



**City, University of London  
Staff and Student Equality Monitoring Report  
2016-2017**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Equality Act 2010 - Public Sector Equality Duties**

The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) came into force on 5th April 2010. In England the Equality Act 2010 (specific duties and public authorities) Regulations came into force on 31 March 2017 replacing the Equality Act 2010 (specific duties) Regulations 2011.

### **Aims of the General Duty**

In the exercise of their functions public authorities of which City is one, must have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who do and do not share a protected characteristic
- Foster good relations between people who do and do not share a protected characteristic.

### **Management Information Data**

The commentary and data outlined below shows City, University of London's activity and monitoring information.

City is committed to improving and extending the gathering of data across its functions. To enable continued monitoring of the impact of decisions and practices for staff with protected characteristics.

### **Equality Objectives 2017-2019**

As a Higher Education Institution we have specific equality duties, as outlined by The Equality Act (2010). These require public authorities to tackle discrimination, victimisation and harassment, advance equality and foster good relations. It is also our responsibility to publish our equality information on an annual basis to review and publish specific and measurable equality objectives every 4 years.

City has set a number of Equality Objectives:

### **Staff**

#### **Objective 1**

To promote Gender Equality and impact positively on other equality areas, including intersectionality, in order to build and maintain an inclusive environment that supports and values the diversity of students, staff and the wider community.

Arising from the Athena SWAN Bronze Award and Action Plan, there are two Performance Indicators that support this objective:

Performance Indicator 1. Increasing the representation of females in senior roles:

- The proportion (of base population) of Professorial staff will be ~30% female by 2020/21
- The proportion of Grade 9 Professional Services staff will be ~50% female by 2020/21.

Performance Indicator 2. Increasing the representation of females on executive/institutional committees:

- We expect diverse membership on our executive/institutional committees, with a minimum of 30% females and 30% males on each committee.

## **Objective 2**

- To consider and prepare for the Equality Challenge Unit's Race Equality Charter with a view to submitting an application by 2018/19.

## **Students**

The Education & Student Strategy 2016-2021 provides the road map via which City will achieve its Academic Output Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for student progression, experience and employability.

## Part 1: Staff

### The data:

This section presents City's, staff equality data for the academic years 2014/15 to 2016/17. City currently monitors eight protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act 2010. The characteristics covered are Gender/Sex, Maternity, Race, Disability, Sexual Orientation, Religion and Belief, Age and Gender Reassignment. The proportion of staff disclosing as being in a gender identity different to that assigned at birth was insufficient for statistical analysis and is not included in this report.

The data used for this report includes all salaried staff who were employed at City at any point in the referenced academic year e.g. includes those who started or left during the year. Turnover data calculations use average headcount at the institution throughout the year.

In the tables throughout the staff report:


- \*\* indicates where percentages have been calculated horizontally
- ^ indicates where percentages have been calculated vertically
- \* indicates where staff numbers they are less than five

Throughout the report comparisons are made with the most recent Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data from 2015/16.

### **Section 1: Overview**

In 2016/17 City employed 2,270 staff comprising 974 Academic and Research (43%) and 1296 Professional Service Staff (PSS) (57%).


*Figure 1 Staff breakdown by Academic and Professional Service Staff*



## Section 2: Gender

Table 1 - Academic and Professional Service Staff by Role & Gender (2014 - 2017)									
	2014/15			2015/16			2016/17		
	Female	Male	% Female**	Female	Male	% Female**	Female	Male	% Female**
<b>Academic</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>41.5%</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>542</b>	<b>43.1%</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>42.9%</b>
Research	81	100	44.8%	85	102	45.5%	87	111	43.9%
Lecturer	118	100	54.1%	130	99	56.8%	127	103	55.2%
Senior Lecturer	119	123	49.2%	119	125	48.8%	122	135	47.5%
Reader/ Associate Professor	22	36	37.9%	24	37	39.3%	32	33	49.2%
Professor	47	186	20.2%	52	179	22.5%	50	174	22.3%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>737</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>57.7%</b>	<b>707</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>55.9%</b>	<b>728</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>56.2%</b>
Support & Technical	*	30	9.1%	*	43	10.4%	*	40	9.1%
Clerical & Library	406	234	63.4%	384	247	60.9%	385	248	60.8%
Senior Administrative, Senior Library and Computer (SALC) Staff	328	277	54.2%	318	267	54.4%	339	280	54.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,124</b>	<b>1,086</b>	<b>50.9%</b>	<b>1117</b>	<b>1,099</b>	<b>50.4%</b>	<b>1,146</b>	<b>1124</b>	<b>50.5%</b>

Figure 2 – Staff breakdown (2016/17) by role and gender



Overall at City in 2016/17 50% of staff were women. This has remained constant for the last three years. Nationally the proportion of women was 54% (HESA).

In 2016/17 43% of City's academic staff were women, (45% nationally). This has remained stable during the period 2014/15 to 2016/17. The proportion of women academic staff decreases with increasing role seniority, 22% of professorial staff were women in 2016/17.

56% of Professional Service Staff (PSS) staff were women in 2016/17. This has decreased from 58% in 2014/15. The largest proportion of PSS are Clerical & Library staff. 61% of Clerical & Library staff were women in 2016/17.

<b>Table 2 - Academic and Professional Service Staff by Grade &amp; Gender</b>			
	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>% Female**</b>
<b>Academic</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>42.9%</b>
Grade 5B	28	19	59.6%
Grade 6	61	86	41.5%
Grade 7	120	100	54.5%
Grade 8	159	177	47.3%
Professor	50	174	22.3%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>56.1%</b>
Grade 1		11	0.0%
Grade 2	23	18	56.1%
Grade 3	21	42	33.3%
Grade 4	95	62	60.5%
Grade 5	247	148	62.5%
Grade 6	174	115	60.2%
Grade 7	118	101	53.9%
Grade 8	31	43	41.9%
Grade 9	16	28	36.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,143</b>	<b>1,124</b>	<b>50.4%</b>

By grade for Academic staff the largest proportion of women were at Grade 5B, 60% in 2016/17. Grade 5B is exclusively used for Researchers whereas academic grade 6 through to Professor include both academic and research

For PSS staff the largest proportion of women were at Grade 5, 63% in 2016/17. Above Grade 5 the proportion of women continues to decrease to 36% women at Grade 9.

<b>Table 3 - Academic and Professional Service Staff by School &amp; Gender</b>			
	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>% Female**</b>
<b>Academic</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>42.9%</b>
School of Arts and Social Sciences	132	109	54.8%
Cass Business School	51	142	26.4%
School of Health Sciences	153	68	69.2%
School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering	32	179	15.2%
The City Law School	44	50	46.8%
Professional Service	6	8	42.9%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>56.1%</b>
School of Arts and Social Sciences	46	20	69.7%
Cass Business School	114	57	66.7%
School of Health Sciences	62	28	68.9%
School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering	47	27	63.5%
The City Law School	20	12	62.5%
Professional Service	436	424	50.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,143</b>	<b>1,124</b>	<b>50.4%</b>

The School of Health Sciences (SHS) has the largest proportion of women academic staff, 69% in 2016/17. The School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering (SMCSE) has the lowest proportion of academic women, 15% in 2016/17.

Across all five Schools there is a high proportion of women PSS. The School of Arts and Social Sciences (SASS) has the highest proportion of women, 70%.

Contract type

<b>Table 4 - Academic and Professional Service Staff by Contract Type and Gender</b>				
	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>% Female**</b>	<b>% Female^</b>
<b>Academic</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>42.9%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Fixed-term	26	46	36.1%	6.2%
Permanent	392	510	43.5%	93.8%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>56.1%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Fixed-term	73	44	62.4%	10.1%
Permanent	652	524	55.4%	89.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,143</b>	<b>1,124</b>	<b>50.4%</b>	

In 2016/17 of academics on permanent contracts 43% were women, which compares with 44% nationally. For academics on fixed-term contracts 64% were men, which is higher than national figures, 52%.

For PSS of those on fixed-term contracts 62% were women in 2016/17, nationally 65%. For those on permanent contracts 55% were women which is lower than the national data of 63%.

