006/7 to 2012-13**

![Bar chart showing disability profile from 2006/7 to 2012-13]

**Attainment according to disability**

The results for students who declared a disability and for students who did not declare a disability are broadly comparable in both 2010/11 and 2012/13 (there were problems with the data for 2011/12). Overall, there was no difference between students who declared a disability and those with no known disability.

**Ethnicity**

The University continues to be fortunate to have an ethnically diverse student population, with 47.4% of students identifying as being from a Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) background. This has decreased slightly from the profile reported in 2011/12 (48.3%), (UH, 2014). This has been as a result of a slight increase in the proportion of White students in 2012/13.

From our UK domiciled students, which made up 81.2% of our total student population, 41.6% identify as coming from a BME background. The BME student profile measures well against the rest of the higher education sector in the UK, which have a UK-domiciled BME profile of 19.6%. The University draws a number of students from London and the surrounding areas, therefore as a comparison 46% of students are from a BME background in London, (ECU, 2014).

**Figure 22: Student population by ethnic background 2012/13**

---

8 Black and minority ethnic includes Black/Black British, Asian/Asian British, Chinese, Mixed heritage and Other ethnic background
Attainment according to ethnicity

With 74% gaining ‘good degrees’, White students continued to perform markedly better than all other ethnic groups (73% in 2011/12). Students whose ethnicity was recorded as Asian/Asian British, Mixed or the Other Ethnic Background category were marginally below the University’s overall ‘good degree’ performance, achieving between 59% and 61%.

Students whose ethnicity was recorded as Black/Black British or Chinese were markedly below the University’s overall ‘good degree’ performance, at 47% and 43% respectively. Whilst Chinese student performance was the same as in 2011/12 (compared to 40% in 2010/11), Black/Black British performance had slipped from 51% in 2011/12. This was still an improvement on the 43% of ‘good degrees’ achieved by Black/Black British students in 2010/11 and it is likely that the increase in ‘good degree’ results for Black students in 2011/12 was in part attributable to the very high percentage of ‘good degrees’ in the Law School in 2011/12.

Gender

Our student gender profile is broadly comparable to that recorded across the higher education sector in the UK where 56.2% are female and 43.8% are male, (ECU, 2014). At undergraduate level, the profile remains fairly similar with a female representation of 55%, and mirrors the sector, (ECU, 2014). The gender profile reported last year has remained virtually static, (UH, 2014).

Figure 23: Student population by gender 2012/13
The gender profile does however shift somewhat at postgraduate taught level, where women account for 61.9% of that student cohort. At postgraduate research level, female representation decreases to 48.8% of this cohort. In relation to mode of study, women make up 65.1% of students that study part-time, which is slightly higher than women studying part-time at all levels across the higher education sector in the UK, (ECU, 2014).

**Attainment according to gender**

In terms of ‘good degrees’, overall, females continued to perform marginally better than males (66% compared to 61% for males) but there was minimal difference in the proportion of first class degrees (22% female, 20% male).

For every ethnic group, female students outperformed male students in terms of the proportion gaining a ‘good degree’ although there was considerable variation between ethnic groups. Mixed ethnicity and Black/Black British female students outperformed male students moderately, by 7% and 8% respectively whilst Other Ethnic background British female students outperformed male students markedly by 13%.

**Religion or belief and sexual orientation**

The University had not at 2012/13 begun to capture data in relation to the religion or belief or sexual orientation of its student population. As data gathering develops and improves, the University will report on these areas as appropriate.
8. Conclusion
In conclusion, our aim is to ensure that anyone that works or learns with the University of Hertfordshire is afforded equal opportunity for success. The University is proud of its diverse community and we wish to ensure that our culture is welcoming and inclusive. We acknowledge that in order to achieve this aim we must continue to review and monitor our workforce and student body, as well as review our policies and practices to reduce any disadvantage.

The University has continued to progress against its Equality Objectives and has taken positive steps through additional initiatives, such as the BME Success Project to tackle the attainment gap between White and BME students; the Athena SWAN charter mark; rolling out Unconscious Bias training to all its staff; and latterly its involvement with the national pilot of the Race Equality Charter Mark.

Over the past 12 months, there has been a considerable improvement in the level of engagement from staff and students in relation to equality and diversity, and this has been reflected in the diverse stakeholders from across the institution who have become actively involved in the initiatives mentioned above. In addition to this, the University has embedded equality and diversity as part of its strategic planning across the institution.

Through our work, the University has identified areas related to gender and race equality that require further consideration, and has begun to formulate working groups and action plans to address a number of issues. These include the way we gather and analyse data; understanding the barriers that affect specific groups through qualitative exercises, such as focus groups; and reviewing our policies and practices to reduce any adverse impact to working or learning with us. The University, and its STEMM academic schools will shortly publish its action plans in relation to its Athena SWAN work and a University-wide action plan will be formulated by April 2015 to address its work under the Race Equality Charter Mark.

9. Recommendations

Equality Objectives

- The University feels that as progress has been made against our objectives and that this work is sustainable, yet still challenging, no changes will be made to our existing objectives at this time. A full review of our Equality Objectives is scheduled for summer 2015 in preparation of setting new objectives to cover the period 2016-2020. These objectives will be in line with our new strategic plan, which is currently in consultation stage and will be reviewed by the Board of Governors in early 2016.

Succession planning

- The University has an ageing workforce with peaks between the ages of 46-60 across the institution (academic and professional services). It will be necessary to consider how the institution can attract young academics across a range of roles, as well as support all younger staff to develop and prepare them for future senior roles.
Equality monitoring

- Continue to improve the way we collect information from staff and students. We currently gather information from our workforce at the point of recruitment only and provide little explanation about the reasons we collect information related to protected characteristics. Our move to introduce a self-service through our HR system should improve the levels of declaration, particularly in relation to disability, religion or belief and sexual orientation. The way in which we encourage staff to declare this information will be crucial to raising awareness and improving confidence levels to declare, and reduce the proportion of ‘unknown’ status across a broad range of protected characteristics.
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