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## Our target audience

This document is aimed at:

- Students (present \& future, undergraduate \& postgraduate)
- $\quad$ Staff (present \& future)
- Visitors
- Clients
- Relevant external stakeholders


## Alternative versions and further information

This report is published as a Word document and as a PDF file on the College website at www.rvc.ac.uk.

The standard copy is in minimum 11 point Palatino Linotype font. Large print (18 point), Braille, electronic \& audio recording versions can be provided. We have aimed to make the layout and structure accessible for all but welcome comments if the report does not meet your requirements. We will also explain the content verbally and/or in a simplified version as required.

To request an alternative version, or if you have any other queries about the document format, please contact:

Tan Razaq, Acting Head of HR Operations, Systems and Equality

| Email | trazaq@rvc.ac.uk |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tel | 01707666380 |

Comments on content will be referred on to other staff as necessary.

## Equal Opportunities Monitoring Report - 2014

## Introduction and Background

The Royal Veterinary College (the College) is committed to the promotion of equal opportunity for all staff and students. This commitment is for staff and students to be treated equally regardless of age, disability, ethnic origin, gender, gender reassignment, marriage or civil partnership status, pregnancy or maternity, religion or belief or sexual orientation.

This report provides a summary of the work carried out by the Equality Strategy Group, including the progress that has been made against the actions contained within the College's Single Equality Scheme (SES). The report also provides equality monitoring statistics for current staff and students (as at 1 August 2014) as well as equality monitoring statistics for the recruitment of staff (during the period 1 August 2013 to 31 July 2014) and students (during the period 1 August 2012 to 31 July 2013).

The report will be published on the College internet and intranet.

## Remit of monitoring

The report will provide monitoring information on staff and student matters within the College covering age, disability, ethnicity and gender.

This report will monitor:

- Staff and student applications
- Interview statistics (for staff only)
- Offers and Appointments
- Current staff and student profile

The following report has been produced using data collected and held on College systems. The ethnicity categories currently being used are in line with current best practice. Please note however that minority ethnic data has been presented in terms of white, minority ethnic/other and not known - this is to maintain confidentiality.

## Single Equality Scheme - Update

## Equality Strategy Group

The College's Equality Strategy Group (ESG) has continued to make progress with implementing the Single Equality Scheme, working with colleagues from across the College to ensure equality of opportunity is embedded throughout the organisation.

Following the appointment of Dr Jill Maddison, Director of Continuing Professional Development as the permanent chair of the ESG in 2013, the main area of responsibility for 2014 was to work towards producing a new Single Equality Scheme and Action Plan to take us to 2018. This has involved various group discussions and the release of a College wide survey.

The current Single Equality Scheme and Action Plan (2010-2014) is sub-divided into four main areas: Awareness and Communication, Facilities and Buildings, Staff/Students/Visitors and Miscellaneous. This update will provide a summary of activity against each of these areas.

## Awareness and Communication

A key element of the SES was the need for the ESG to publicize the work the College has undertaken in regards to the equality initiatives and communicate/consult with the various stakeholders to keep people up to date. One particular initiative was to investigate the possibility of using e-technology to achieve this aim. The equality web-pages have been developed and were launched as part of the release of the new RVC website. This ensures the College's equality policies and procedures are contained within a single area, making it easier for staff and students to search for the information they require.

Work had started on creating a specific area on the student portal. This was suggested by a number of respondents to the Single Equality Scheme consultation exercise. However due to other priorities, this was put on hold. Awareness events were held as part of the 'Student Welfare Weeks'. It was envisaged that the format of this week would change, including changing the name to RVC 'Diversity' Week and working in conjunction with other local universities within the Bloomsbury area. This is an area that will need further investigation.

## Facilities and Building

There has been a considerable amount of capital development and refurbishment of existing buildings on both the Hawkshead and Camden campuses. All new buildings are accessible and meet the necessary accessibility standards, with purpose built accessible bedrooms within the student village on the Hawkshead Campus. Part of this development has included an increase in the number of car park spaces specifically for blue badge holders.