Full-time or Part-time Status work

<b>Table 5 - Academic and Professional Service Staff by Full-time/Part-time status and Gender</b>				
	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>% Female**</b>	<b>% Female^</b>
<b>Academic</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>42.9%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Part-time	137	102	57.3%	32.8%
Full-time	281	454	38.2%	67.2%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>56.1%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Part-time	131	30	81.4%	18.1%
Full-time	594	538	52.5%	81.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,143</b>	<b>1,124</b>	<b>50.4%</b>	

For academic staff that work part-time 57% were women in 2016/17, compared to 55% nationally.

For PSS that work part-time 81% were women in 2016/17, compared to 80% nationally.

## Turnover and Reasons for leaving

Table 6 - Turnover: Academic and Professional Service Staff by Role and Gender - 2016/17									
Headcount 1st August 2016	Total Turnover			Female Turnover			Male Turnover		
	Headcount	Leaver	Turnover %	Female Headcount	Female Leaver	Turnover %	Male Headcount	Male Leaver	Turnover %
<b>Academic</b>									
Research	132	60	45.5%	62	26	41.9%	70	34	48.6%
Lecturer	188	32	17.0%	104	17	16.3%	84	15	17.9%
Senior Lecturer	249	14	5.6%	118	8	6.8%	131	6	4.6%
Reader/ Associate Professor	63	*	3.2%	30	*	3.3%	33	*	3.0%
Professor	223	10	4.5%	50	*	2.0%	173	9	5.2%
<b>Professional</b>									
Support & Technical	37	6	16.2%	*	*	50.0%	33	*	12.1%
Clerical & Library	470	115	24.5%	276	68	24.6%	194	47	24.2%
SALC Staff	539	72	13.4%	286	46	16.1%	253	26	10.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,901</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>930</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>14.6%</b>

The annualised total turnover rate for City was 16.4% during 2016/17. The turnover for Research staff was the largest, 45.5%, as would be expected given the nature of funding for these roles. Reader/Associate Professor had the lowest turnover at 3.2%.

Overall the turnover of women staff is higher than City's turnover rate, 18.2% compared to 16.4%. PSS staff highest turnover is for women in Support & Technical Roles, however the numbers here are small (<5).

Table 7 - Leaving reason: Academic and Professional Service Staff by Gender			
	Female	Male	% Female**
<b>Academic</b>			
End of Contract	13	29	31.0%
Other	6	*	85.7%
Redundancy	*		100.0%
Resignation	28	28	50.0%
Retirement	*	7	36.4%
<b>Professional</b>			
End of Contract	7	10	41.2%
Other	15	10	60.0%
Redundancy	*	*	60.0%
Resignation	86	52	62.3%
Retirement	*	*	62.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>54.3%</b>

The most frequent reason for leaving in 2016/17 was resignation. For academic staff the proportion of women leavers was 45% which is proportionate to their representation at City. For PSS staff 59% of leavers were women, which is also proportionate to their representation at City.



Maternity, paternity, shared parental and adoption leave

<b>Table 8 - Staff Returning from Maternity Leave</b>			
	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>
Staff returning to City after Maternity Leave	93.2%	83.7%	95.8%*

*\*of staff whose maternity has ended*

The number of staff returning after maternity leave has increased to 95.8% in 2016/17 from 93.2% in 2014/15.

<b>Table 9 - Shared Parental Leave &amp; Paternity Leave</b>			
	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>2014/15</b>	*	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
Parental Leave	*		*
Paternity Leave	N/A	15	15
<b>2015/16</b>	*	<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>
Parental Leave		*	*
Paternity Leave		21	21
Shared Parental	*		*
<b>2016/17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>
Parental Leave			
Paternity Leave	N/A	24	24
Shared Parental		*	*
<b>Total</b>	*	<b>66</b>	<b>69</b>

In 2016/17 28 staff took paternity or shared parental leave, this has increased from 16 in 2014/15.

### Section 3: Ethnicity

Throughout this section data is presented by ethnicity, and split by White, BAME and Refused/Not known. BAME includes staff who disclose as Black, Asian, or Minority Ethnic. Calculations includes only those who have disclosed an ethnicity e.g., Refused/Not known are excluded.

Table 10 - Nationality: Academic and Professional Service Staff by Ethnicity				
	BAME	Refused/Not known	White	% BAME**
<b>Academic</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>17.4%</b>
UK	79	9	463	14.3%
Non UK	90	13	320	21.3%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>890</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
UK	337	19	725	31.2%
Non UK	39	8	165	18.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>1673</b>	<b>24.0%</b>

Overall 24% of City staff were BAME in 2016/17, this has increased from 21% in 2014/15. Of UK staff 25% were BAME, this is much higher than the UK national average of 9%. 57% of City's non-UK staff were BAME in 2016/17, which is higher than the UK national average of 28%.

Figure 3 – Academic & Research and Professional Service Staff by ethnicity – 2016/17





Table 11- Academic and Professional Service Staff by Role & Ethnicity (2014 - 2017)												
	2014/15				2015/16				2016/17			
	BAME	Refused/ Not known	White	% BAME**	BAME	Refused/ Not known	White	% BAME**	BAME	Refused/ Not known	White	% BAME**
<b>Academic</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>14.6%</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>778</b>	<b>16.6%</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>17.4%</b>
Research	38	*	141	21.0%	51	*	132	27.3%	57	6	135	28.8%
Lecturer	39	*	178	17.9%	44	*	183	19.2%	46	*	179	20.0%
Senior Lecturer	*	*	52	8.6%	6	*	54	9.8%	7	*	57	10.8%
Reader/Associate Professor	30	*	209	12.3%	34	*	207	13.9%	36	*	217	14.0%
Professor	24	8	200	10.3%	23	6	202	10.0%	23	6	195	10.3%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>919</b>	<b>26.3%</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>894</b>	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>890</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
Support & Technical	117	7	481	19.3%	113	6	466	19.3%	129	7	483	20.8%
Clerical & Library	*	*	28	12.1%	14	*	33	29.2%	16	*	27	36.4%
SALC Staff	215	15	410	33.6%	217	19	395	34.4%	231	19	380	36.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>1699</b>	<b>21.4%</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>1672</b>	<b>22.7%</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>1673</b>	<b>24.0%</b>

Figure 4 – Staff breakdown (2016/17) by ethnicity and role



For academic staff 17% were BAME in 2016/17. This has increased from 15% in 2014/15. By role the proportion of BAME academic staff decreases from 29% of Research Staff to 10% of Professors. This is higher than the national data, where 8% of Professors are BAME.

For PSS 29% were BAME in 2016/17, which has increased from 23% in 2014/15.

<b>Table 12 - Academic and Professional Service Staff by School &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
	<b>BAME</b>	<b>Refused/Not known</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>% BAME**</b>
<b>Academic</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>17.4%</b>
School of Arts and Social Sciences	35	*	201	14.5%
Cass Business School	34	*	154	17.6%
School of Health Sciences	31	*	187	14.0%
School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering	54	7	150	25.6%
The City Law School	15	*	77	16.0%
Professional Service			14	0.0%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>890</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
School of Arts and Social Sciences	13	*	52	19.7%
Cass Business School	42	*	126	24.6%
School of Health Sciences	34	*	55	37.8%
School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering	25		49	33.8%
The City Law School	7		25	21.9%
Professional Service	255	22	583	29.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>1673</b>	<b>24.0%</b>

The School with the highest proportion of BAME staff is SMCSE with 26% BAME academic staff and 34% BAME PSS.

### Contract Type

<b>Table 12 - Academic and Professional Service Staff by Contract type &amp; Ethnicity</b>							
	<b>BAME</b>	<b>Refused/Not known</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>% BAME**</b>	<b>% BAME^</b>	<b>% White**</b>	<b>% White^</b>
<b>Academic</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>80.4%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Fixed-term	13		59	18.1%	7.7%	81.9%	7.5%
Permanent	156	22	724	17.3%	92.3%	80.3%	92.5%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>890</b>	<b>29.1%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>68.8%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Fixed-term	43	*	73	36.8%	11.4%	62.4%	8.2%
Permanent	333	26	817	28.3%	88.6%	69.5%	91.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>1673</b>	<b>24.0%</b>		<b>73.8%</b>	

For academic staff 7.7% of BAME staff were on fixed-term contracts, compared to 7.5% of White staff.

For PSS there was a higher proportion of BAME staff on fixed-term contracts, 11.4%, than White staff 8.2%.

### Part-time work

<b>Table 13 - Academic and Professional Service Staff by Full-time/Part-time &amp; Ethnicity</b>							
	<b>BAME</b>	<b>Refused/Not known</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>% BAME**</b>	<b>% BAME^</b>	<b>% White**</b>	<b>% White^</b>
<b>Academic</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>80.4%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Part-time	34	*	200	14.2%	20.1%	83.7%	25.5%
Full-time	135	17	583	18.4%	79.9%	79.3%	74.5%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>890</b>	<b>29.1%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>68.8%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Part-time	40	*	118	24.8%	10.6%	73.3%	13.3%
Full-time	336	24	772	29.7%	89.4%	68.2%	86.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>1673</b>	<b>24.0%</b>			

For academic BAME staff 20.1% work part-time, compared to 10.6% for PSS BAME staff.

## Turnover and Reasons for leaving

The turnover rate for BAME staff was 21.7% in 2016/17. This is higher than the turnover for White staff, 14.7%.

Table 14 - Turnover: Academic and Professional Service Staff by T&C and Ethnicity - 2016/17												
Headcount 1st August 2016	Total Turnover			BAME Turnover			Refused/Not known Turnover			White Turnover		
	Headcount	Leaver	Turnover % **	BAME Headcount	BAME Leaver	Turnover % **	Refused/Not known Headcount	Refused/Not known Leaver	Turnover % **	White Headcount	White Leaver	Turnover % **
<b>Academic</b>												
Research	132	60	45.5%	37	15	40.5%	*		0.0%	90	45	50.0%
Lecturer	188	32	17.0%	38	11	28.9%	*		0.0%	148	21	14.2%
Senior Lecturer	249	14	5.6%	36	*	8.3%	*		0.0%	210	11	5.2%
Reader/Associate Professor	63	*	3.2%	7		0.0%	*		0.0%	55	*	3.6%
Professor	223	10	4.5%	23	*	4.3%	6		0.0%	194	9	4.6%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>										
Support & Technical	37	6	16.2%	13	*	15.4%				24	*	16.7%
Clerical & Library	470	115	24.5%	165	48	29.1%	15	*	33.3%	290	62	21.4%
SALC Staff	539	72	13.4%	109	13	11.9%	7	*	28.6%	423	57	13.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1901</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>21.7%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>1434</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>14.7%</b>

The turnover rate for BAME staff amongst lecturers is 28.9% for BAME staff, 14.2% for White staff, and 17.0% for lecturers overall at City.

<b>Table 15 - Leaving reason: Academic and Professional Service Staff by Ethnicity</b>				
	<b>BAME</b>	<b>Refused/Not known</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>% BAME**</b>
<b>Academic</b>				
End of Contract	11		31	26.2%
Other	*		*	42.9%
Redundancy			*	0.0%
Resignation	14		42	25.0%
Retirement	*		9	18.2%
<b>Professional</b>				
End of Contract	9	*	7	52.9%
Other	7	*	17	28.0%
Redundancy	*		*	20.0%
Resignation	46	*	87	33.3%
Retirement			8	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>29.9%</b>

For BAME academic staff the largest reason for leaving was “Other”, however numbers are small. Other covers a wide range of reasons for leaving. When looking at the largest numbers of BAME staff leaving, this is either due to resignation or end of contract. For BAME PSS the largest reason for leaving was end of contract, 52.9%.

## Section 4: Disability

	2014/15		2015/16		2016/17	
<b>Academic</b>	<b>932</b>	<b>% of Academic^</b>	<b>952</b>	<b>% of Academic^</b>	<b>974</b>	<b>% of Academic^</b>
Information refused	*	0.5%	8	0.8%	11	1.1%
None	730	78.3%	761	79.9%	796	81.7%
Not known	150	16.1%	137	14.4%	123	12.6%
Disabled	47	5.0%	46	4.8%	44	4.5%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>1278</b>	<b>% of Professional^</b>	<b>1264</b>	<b>% of Professional^</b>	<b>1293</b>	<b>% of Professional^</b>
Information refused	10	0.8%	6	0.5%	8	0.6%
None	1015	79.4%	1030	81.5%	1089	84.2%
Not known	201	15.7%	177	14.0%	136	10.5%
Disabled	52	4.1%	51	4.0%	60	4.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2210</b>	<b>% of all staff^</b>	<b>2216</b>	<b>% of all staff^</b>	<b>2267</b>	<b>% of all staff^</b>
Information refused	15	0.7%	14	0.6%	19	0.8%
None	1745	79.0%	1791	80.8%	1885	83.1%
Not known	351	15.9%	314	14.2%	259	11.4%
Disabled	99	4.5%	97	4.4%	104	4.6%

The proportion of staff disclosing a disability at City has increased from 4.4% in 2015/16 to 4.6% in 2016/17, (National figure 4.6 %). The highest proportion of disabled staff is seen at professorial level, 5.8%.

	Information refused	None	Not known	Disability	% Disabled**
Professor	*	158	48	13	5.8%
Senior Admin		36	7	*	2.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5.2%</b>

### Contract type

	Fixed-term	Permanent	% Fixed Term**	% Fixed Term^
<b>Academic</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>902</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Information refused	*	10	9.1%	1.4%
None	65	731	8.2%	90.3%
Not known	*	119	3.3%	5.6%
Disabled	*	42	4.5%	2.8%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>1176</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	
Information refused	*	6	25.0%	1.7%
None	105	984	9.6%	89.7%
Not known	*	135	0.7%	0.9%
Disabled	9	51	15.0%	7.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>2078</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	

For academic staff 5% of those with a disability are on fixed-term contracts, compared to 5.2% nationally. For PSS 15% were on fixed-term contracts, which is higher than the national data of 5.2%.



Full-time or part-time status

<b>Table 19 - Academic and Professional Service Staff by Full-Time/Part-time status &amp; Disability Disclosure</b>				
	<b>Part-time</b>	<b>Full-time</b>	<b>% Part-Time**</b>	<b>% Part-Time^</b>
<b>Academic</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>24.5%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Information refused	*	8	27.3%	1.3%
None	190	606	23.9%	79.5%
Not known	35	88	28.5%	14.6%
Disabled	11	33	25.0%	4.6%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>1132</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Information refused	*	7	12.5%	0.6%
None	139	950	12.8%	86.3%
Not known	13	123	9.6%	8.1%
Disabled	8	52	13.3%	5.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>17.6%</b>	

At City in 2016/17 18% of staff were part-time. For academic staff that declared a disability 25% were part-time, and PSS 13% were part-time.

4.6% of academics that are part-time have declared as disabled, this compares similarly to the national data of 4.9%.

Similarly, in 2016/17, 5.0% of PSS that are part-time have declared as disabled, compared to 5.5% nationally.

## Section 5: Age

Table 20 - Academic and Professional Service Staff by Age Range (2014 - 2017)						
	2014/15		2015/16		2016/17	
Academic	932	%^	952	%^	974	%^
Under 25		0.0%		0.0%	*	0.5%
25 - 34	179	19.2%	170	17.9%	164	16.8%
35 - 44	264	28.3%	280	29.4%	285	29.3%
45 - 54	252	27.0%	262	27.5%	270	27.7%
55 - 64	176	18.9%	178	18.7%	181	18.6%
65+	61	6.5%	62	6.5%	69	7.1%
Professional	1278	%^	1264	%^	1293	%^
Under 25	64	5.0%	73	5.8%	71	5.5%
25 - 34	480	37.6%	454	35.9%	443	34.3%
35 - 44	388	30.4%	393	31.1%	409	31.6%
45 - 54	221	17.3%	216	17.1%	246	19.0%
55 - 64	109	8.5%	106	8.4%	109	8.4%
65+	16	1.3%	22	1.7%	15	1.2%
Total	2210	%^	2216	%^	2267	%^
Under 25	64	2.9%	73	3.3%	76	3.4%
25 - 34	659	29.8%	624	28.2%	607	26.8%
35 - 44	652	29.5%	673	30.4%	694	30.6%
45 - 54	473	21.4%	478	21.6%	516	22.8%
55 - 64	285	12.9%	284	12.8%	290	12.8%
65+	77	3.5%	84	3.8%	84	3.7%

The largest proportion of City's staff are aged 35-44, comprising 31% of staff.