The doors to the Camden Campus Lightwell opened on June 2010. The Lightwell is a great social learning space for both staff and students. To ensure the Lightwell is as accessible as possible, the inclusion of a lift which is designed for users with disabilities means the Lightwell can be used by anyone.

The Estates Department confirm that all new buildings meet all necessary accessibility standards and access to existing buildings is being continually improved on an ongoing basis.

A review has been undertaken of quiet/prayer room facilities and an additional room was made available at the Hawkshead Campus. This is a positive development and one which will be welcomed by staff and students.

## Staff, Students and Visitors

It was evident from the consultation exercise as part of the development of the Single Equality Scheme that communication and awareness was a key theme. Students were particularly keen to ensure they were informed of the key equality initiatives within the College and this was reinforced again in a recent student support survey. A revamp of the Registry website with particular emphasis on student support services was introduced. Another key development was the inclusion of a diversity section within course inductions, ensuring students are introduced to the subject as early as possible into the academic year.

The ESG also investigated the possibility of joining the Stonewall Diversity Champions Programme. Although there was much support to sign up to the programme, it was deemed necessary to postpone membership due to financial restraints. At recent ESG meetings, the discussions centred around the need to resurrect this application. The ESG will also be involved in the production of the Colleges Equal Pay Audit, with the final report due to be finalised in summer 2015. This will show what progress the College has made since the last pay audit and it is hoped that no major issues will be identified, as was the case previously.

The uptake of equality training has been extremely successful since the online training tool was launched in 2009/10. It is important, now that the e-training course has embedded itself, that the ESG look into the possibility of providing a refresher course/information for existing staff.

There has been limited progress on assessing the impact of new policies and procedures when they are devised, updated or changed. Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are a key part of developing new policies and procedures and will ensure that when they are written, a review on the possible impact on equality is taken into account before the policy or procedure is finalised.

The College is also keen to ensure staff diversity is reflected at all levels of the organisation as well defining greater clarity in staff promotion processes. Particular initiatives which will help with this are the introduction of a revised Academic Probation and Promotion procedure and achieving the Athena SWAN Charter Bronze Award. The Athena SWAN scheme looks at the career development and promotion prospects of women in higher education. An application will be submitted in the November 2014 round.

The College has also achieved the 'HR Excellence in Research' award, which recognises its achievements in recruiting and developing Research employees. A large element of achieving this award was the College's commitment to applying the principles of equality and diversity to the recruitment, development and promotion of researchers at the College.

As part of the Research Excellence Framework submission, an Equal Opportunities Code of Practice was developed where the College committed to ensuring that the maximum number of employees conducting high quality research could be considered for inclusion in the REF submission through the assessment of personal circumstances. Staff members were encouraged to completed personal circumstance forms using defined criteria which were assessed confidentially by the RVC REF Equality Panel - recommendations made by this panel on the number of papers to be reduced dependant on the circumstance fed into the final RVC submission.

## Miscellaneous

Following a review of how Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) were conducted and how the information was being used at the College, it was envisaged a new system would be deployed in to capture Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) information more efficiently and effectively. This is work in progress.

The College's Senior Management Group confirmed that the ESG would have a dedicated budget. This was a positive and welcome development and will help ensure the group can deliver against the Single Scheme Action Plan and instigate projects to help promote equality of opportunity.

## Future Priorities for the Equality Strategy Group

The main priority for the ESG in 2014 was to work on producing a revised Single Equality Scheme and Action Plan. A key element of this was to ensure staff and students had input into this review a survey was released with 173 respondents. The ESG will review the results which will help towards the creation of the updated Action Plan.

Other key areas will involve working with the Athena SWAN Self-Assessment Team to deliver on the Athena SWAN action plan and ensure gender equality is high on the College's strategic objectives, ensuring the need for the development and succession planning of women at the College is discussed and appropriately addressed.