For academic staff the largest age groups are 35-44 and 45-54 at 29% and 28% respectively. However for PSS 25-34 is the largest age group, 34% in 2016/17.

Figure 5 – Staff breakdown by age, academic and professional service staff




Table 21 - Academic Staff by Age Range & Role								
	Research	% Research <sup>^</sup>	Lecturer	% Lecturer <sup>^</sup>	Senior Lecturer	% Senior Lecturer <sup>^</sup>	Reader / Associate Professor	% Reader / Associate Professor <sup>^</sup>
Under 25	*	2.5%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%
25 - 34	100	50.5%	57	24.8%	*	1.9%	*	3.1%
35 - 44	62	31.3%	89	38.7%	90	35.0%	20	30.8%
45 - 54	20	10.1%	60	26.1%	89	34.6%	25	38.5%
55 - 64	8	4.0%	22	9.6%	63	24.5%	17	26.2%
65+	*	1.5%	*	0.9%	10	3.9%	*	1.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

For academic and research roles, the age group make-up can be linked to an increase in seniority. For example the largest age group for Researchers is 25-34, 51%, compared to Associate Professor/Reader where 3% of staff are aged 25-34. The largest age group with Associate Professor/Reader group is 45-54, 38%.

Table 22 - Professional Service Staff by Age Range & Role						
	Support & Technical	% Support & Technical^	Clerical & Library	& Clerical & Library^	SALC Staff	% SALC Staff^
Under 25	*	2.3%	69	11.0%	*	0.2%
25 - 34	14	31.8%	277	44.0%	152	24.6%
35 - 44	7	15.9%	159	25.2%	243	39.3%
45 - 54	14	31.8%	81	12.9%	151	24.4%
55 - 64	*	11.4%	38	6.0%	66	10.7%
65+	*	6.8%	6	1.0%	6	1.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

For PSS by role, the largest age group for staff in Support & Technical Roles are aged 25-34, 32%. For Clerical & Library staff, 25-34 is also the largest age group, however there is a higher proportion of staff in this age group, 44%. For SALC staff the largest age group is 35-44 with 39% of SALC staff in this age category.

### Contract Status

Table 23 - Academic and Professional Service Staff by Age Range & Contract Type			
	Fixed-term	Permanent	% Fixed**
<b>Academic</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>902</b>	<b>7.4%</b>
Under 25		*	0.0%
25 - 34	21	143	12.8%
35 - 44	18	267	6.3%
45 - 54	13	257	4.8%
55 - 64	8	173	4.4%
65+	12	57	17.4%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>1176</b>	<b>9.0%</b>
Under 25	20	51	28.2%
25 - 34	52	391	11.7%
35 - 44	23	386	5.6%
45 - 54	16	230	6.5%
55 - 64	*	104	4.6%
65+	*	14	6.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>2078</b>	<b>8.3%</b>

For PSS, the under 25 age group has the highest proportion of staff on fixed-term contracts, 28% in 2016/17, compared to 9% of PSS at City. For academics, staff aged 65+ have the largest proportion of staff on fixed-term contracts, 17.4%, compared to 7.4% of academics at City.

Full-time and part-time status

<b>Table 24 - Academic and Professional Service Staff by Age Range &amp; Full-time/Part-time status</b>			
	<b>Part-time</b>	<b>Full-time</b>	<b>% Part-time**</b>
<b>Academic</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>24.5%</b>
Under 25	*	*	40.0%
25 - 34	31	133	18.9%
35 - 44	64	221	22.5%
45 - 54	57	213	21.1%
55 - 64	43	138	23.8%
65+	42	27	60.9%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>1132</b>	<b>12.5%</b>
Under 25	9	62	12.7%
25 - 34	29	414	6.5%
35 - 44	68	341	16.6%
45 - 54	30	216	12.2%
55 - 64	18	91	16.5%
65+	7	8	46.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>17.6%</b>

The highest proportion of staff working part-time is for staff aged 65+, for both academic and PSS, 61% and 47% respectively.

## **Section 6: Religion and Belief and Sexual Orientation**

<b>Table 25 - All Staff by Religious Belief (2014 - 2017)</b>			
	<b>2014/15^</b>	<b>2015/16^</b>	<b>2016/17^</b>
Buddhist	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
Christian	15.5%	17.4%	19.5%
Hindu	2.0%	2.3%	2.6%
Jewish	1.2%	1.2%	1.3%
Muslim	3.3%	3.8%	4.5%
No religion	28.3%	30.5%	32.8%
Other	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%
Sikh	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%
Spiritual	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%
Not known	34.6%	30.4%	25.6%
Prefer not to say	13.3%	12.6%	11.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Staff who state they have no religion are the highest proportion of staff, 32.8% in 2016/17. This has also increased from 28.3% in 2014/15. 19.5% of staff identified themselves as Christian, which has also increased from 15.5% in 2014/15

<b>Table 26 - All Staff by Sexual Orientation (2014 - 2017)</b>			
	<b>2014/15^</b>	<b>2015/16^</b>	<b>2016/17^</b>
Bisexual, gay man, gay woman/lesbian	3.3%	4.2%	4.7%
Heterosexual	60.0%	62.4%	65.8%
Not known	22.8%	19.9%	16.2%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Prefer not to say	13.8%	13.5%	13.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

4.7% of City staff disclosed themselves as either bisexual, gay man or gay woman/lesbian. This is an increase from 3.3% in 2014/15. Whilst the proportion of staff choosing “prefer not to say” has remained at around 13%, the proportion of staff disclosing their sexual orientation as “Not known” has decreased from 22.8% in 2014/15 to 16.2% in 2016/17.

## **Section 7: Members of committees**

<b>Table 27 - Executive Team Membership by Gender (2015 - 2018)</b>			
	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>Start of 2016/17</b>	<b>Start of 2017/18</b>
Total membership	7	7	7
Member - Male	6	5	5
Member - Female	1	2	2
<b>% Female</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	<b>28.6%</b>

<b>Table 28 - Executive Committee Membership by Gender (2015 - 2018)</b>			
<b>ExCo Membership</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>Start of 2016/17</b>	<b>Start of 2017/18</b>
Total membership	18	18	19
Member - Male	15	12	12
Member - Female	3	6	7
<b>% female</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>36.8%</b>


City is committed to increasing the representation of women on senior committees, with a minimum of 30% women by 2021.

Since 2015/16 there has been an increase in the proportion of women on both our Executive Team and Executive Committee. Executive committee gender proportion has increased from 16.7% in 2015/16 to 36.8% in 2017/18 and the Executive Team membership has increased from 14.3% women to 28.6% over the same time period.

## Section 8: Recruitment

Table 29 - Female applicants at each stage of recruitment (%)			
	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
Female job applicants	31.5%	38.6%	41.1%
Female shortlisted	39.2%	52.5%	54.6%
Female appointments	39.6%	49.2%	58.2%

Figure 6 – Recruitment by gender – 2016/17



Overall the percentage of female applicants has seen an increase from 31.5% in 2014/15 to 41.1% in 2016/17. The highest proportion of female applicants is to Clerical/Technical/Support roles.

The proportion of women being shortlisted was 54.6% in 2016/17, which is an increase from 39.2% in 2014/15. The improvement in the proportion of women being shortlisted was reflected in appointments, 58.2% in 2016/17, which is an increase from 39.6% in 2014/15.




**Table 30 - Recruitment: Academic and Professional Service Staff by Gender & Stage (2014 - 2017)**

	2014/15					2015/16					2016/17				
	Female	% from previous Stage	Male	% from previous Stage	Other/ Unknown	Female	% from previous Stage	Male	% from previous Stage	Other / Unknown	Female	% from previous Stage	Male	% from previous Stage	Other / Unknown
<b>Academic</b>															
<b>Research</b>	<b>428</b>		<b>334</b>		<b>639</b>	<b>613</b>		<b>732</b>		<b>333</b>	<b>570</b>		<b>488</b>		<b>350</b>
Applications	381		265		572	533		615		330	474		400		350
Interview	35	9.2%	51	19.2%	51	60	11.3%	92	15.0%	*	78	16.5%	59	14.8%	0
Offer	12	34.3%	18	35.3%	16	20	33.3%	25	27.2%	*	18	23.1%	29	49.2%	0
<b>Academic</b>	<b>378</b>		<b>424</b>		<b>705</b>	<b>747</b>		<b>1220</b>		<b>410</b>	<b>878</b>		<b>1220</b>		<b>427</b>
Applications	340		377		649	687		1142		405	757		1107		426
Interview	27	7.9%	28	7.4%	34	34	4.9%	50	4.4%	*	79	10.4%	85	7.7%	*
Offer	11	40.7%	19	67.9%	22	26	76.5%	28	56.0%	*	42	53.2%	28	32.9%	0
<b>Professor</b>	<b>11</b>		*		<b>21</b>	*		<b>15</b>		<b>17</b>	<b>22</b>		<b>22</b>		<b>17</b>
Applications	11		*		17	*		12		16	18		15		17
Interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	*	0	0.0%	*	16.7%	0	*	16.7%	*	33.3%	0
Offer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	*	*	0.0%	*	50.0%	*	*	33.3%	*	40.0%	0
<b>Professional</b>															
<b>Clerical/ Technical/ Support</b>	<b>4071</b>		<b>2809</b>		<b>5239</b>	<b>4005</b>		<b>3047</b>		<b>2650</b>	<b>4397</b>		<b>2867</b>		<b>2496</b>
Applications	3626		2451		5020	3535		2676		2620	3783		2451		2484
Interview	355	9.8%	294	12.0%	181	391	11.1%	313	11.7%	20	491	13.0%	351	14.3%	6
Offer	90	25.4%	64	21.8%	38	79	20.2%	58	18.5%	10	123	25.1%	65	18.5%	6
<b>SALC</b>	<b>894</b>		<b>783</b>		<b>1202</b>	<b>1074</b>		<b>766</b>		<b>524</b>	<b>1240</b>		<b>1087</b>		<b>537</b>
Applications	738		644		1101	878		631		516	984		864		517
Interview	120	16.3%	113	17.5%	79	165	18.8%	106	16.8%	*	195	19.8%	186	21.5%	11
Offer	36	30.0%	26	23.0%	22	31	18.8%	29	27.4%	*	61	31.3%	37	19.9%	9

The table above shows the breakdown of applications by gender and the % that progress to the next stage.

Table 31 - BAME applicants at each stage of recruitment (%)			
	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
BAME job applicants	33.3%	34.3%	35.9%
BAME shortlisted	37.4%	37.3%	37.8%
BAME appointments	29.8%	24.3%	26.4%

Figure 7 – Recruitment by ethnicity -2016/17



Overall the percentage of BAME applicants has seen an increase from 33.3% in 2014/15 to 35.9% in 2016/17. The highest proportion of BAME applicants was to Clerical/Technical/Support roles.

The proportion of those shortlisted that were BAME was 37.8% in 2016/17, which has remained around this proportion for the last three years. The proportion of appointments that were BAME was 26.4% in 2016/17, which is an increase from 24.3% in 2015/16.

Table 32 - Recruitment: Academic and Professional Service Staff by Ethnicity & Stage (2014 - 2017)															
	2014/15					2015/16					2016/17				
	BAME	% from previous Stage	White	% from previous Stage	Unknown/ Refused	BAME	% from previous Stage	White	% from previous Stage	Unknown/ Refused	BAME	% from previous Stage	White	% from previous Stage	Unknown / Refused
<b>Academic</b>															
<b>Research</b>	<b>460</b>		<b>654</b>		<b>287</b>	<b>563</b>		<b>732</b>		<b>379</b>	<b>493</b>		<b>527</b>		<b>377</b>
Applications	397		538		283	497		614		367	432		414		375
Interviewed	49	12.3%	85	15.8%	*	54	10.9%	90	14.7%	9	49	11.3%	85	20.5%	*
Offered	14	28.6%	31	36.5%	*	12	22.2%	28	31.1%	*	12	24.5%	28	32.9%	*
<b>Academic</b>	<b>362</b>		<b>852</b>		<b>293</b>	<b>665</b>		<b>1263</b>		<b>442</b>	<b>609</b>		<b>1410</b>		<b>491</b>
Applications	327		753		286	639		1154		441	576		1229		485
Interviewed	24	7.3%	61	8.1%	*	19	3.0%	63	5.5%	*	27	4.7%	126	10.3%	*
Offered	11	45.8%	38	62.3%	*	7	36.8%	46	73.0%	0	6	22.2%	55	43.7%	*
<b>Professor</b>	<b>*</b>		<b>23</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>*</b>		<b>11</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>15</b>		<b>17</b>
Applications	*		21		8	*		8		15	10		13		17
Interviewed		0.0%	*	4.8%	*		0.0%	*	25.0%	0		0.0%	*	7.7%	0
Offered		0.0%	*	100.0%	*		0.0%	*	100.0%	0		0.0%	*	0.0%	0
<b>Professional</b>															
<b>Clerical/ Technical / Support</b>	<b>4385</b>		<b>4764</b>		<b>2970</b>	<b>3655</b>		<b>3466</b>		<b>2579</b>	<b>3829</b>		<b>3258</b>		<b>2669</b>
Applications	3959		4198		2940	3299		2979		2553	3364		2717		2635
Interviewed	355	9.0%	455	10.8%	20	311	9.4%	395	13.3%	18	391	11.6%	435	16.0%	22
Offered	71	20.0%	111	24.4%	10	45	14.5%	92	23.3%	8	74	18.9%	106	24.4%	12
<b>SALC</b>	<b>809</b>		<b>1454</b>		<b>616</b>	<b>658</b>		<b>1152</b>		<b>557</b>	<b>989</b>		<b>1292</b>		<b>572</b>
Applications	708		1182		593	573		918		543	866		955		545
Interviewed	85	12.0%	213	18.0%	14	75	13.1%	186	20.3%	10	111	12.8%	261	27.3%	18
Offered	16	18.8%	59	27.7%	9	10	13.3%	48	25.8%	*	12	10.8%	76	29.1%	9

The table above shows the breakdown of applications by gender and the % that progress to the next stage.

Table 33 - Disabled applicants at each stage of recruitment - Applications & Hiring for 2017 - Two Ticks Scheme							
	Applications	% Applications	Interviewed	% Interviewed	Hired	% Hired of applied	% Hired of interviewed
No known disability	10,067	69.1%	1,425	14.2%	399	4.0%	28.0%
Unknown	3,823	26.2%	20	0.5%	11	0.3%	55.0%
Disclosed a disability and applying under GIS Scheme	398	2.7%	90	22.6%	8	2.0%	8.9%
Disclosed a disability and not applying under the GIS Scheme	290	2.0%	64	22.1%	15	5.2%	23.4%
Total	14,578	100.0%	1,599	11.0%	433	3.0%	27.1%

Whilst people who declare as disabled are well represented at interview stage a lower proportion of disabled candidates are hired compared to those with no known disability.

### **Section 9: Promotion and Progression**

Table 34 - Promotion & Progression: Academic and Professional Service Staff (2013 - 2017)				
	Female	Male	% Female**	% Male**
<b>Academic</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>55.6%</b>	<b>44.4%</b>
2013/14	42	32	56.8%	43.2%
2014/15	9	10	47.4%	52.6%
2015/16	26	25	51.0%	49.0%
2016/17	32	20	61.5%	38.5%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>54.0%</b>	<b>46.0%</b>
2013/14	45	40	52.9%	47.1%
2014/15	45	46	49.5%	50.5%
2015/16	28	22	56.0%	44.0%
2016/17	56	40	58.3%	41.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>54.6%</b>	<b>45.4%</b>

NB: Promotion relates circumstances to Academic and Professional Service staff progression from one grade to another (unless it is automatic) and the formal academic promotion process. There is no formal process for promotions for PSS).

For both Academic and PSS staff a higher proportion of women were promoted or progressed in 2016/17, which is a trend that has continued for the last two years.