## Staff Recruitment

The recruitment process (through the online recruitment system) has been monitored from 1 August 2013 to 31 July 2014 for the purposes of this report. In this period 2,170 applications were received with 189 job offers made (an increase of $20.2 \%$ and $21.1 \%$ respectively of total applications and total offers made compared to the 2013 report). The data from pages 8 to 12 gives a breakdown of applications received, shortlisted candidates, and appointed candidates by age, disability, gender and ethnicity as well as the current staff equality profile.

## Staff Recruitment - Overall

## Category

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| Academic | 152 | 70 | 34 |
| Non Academic | 1572 | 461 | 125 |
| Research | 446 | 109 | 30 |
| Total | 2170 | 640 | 189 |

Table 1

## Location

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Applied | Shortlist | Offered |  |
| Hawkshead | 1386 | 404 | 135 |
| Camden | 784 | 236 | 54 |
| Total | 2170 | 640 | 189 |

Table 2

Table 1 shows that Academic applications (which includes Staff Clinician positions) accounted for $7 \%$ of applications (a drop from $11.4 \%$ in 2013). For the second year in a row, proportionally, an applicant was more likely to be shortlisted for an Academic position compared to a Non-Academic position ( $46.0 \%$ compared to $29.3 \%$ - in 2013 it was $41.7 \%$ and $29.8 \%$ respectively). Those who applied for an Academic position were more likely to be offered a position ( $22.3 \%$ compared to $7.9 \%$ - in 2013, this was $14.5 \%$ and $7.2 \%$ respectively). Applications to positions based at the Hawkshead Campus ${ }^{1}$ accounted for $63.8 \%$ of total applications (down from $69 \%$ in 2013). Table 2 shows that an applicant was more likely to be offered a position at the Hawkshead Campus compared to the Camden Campus ( $9.7 \%$ and $6.8 \%$ respectively - the figures are broadly similar to 2013).

## Staff Recruitment by Age

## Academic

| Hawkshead |
| :--- |
|  |
|  |
| Applied | Shortlist | Offered |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{< \mathbf { 1 8 }}$ | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 - 3 0}$ | 19 |
| 9 | 4 |
| $\mathbf{3 1 - 4 0}$ | 60 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 - 5 0}$ | 6 |
| $\mathbf{5 1 - 6 0}$ | 1 |
| $\mathbf{6 1 +}$ | 3 |
| Unknown | 6 |
| Total | 95 |

Table 3

Camden

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Applied | Shortlist | Offered |  |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 - 3 0}$ | 33 | 9 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{3 1 - 4 0}$ | 15 | 5 | 4 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 - 5 0}$ | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{5 1 - 6 0}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{6 1 +}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Unknown | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Total | 57 | 17 | 9 |

Table 4

[^0]The majority of applications received for Academic positions were received from applicants under the age of $40(83 \%$ - an increase of $9 \%$ when compared to 2013), who were more likely to be offered an Academic position than those aged 41 or over ( $88 \%$ compared to $12 \%$ ). When compared to 2013, there was an increase in the applications received for Academic positions from applicants aged 61 or over ( $2.6 \%$ compared to less than $1 \%$ ).

## Non Academic

Hawkshead

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\boldsymbol{<} \mathbf{1 8}$ | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 - 3 0}$ | 456 | 138 | 49 |
| $\mathbf{3 1 - 4 0}$ | 204 | 54 | 16 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 - 5 0}$ | 155 | 46 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{5 1 - 6 0}$ | 92 | 26 | 5 |
| $\mathbf{6 1 +}$ | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 51 | 11 | 3 |
| Total | 964 | 275 | 84 |

Table 5

| Camden |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| <18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18-30 | 297 | 99 | 24 |
| 31-40 | 127 | 29 | 6 |
| 41-50 | 86 | 28 | 6 |
| 51-60 | 53 | 17 | 2 |
| 61+ | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 40 | 13 | 3 |
| Total | 608 | 186 | 41 |

Table 6

The figures above show that $68.9 \%$ of Non-Academic applications received were from applicants aged under 40 , with $8.7 \%$ being offered a position. This compares to $4.3 \%$ of applicants aged 41 or over who were offered a position. The figures also show that applicants for Non-Academic positions were more likely to be offered a position at the Hawkshead Campus compared to the Camden Campus ( $8.7 \%$ at Hawkshead compared to $6.7 \%$ at Camden).