<b>Table 35 - Promotion &amp; Progression: Academic and Professional Service Staff (2013 - 2017)</b>				
	<b>BAME</b>	<b>Refused/Not known</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>% BAME**</b>
<b>Academic</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>19.4%</b>
2013/14	14		60	18.9%
2014/15	*	*	14	21.1%
2015/16	8		43	15.7%
2016/17	12		40	23.1%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>21.4%</b>
2013/14	15		70	17.6%
2014/15	19	*	69	20.9%
2015/16	6	*	41	12.0%
2016/17	29	*	66	30.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>20.7%</b>

In 2016/17 23% of academics promoted were BAME staff which is higher than City's academic BAME population (17%). However for PSS 21% of staff that progressed were BAME, which was lower than the PSS BAME population in 2016/17, 29%.

<b>Table 36 - Promotion &amp; Progression: Academic and Professional Service Staff (2013 - 2017)</b>					
	<b>Information refused</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>Not known</b>	<b>Disability</b>	<b>% Disabled**</b>
<b>Academic</b>		<b>156</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
2013/14		52	17	*	6.8%
2014/15		17	*		0.0%
2015/16		37	13	*	2.0%
2016/17		50	*		0.0%
<b>Professional</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>5.0%</b>
2013/14		61	19	*	5.9%
2014/15		71	16	*	4.4%
2015/16		44	*	*	6.0%
2016/17	*	89	*	*	4.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>4.2%</b>

For academic staff 3% of those promoted had disclosed as disabled in 2016/17, and 5% PSS.

## **Section 11: Training opportunities**

Training data relates to all salaried staff who attended classroom training in the academic year that was organised by either Organisational Development or the Health & Safety team. Training events generally fit into the category of career progression, equality, health & safety, management & personal development. For example; Successful proposals for EU Funding, Diversity Awareness, Building Disability Confidence, Department Safety Officer training, UKVI compliance and visa checking, coaching sessions and corporate inductions.

<b>Table 37 - Training by Gender: 2014 - 2017</b>						
	<b>Female</b>			<b>Male</b>		
	<b>Headcount</b>	<b>Attended</b>	<b>%**</b>	<b>Headcount</b>	<b>Attended</b>	<b>%**</b>
<b>2014/15</b>	<b>1,124</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>35.0%</b>	<b>1,086</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>29.3%</b>
Academic	387	62	16.0%	545	76	13.9%
Professional	737	331	44.9%	541	242	44.7%
<b>2015/16</b>	<b>1,117</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>46.5%</b>	<b>1,099</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>31.2%</b>
Academic	410	87	21.2%	542	72	13.3%
Professional	707	432	61.1%	557	271	48.7%
<b>2016/17</b>	<b>1,143</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>40.2%</b>	<b>1,124</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>25.2%</b>
Academic	418	85	20.3%	556	74	13.3%
Professional	725	374	51.6%	568	209	36.8%

The proportion of women attending training in 2016/17 was 40.2%, this is an increase from 35% in 2014/15. A higher proportion of women attend training than men, 40.2% of women, compared to 25.2% of men.

<b>Table 38 - Grade 9 Training: 2014 - 2017</b>						
	<b>Female</b>			<b>Male</b>		
	<b>Headcount</b>	<b>Attended</b>	<b>%**</b>	<b>Headcount</b>	<b>Attended</b>	<b>%**</b>
<b>2014/15</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20.3%</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>19.1%</b>
Professor	46	7	15.2%	186	30	16.1%
Senior Admin	23	7	30.4%	34	12	35.3%
<b>2015/16</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>22.5%</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>14.9%</b>
Professor	52	7	13.5%	179	22	12.3%
Senior Admin	19	9	47.4%	29	9	31.0%
<b>2016/17</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>30.3%</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>19.3%</b>
Professor	50	15	30.0%	174	27	15.5%
Senior Admin	16	*	31.3%	28	12	42.9%

Of our professors and senior admin staff groups, women were more likely to attend training than men; 30.3% of women, compared to 19.3% of men in 2016/17.

30.0% of women professors attended training in 2016/17 compared to 15.5% of male professors.

Table 39 - Training by Ethnicity: 2014 - 2017									
	BAME			Refused/Not known			White		
	Headcount	Attended	%	Headcount	Attended	%	Headcount	Attended	%**
<b>2014/15</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>31.8%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28.2%</b>	<b>1699</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>32.4%</b>
Academic	136	16	11.8%	16	*	18.8%	780	119	15.3%
Professional	336	134	39.9%	23	8	34.8%	919	431	46.9%
<b>2015/16</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>42.4%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>38.1%</b>	<b>1672</b>	<b>633</b>	<b>37.9%</b>
Academic	158	27	17.1%	16	*	12.5%	778	130	16.7%
Professional	344	186	54.1%	26	14	53.8%	894	503	56.3%
<b>2016/17</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>36.3%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	<b>1673</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>31.7%</b>
Academic	169	24	14.2%	22	*	18.2%	783	131	16.7%
Professional	376	174	46.3%	27	10	37.0%	890	399	44.8%

In 2016/17, 36.3% of BAME staff attended training which was similar to the proportion of White staff attending training, 31.7%. The proportion of BAME staff attending training increased from 31.8% in 2014/15 to 36.3% in 2016/17.

A higher proportion of BAME PSS attended training, 46.3%, than BAME academic staff, 14.2% in 2016/17.

Table 40 - Training by Age Range: 2014 - 2017						
	Female			Male		
	Headcount	Attended	%**	Headcount	Attended	%**
<b>2014/15</b>	<b>1124</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>35.0%</b>	<b>1086</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>29.3%</b>
Under 25	39	20	51.3%	25	10	40.0%
25 - 34	398	159	39.9%	261	85	32.6%
35 - 44	326	111	34.0%	326	98	30.1%
45 - 54	213	71	33.3%	260	88	33.8%
55 - 64	129	31	24.0%	156	31	19.9%
65+	19	*	5.3%	58	6	10.3%
<b>2015/16</b>	<b>1117</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>46.5%</b>	<b>1099</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>31.2%</b>
Under 25	39	28	71.8%	34	10	29.4%
25 - 34	360	191	53.1%	264	118	44.7%
35 - 44	340	162	47.6%	333	111	33.3%
45 - 54	230	92	40.0%	248	66	26.6%
55 - 64	130	44	33.8%	154	33	21.4%
65+	18	*	11.1%	66	*	7.6%
<b>2016/17</b>	<b>1143</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>40.2%</b>	<b>1124</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>25.2%</b>
Under 25	44	28	63.6%	32	11	34.4%
25 - 34	337	163	48.4%	270	94	34.8%
35 - 44	359	147	40.9%	335	78	23.3%
45 - 54	252	78	31.0%	264	64	24.2%
55 - 64	133	42	31.6%	157	31	19.7%
65+	18	*	5.6%	66	*	7.6%

The number of staff attending training varies by age group. For women, staff aged under 25 had the largest proportion of staff attending training. For men, staff ages under 25 and 25-34 were the largest age groups attending training.

Table 41 - Training by Disability Disclosure: 2014 - 2017												
	Information refused			None			Not Known			Disabled		
	Headcount	Attended	%**	Headcount	Attended	%**	Headcount	Attended	%**	Headcount	Attended	%
<b>2014/15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>26.7%</b>	<b>1,745</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>33.1%</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>33.3%</b>
Academic	*		0.0%	730	111	15.2%	150	16	10.7%	47	11	23.4%
Professional	10	*	40.0%	1,015	467	46.0%	201	80	39.8%	52	22	42.3%
<b>2015/16</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>1,791</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>40.5%</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>32.5%</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>34.0%</b>
Academic	8	*	12.5%	761	139	18.3%	137	11	8.0%	46	8	17.4%
Professional	6	*	16.7%	1,030	586	56.9%	177	91	51.4%	51	25	49.0%
<b>2016/17</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>10.5%</b>	<b>1,885</b>	<b>638</b>	<b>33.8%</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>34.6%</b>
Academic	11		0.0%	796	132	16.6%	123	15	12.2%	44	12	27.3%
Professional	8	*	25.0%	1,089	506	46.5%	136	51	37.5%	60	24	40.0%

In 2016/17 34.6% of staff who disclosed a disability attended training. This proportion has remained similar for the last three years.



## Part 2: Students' Equalities Monitoring Statistics

Details on various protected characteristics can be taken from the annual HESA return, allowing analysis of the student body by School.

\*Denotes number under 10

### 1.0 Overview of Student Body

Table 1 Student Body Overview

	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
<b>Total</b>	<b>19411</b>	<b>14102</b>	<b>18997</b>	<b>13809</b>	<b>18278</b>	<b>13010</b>

The overall student population increased by 2.17% from 2015/16 to 2016/17. This is 1.74% smaller than the percentage increase of 3.93 from 14/15 to 15/16.

Table 2 Student Body Population Headcount vs Full Time Equivalent

Increase 15/16 -16/17		Percentage Change 15/16 – 16/17		Increase 14/15 – 15/16		Percentage Change 14/15 -15/16	
Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
414	293	2.17%	2.12%	719	799	3.93%	6.14%

Table 3 Student Body Mode of Study

Mode	2016/2017		2015/16		2014/15	
	Headcount	%	Headcount	%	Headcount	%
Full-time (including sandwich)	15927	82%	15595	82%	14553	80%
Part-time	3484	18%	3402	18%	3716	20%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>19411</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18997</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18269</b>	<b>100%</b>

Mode	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
Full-time (including sandwich)	13056	93%	12709	93%	11941	92%
Part-time	1046	7%	939	7%	1067	8%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>14102</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13648</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13007</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 4 School populations


School	2016/17 Grand Total	2015/16 Grand Total	2014/15 Grand Total
Cass	5705	5882	5417
Law	2108	2071	1835
LEAD	168	187	160
SASS	3975	3692	3369
SHS	3879	3721	4190
SMCSE	3576	3444	3307
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>19411</b>	<b>18997</b>	<b>18278</b>

**Table 5 Level of Study Breakdown**

School	2016/2017		2015/16		2014/15	
	First degree	Other UG	First Degree	Other UG	First Degree	Other UG
Cass	2234	*	2309	*	2170	*
Law	1049	181	992	194	860	181
LEAD	*	*	*	*	*	*
SASS	2160	12	1882	25	1621	23
SHS	1595	804	1574	847	1635	1299
SMCSE	2036	*	2005	*	1904	*
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>9074</b>	<b>998</b>	<b>8762</b>	<b>1066</b>	<b>8190</b>	<b>1505</b>


School	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	Postgraduate (taught)	Postgraduate (research)	Postgraduate (taught)	Postgraduate (research)	Postgraduate (taught)	Postgraduate (research)
Cass	3405	66	3511	62	3207	40
Law	860	18	872	13	778	16
LEAD	167	*	184	*	157	*
SASS	1609	194	1541	244	1474	251
SHS	1394	86	1245	55	1180	76
SMCSE	1383	156	1269	170	1202	199
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>8818</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>8622</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>7998</b>	<b>585</b>

**Figure 8 Student Population by Level of Study**




First degree students have consistently been the largest cohort of students at City. The chart below highlights that First Degree students account for 47% of City’s student population, with the second largest type of student being Postgraduate Taught.

**Figure 9 Level of Study Breakdown 2016/17**



## 2.0 Gender

Figure 10 Gender Breakdown



Student breakdown by gender highlights that there has been a consistent split of 56% of students identifying as females and 44% identifying as male. Students can also select 'other', however as the table below highlights the percentage of students selecting this option is minimal.

For the 2017/18 academic year students were able to choose from a wider selection of pronouns which may impact on the gender figures in future PSED submissions.

### 2.1 Gender breakdown by School

Table 6 Gender breakdown by School

School	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	Female	% of population	Female	% of population	Female	% of population
Cass	2560	45%	2623	45%	2283	42%
Law	1310	62%	1268	61%	1105	60%
LEAD	96	57%	115	61%	87	54%
SASS	2676	67%	2522	68%	2287	68%
SHS	3285	85%	3197	89%	3538	84%
SMCSE	892	25%	886	26%	853	26%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>10819</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>10611</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>10153</b>	<b>56%</b>

School	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	Male	% of population	Male	% of population	Male	% of population
Cass	3145	55%	3259	55%	3134	58%
Law	797	38%	803	39%	730	40%
LEAD	72	43%	72	28%	73	46%
SASS	1298	33%	1169	32%	1082	32%
SHS	594	15%	524	14%	652	16%
SMCSE	2684	75%	2558	74%	2454	74%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>8590</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>8385</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>8125</b>	<b>44%</b>

School	2016/17	2015/16	2014/15
	Other	Other	Other
Cass	*	*	N/A
Law	*	*	N/A
LEAD	*	*	N/A
SASS	*	*	N/A
SHS	*	*	N/A
SMCSE	*	*	N/A
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Both SMCSE and Cass had populations which were below the institutional gender split with SMCSE's population only featuring 25% females and Cass with 45%. This difference was reflected in SHS 85% female, SASS 67% females and

Law 62% females. The percentage breakdowns recording by all Schools were fairly consistent with the biggest percentage change being in SHS with a drop of 4% in the number of female students between 2015/16 and 16/17.

### 3.0 Ethnicity

**Table 7 Institution Level Ethnicity Breakdown**

Ethnicity	2016/17 Grand Total		2015/16 Grand Total		2014/15 Grand Total	
	Headcount	%	Headcount	%	Headcount	%
Arab	610	3%	547	3%	466	3%
Black	1849	10%	1682	9%	1625	9%
Chinese	1701	9%	1870	10%	1670	9%
Indian subcontinent	5013	26%	5164	27%	5239	29%
Mixed	714	4%	726	4%	658	4%
Not known	1644	8%	845	4%	779	4%
Other	362	2%	306	2%	298	2%
White	7518	39%	7857	41%	7543	41%
<b>Total</b>	<b>19411</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18997</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18278</b>	<b>100%</b>

The largest identified ethnicity at City in 2016/17 was White which accounted for 39% of the student population, a decrease of 2% from 2015/16 and 2014/15. The second largest registered ethnicity in 2016/17 was Indian Subcontinent which accounted for 26% of the population 2016/17, a decrease of 1% from 2015/16 and 3% from 2014/15.

**Table 8 Institution Level Non-UK Domiciled Student Ethnicity Breakdown**

Ethnicity	2016/17 Non-UK domiciled student		2015/16 Non-UK domiciled student		2014/15 Non-UK domiciled student	
	Headcount	%	Headcount	%	Headcount	%
Arab	364	5%	347	5%	298	4%
Black	237	3%	216	3%	220	3%
Chinese	1355	18%	1439	19%	1357	19%
Indian subcontinent	1266	17%	1484	20%	1507	21%
Mixed	177	2%	203	3%	182	3%
Not known	1412	19%	670	9%	624	9%
Other	75	1%	68	1%	89	1%
White	2676	35%	3078	41%	2937	41%
<b>Total</b>	<b>7562</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7505</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7214</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 9 Institution Level UK Domiciled Student Ethnicity Breakdown**

Ethnicity	2016/17 UK domiciled student		2015/16 UK domiciled student		2014/15 UK domiciled student	
	Headcount	%	Headcount	%	Headcount	%
Arab	246	2%	200	2%	168	2%
Black	1612	14%	1466	13%	1405	13%
Chinese	346	3%	431	4%	313	3%
Indian subcontinent	3747	32%	3680	32%	3732	34%
Mixed	537	5%	523	5%	476	4%
Not known	232	2%	175	2%	155	1%
Other	287	2%	238	2%	209	2%
White	4842	41%	4779	42%	4606	42%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11849</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11492</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11064</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 10 Institution Level BAME Headcount Breakdown**

Ethnicity	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	Headcount	%	Headcount	%	Headcount	%
Arab	610	3%	547	3%	466	3%
Black	1849	10%	1682	9%	1625	9%
Chinese	1701	9%	1870	10%	1670	9%
Indian subcontinent	5013	26%	5164	27%	5239	29%
Mixed	714	4%	726	4%	658	4%
Not known	1644	8%	845	4%	779	4%
Other	362	2%	306	2%	298	2%
White	7518	39%	7857	41%	7543	41%
<b>Total</b>	<b>19411</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18997</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18278</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 11 Institution Level BAME FTE Breakdown**

Ethnicity	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
Arab	453	3%	431	3%	350	3%
Black	1242	9%	1105	8%	1017	8%
Chinese	1146	8%	1269	9%	1171	9%
Indian subcontinent	4038	29%	4147	30%	3974	31%
Mixed	528	4%	529	4%	480	4%
Not known	1518	11%	750	5%	690	5%
Other	291	2%	248	2%	231	2%
White	4886	35%	5169	38%	5096	39%
<b>Total</b>	<b>14102</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13648</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13010</b>	<b>100%</b>