## Research

Hawkshead

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Applied | Shortlist | Offered |  |
| $\mathbf{1 8 - 3 0}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{3 1 - 4 0}$ | 186 | 35 | 12 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 - 5 0}$ | 21 | 8 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{5 1 - 6 0}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{6 1 +}$ | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| Total | 327 | 76 | 26 |

Table 7

Camden

|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18-30 | 63 | 16 | 1 |
| 31-40 | 40 | 13 | 3 |
| 41-50 | 8 | 3 | 0 |
| 51-60 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 61+ | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 119 | 33 | 4 |

Table 8

The figures in tables 7 and 8 show that applicants aged 40 or under were more likely to be offered a position when you combine the data for both campuses - this is a reverse when compared to 2013.

## Staff Recruitment by Disability

## Academic

\section*{Hawkshead <br> |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Applied | Shortlist | Offered |  |
| Disabled | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Not disabled | 88 | 51 | 23 |
| Unknown | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | 95 | 53 | 25 |}

Table 9

## Non Academic

\section*{Hawkshead <br> |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| Disabled | 27 | 13 | 2 |
| Not Disabled | 887 | 251 | 79 |
| Unknown | 50 | 11 | 3 |
| Total | 964 | 275 | 84 |}

Table 11

## Research

| Hawkshead |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| Disabled | 12 | 6 | 2 |
| Not Disabled | 298 | 66 | 22 |
| Unknown | 17 | 4 | 2 |
| Total | 327 | 76 | 26 |

Table 13

| Camden |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| Disabled | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not disabled | 55 | 17 | 9 |
| Unknown | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 57 | 17 | 9 |

Table 10

## Camden

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| Disabled | 27 | 11 | 0 |
| Not disabled | 552 | 166 | 36 |
| Unknown | 29 | 9 | 5 |
| Total | 608 | 186 | 41 |

Table 12

| Camden |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| Disabled | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Not disabled | 112 | 32 | 4 |
| Unknown | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 119 | 33 | 4 |

Table 14

The figures above show that for Academic positions, disabled applicants accounted for just over 1\% of total applications, compared to $4.0 \%$ for Non Academic applications and $2.9 \%$ for Research applications. These figures show a slight increase when compared against the 2013 report for Academic and Non Academic applications, however are a decrease for Research applications. Overall applicants with a disability accounted for $3.1 \%$ of total applications (a decrease of $0.4 \%$ when compared to 2013) - however, it is encouraging to note that the proportion of offers made to disabled applicants increased to $2.1 \%$ from $1.9 \%$.

It is disappointing to see that this is below the proportion of current employees who have identified a disability ( $2.4 \%$ ).

## Staff Recruitment by Ethnicity

## Academic

\section*{Hawkshead <br> |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 183 | 48 | 23 |
| BAME | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| Unknown | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 95 | 53 | 25 |}

Table 15

## Non Academic

| Hawkshead |
| :--- |
|  |
|  |
| Applied | Shortlist |  | Offered |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 726 | 237 |
| BAME | 208 | 30 |
| Unknown | 30 | 8 |
| Total | 964 | 275 |

Table 17

## Research

Hawkshead

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| BAME | 200 | 56 | 20 |
| Unknown | 7 | 19 | 5 |
| Total | 327 | 76 | 1 |

Table 19

| Camden |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| White | 53 | 17 | 9 |
| BAME | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 57 | 17 | 9 |

Table 16

| Camden |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| White | 452 | 142 | 32 |
| BAME | 141 | 39 | 7 |
| Unknown | 15 | 5 | 2 |
| Total | 608 | 186 | 41 |

Table 18

| Camden |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| White | 55 | 16 | 3 |
| BAME | 62 | 16 | 1 |
| Unknown | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 119 | 33 | 4 |

Table 20

Applications from BAME applicants accounted for $25.0 \%$ of the total received (which is an increase by just under $2 \%$ when compared against the 2013 report). Of these, $3.6 \%$ were offered a position compared to $9.9 \%$ of applicants who had classified themselves 'white'. Although, it is encouraging to see that the number of offers made to BAME applicants increased when compared to the 2013 report (by $0.5 \%$ ), the figures reveal proportionally a higher offer rate for 'white' applicants in the Non Academic category. Of the 189 offers made, 'white' applicants accounted for $85.1 \%$ (although this has reduced by almost $2 \%$ when compared against the 2013 report). It is worth noting that $31.7 \%$ of 'white' applicants were shortlisted (a reduction of nearly $5 \%$ when looking at 2013) compared to $19.8 \%$ of 'BAME' applicants (an increase of $0.8 \%$ when looking at 2013).

## Staff Recruitment by Gender

## Academic

Hawkshead

|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 43 | 20 | 9 |
| Female | 50 | 32 | 15 |
| Unknown | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 95 | 53 | 25 |

Table 21

Camden

|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 18 | 3 | 1 |
| Female | 39 | 14 | 8 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 57 | 17 | 9 |

Table 22

Tables 21 and 22 highlight that female applicants were likely to be more successful in being shortlisted and offered an Academic position than their male counterparts ( $51.6 \%$ of female applicants were shortlisted compared to $37.7 \%$ of male applicants and $25.8 \%$ of female applicants were offered a position compared to $16.3 \%$ of male applicants respectively). This continues a recent trend, especially when compared to the 2013 report (it is interesting to note that the proportions of females being shortlisted and appointed has increased when compared to 2013). The figures for Non Academic positions show that $8.4 \%$ of female applicants were offered a position compared to $6.2 \%$ of male applicants (these figures are similar to those presented in the 2013 report).

## Non Academic

\section*{Hawkshead <br> |  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 287 | 60 | 15 |
| Female | 668 | 211 | 67 |
| Unknown | 9 | 4 | 2 |
| Total | 964 | 275 | 84 |}

Table 23

| Camden |
| :--- |
|  |
| Applied | Shortlist |  | Offered |
| :---: | :---: |
| Male | 160 |
| 53 | 13 |
| Female | 445 |
| 132 | 27 |
| Unknown | 3 |
| 1 | 1 |
| Total | 608 |
| 186 | 41 |

Table 24

## Research

Hawkshead

|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 116 | 22 | 8 |
| Female | 207 | 54 | 18 |
| Unknown | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 327 | 76 | 26 |

Table 25

## Camden

|  | Applied | Shortlist | Offered |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 55 | 19 | 1 |
| Female | 62 | 14 | 3 |
| Unknown | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 119 | 33 | 4 |

Table 26

The figures show that overall $73 \%$ of successful applicants were female (an increase from 2013 of $3 \%$ - this highlights a continuing recent trend and is a higher proportion of successful applicants being female than the College staff profile when broken down by gender). Overall, female applications accounted for $67.7 \%$ of applications, the majority of which were in Non Academic positions. The total number of female applications is an increase when compared to the 2013 report, from $61 \%$.

## Staff Profile

The following is based on data known as of 1 August 2014. Where possible, comparisons will be made with the 2013 report. As can be seen in chart 1, headcount has increased by $1.7 \%$ since 1 August 2013 and $9.5 \%$ when compared to 1 August 2011. Staff headcount as at 1 August 2014 was 814.