3.1 Ethnicity breakdown by School

**Table 12 Ethnicity Breakdown by School**

School	2016/17			2015/16			2014/15		
	Indian Subcontinent	Black	Chinese	Indian Subcontinent	Black	Chinese	Indian Subcontinent	Black	Chinese
<b>Cass</b>	1160	166	1192	1327	148	1297	1317	140	1140
<b>Law</b>	624	174	116	676	172	128	604	160	85
<b>LEAD</b>	19	*	*	23	13	*	11	10	*
<b>SASS</b>	1035	252	145	945	195	164	786	179	176
<b>SHS</b>	941	878	40	958	833	43	1382	821	39
<b>SMCSE</b>	1234	371	200	1235	321	230	1139	315	225
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>5013</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1701</b>	<b>5164</b>	<b>1682</b>	<b>1870</b>	<b>5239</b>	<b>1625</b>	<b>1670</b>

School	2016/17			2015/16			2014/15		
	Mixed	White	Arab	Mixed	White	Arab	Mixed	White	Arab
<b>Cass</b>	153	2096	174	166	2373	150	150	2150	131
<b>Law</b>	77	739	82	84	782	79	81	721	53
<b>LEAD</b>	11	107	*	11	119	*	*	108	*
<b>SASS</b>	203	1785	104	203	1836	94	164	1759	77
<b>SHS</b>	146	1681	52	130	1622	40	141	1694	28
<b>SMCSE</b>	124	1110	197	132	1125	183	114	1111	176
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>714</b>	<b>7518</b>	<b>610</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>7857</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>658</b>	<b>7543</b>	<b>466</b>

School	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	Not known/ refused/ other	Total	Not known/ refused/ other	Total	Not known/ refused/ other	Total
Cass	764	5705	421	5882	389	5417
Law	296	2108	150	2071	131	1835
LEAD	14	168	12	187	17	160
SASS	451	3975	255	3692	228	3369
SHS	141	3879	95	3721	85	4190
SMCSE	340	3576	248	3444	227	3307
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>19411</b>	<b>1151</b>	<b>18997</b>	<b>1077</b>	<b>18278</b>

Table 13 School Ethnicity Percentage Breakdown

School	2016/17			2015/16			2014/15		
	Indian Subcontinent	Black	Chinese	Indian Subcontinent	Black	Chinese	Indian Subcontinent	Black	Chinese
Cass	20%	3%	21%	23%	3%	22%	24%	3%	21%
Law	30%	8%	6%	33%	8%	6%	33%	9%	5%
LEAD	11%	5%	5%	12%	7%	4%	7%	6%	3%
SASS	26%	6%	4%	26%	5%	4%	23%	5%	5%
SHS	24%	23%	1%	26%	22%	1%	33%	20%	1%
SMCSE	35%	10%	6%	36%	9%	7%	34%	10%	7%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>

School	2016/17			2015/16			2014/15		
	Mixed	White	Arab	Mixed	White	Arab	Mixed	White	Arab
Cass	3%	37%	3%	3%	40%	3%	3%	40%	2%
Law	4%	35%	4%	4%	38%	4%	4%	39%	3%
LEAD	7%	64%	1%	6%	64%	1%	5%	68%	1%
SASS	5%	45%	3%	5%	50%	3%	5%	52%	2%
SHS	4%	43%	1%	3%	44%	1%	3%	40%	1%
SMCSE	3%	31%	6%	4%	33%	5%	3%	34%	5%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>3%</b>

School	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	Not known/ refused/ other		Not known/ refused/ other		Not known/ refused/ other	
Cass	13%		7%		7%	
Law	14%		7%		7%	
LEAD	8%		6%		11%	
SASS	11%		7%		7%	
SHS	4%		3%		2%	
SMCSE	10%		6%		7%	
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>10%</b>		<b>6%</b>		<b>6%</b>	

Students who listed their ethnicity as White have consistently been the largest population at City, accounting for 39% of all students in 201/17 down 2% from 41% recorded in both 15/16 and 14/15. Students from the Indian Subcontinent have remained the second largest population. Across the three years of data included here, no ethnicity breakdowns have seen much variation.

Table 14 BAME % by School

School	2016/17 % BME	2015/16 % BME	2014/15 % BME
Cass	50%	52%	53%
Law	51%	55%	54%
LEAD	28%	30%	22%
SASS	44%	43%	41%
SHS	53%	54%	58%
SMCSE	59%	61%	60%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>53%</b>

4.0 Age

Table 15 Student Age Breakdown by School

School	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	Under 18	18-20 years	Under 18	18-20 years	Under 18	18-20 years
Cass	32	1567	36	1632	42	1607
Law	*	748	*	718	7	637
LEAD	*	*	*	*	*	*
SASS	15	1704	13	1478	*	1273
SHS	*	753	*	730	*	736
SMCSE	*	1287	15	1276	17	1210
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>6059</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>5834</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>5463</b>

School	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	21-24 years	25-29 years	21-24 years	25-29 years	21-24 years	25-29 years
Cass	2590	785	2665	806	2293	779
Law	901	283	893	274	759	263
LEAD	15	38	18	44	*	51
SASS	1221	543	1149	551	1051	536
SHS	746	902	727	860	827	1135
SMCSE	1037	510	969	532	929	512
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6510</b>	<b>3061</b>	<b>6421</b>	<b>3067</b>	<b>5867</b>	<b>3276</b>

School	2016/17 30 years and over	2015/16 30 years and over	2014/15 30 years and over
Cass	731	743	696
Law	169	180	169
LEAD	115	125	101
SASS	492	501	500
SHS	1477	1403	1492
SMCSE	734	652	639
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3718</b>	<b>3604</b>	<b>3597</b>

Table 126 Age % Breakdown by School

School	2016/2017		2015/16		2014/15	
	Under 18	18-20 years	Under 18	18-20	Under 18	18-20
Cass	1%	27%	1%	28%	1%	30%
Law	0%	35%	0%	35%	0%	35%
LEAD	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SASS	0%	43%	0%	40%	0%	38%
SHS	0%	19%	0%	20%	0%	18%
SMCSE	0%	36%	0%	37%	1%	37%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>30%</b>

School	2016/2017		2015/16		2014/15	
	21-24 years	25-29 years	21-24	25-29	21-24	25-29
Cass	45%	14%	45%	14%	42%	14%
Law	43%	13%	43%	13%	41%	14%
LEAD	9%	23%	10%	24%	5%	32%
SASS	31%	14%	31%	15%	31%	16%
SHS	19%	23%	20%	23%	20%	27%
SMCSE	29%	14%	28%	15%	28%	15%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>18%</b>

School	2016/2017		2015/16		2014/15	
	30 years and over		30 +		30 +	
Cass	13%		13%		13%	
Law	8%		9%		9%	
LEAD	68%		67%		63%	
SASS	12%		14%		15%	
SHS	38%		38%		36%	
SMCSE	21%		19%		19%	
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>19%</b>		<b>19%</b>		<b>20%</b>	

The largest age group at City is those in the 21 – 24 category. The second largest age group are students aged 18 - 29. The smallest cohort at City by age are students aged 25 – 29.

### 5.0 Disability

Table 17 Disability Percentages

Total	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	Disability identified	No known disability	Disability identified	No known disability	Disability identified	No known disability
	6%	94%	5%	95%	5%	95%

The percentage of students identifying as having a disability increased by 1% in 2016/17. However, it is likely that there are other students with disabilities who have not disclosed them; therefore not registered as disabled on the student record

Table 18 Number of Students by Disability

Disability	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	Headcount	%	Headcount	%	Headcount	%
Disability identified	1165	6%	1023	5%	834	5%
No known disability	18246	94%	17974	95%	17444	95%
<b>Total</b>	<b>19411</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18997</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18278</b>	<b>100%</b>



**Table 19 Number of FTE by Disability**

Disability	2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
<b>Disability identified</b>	862	6%	751	6%	619	5%
<b>No known disability</b>	13239	94%	12897	94%	12391	95%
<b>Total</b>	<b>14102</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13648</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13010.22</b>	<b>100%</b>