Headcount by Year


Chart 1

## Staff Profile

| Category |  | Grade |  | Basis |  | Status |  | Location |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | 201 | Grades 1 to 5 | 402 | Full Time | 643 | Permanent | 666 | Hawkshead | 578 |
| Non Academic | 535 | Grades 6 to 9 | 412 | Part Time | 171 | Fixed Term | 148 | Camden | 233 |
| Research | 78 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Other | 3 |

Table 27
Table 27 highlights that $24.6 \%$ of employees at the College are in the Academic category (this includes employees with the job title Staff Clinician). This is an increase of $0.6 \%$ when compared to the 2013 report. A large percentage of employees are full time and permanent $(78.9 \%$ and $81.8 \%$ respectively - these figures are virtually identical when compared against the 2013 report). The majority of employees are based at the Hawkshead campus.

## Staff Profile by Age

Table 28 (overleaf) highlights that a small percentage (1.9\%) of employees categorised as Academic are under the age of 30 compared to $25 \%$ of employees categorised as Non-Academic and $18 \%$ of those categorised as Research. Apart from within the Research category, the figures have increased by $0.4 \%$ and $3 \%$ when compared against the 2013 report.

The figures also show that those aged 41 or over are more likely to be in a permanent position, compared to those aged 30 or under $(89 \%$ and $75 \%$ respectively), highlighting that the College offers more fixed term opportunities to staff in this age demographic - this could mean that the College fails to retain talent particularly as people are increasingly looking for longer term stability - the figures are virtually static when compared to the 2013 report. As would be expected, the figures highlight that a larger percentage of employees aged 51 or over are part time, when compared to those aged under 30 ( $32 \%$ and $10 \%$ respectively).

|  | Academic | Non Academic | Research | Grades 1 to 5 | Grades 6 to 9 | Hawkshead | Camden | Other | Perm | Fixed | Full Time | Part Time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18-30 | 4 | 134 | 14 | 128 | 24 | 104 | 46 | 2 | 117 | 35 | 134 | 18 |
| 31-40 | 82 | 149 | 49 | 113 | 167 | 203 | 77 | - | 209 | 71 | 231 | 49 |
| 41-50 | 63 | 106 | 7 | 62 | 114 | 127 | 49 | - | 161 | 15 | 128 | 48 |
| 51-60 | 41 | 118 | 8 | 81 | 86 | 115 | 51 | 1 | 149 | 18 | 132 | 35 |
| 61+ | 11 | 28 | - | 18 | 21 | 29 | 10 | - | 30 | 9 | 18 | 21 |

Table 28

## Staff Profile by Disability

The figures in table 29 show that proportionally, employees with a disability are typically in lower graded positions at the College - positions in Grades 1 to 5 or in the Non Academic category tend to be more administrative or support roles. The overall employee disclosure rate for disability is $2.4 \%$ (which is down from $2.7 \%$ compared to the previous report). The figures also show that employees with a disability are more likely to be in permanent or full time roles which is encouraging and is in support of the College's commitment under the government led Disability 'Two Ticks' Scheme where employers seek to ensure employees who have, have had or acquire a disability in their employment to remain in employment.

|  | Academic | Non <br> Academic | Research | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grades } \\ & 1 \text { to } 5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Grades <br> 6 to 9 | Hawkshead | Camden | Other | Perm | Fixed Term | Full <br> Time | Part <br> Time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 3 | 13 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 12 | 7 | - | 13 | 6 | 15 | 4 |
| No | 188 | 503 | 75 | 375 | 391 | 542 | 221 | 3 | 627 | 139 | 606 | 160 |
| Unknown | 10 | 19 | - | 14 | 15 | 24 | 5 | - | 26 | 3 | 22 | 7 |

## Staff Profile by Gender

The figures in table 30 show that although more female employees appear in the Grades 6 to 9 category, proportionally a large percentage of female employees are paid salaries within Grades 1 to 5 ( $58 \%$ - this is no change when compared to the 2013 report) whereas male employees are mainly paid salaries within Grades 6 to $9(67 \%$ - this is a decrease of $2 \%$ when compared to the 2013 report). A higher proportion of fixed term employees are female compared to male. A large percentage of employees who are part time are female compared to male ( $87 \%$ compared to $13 \%$ ). The overall female/male split has remained relatively static for four years running (females account for $64 \%$ of current staff).

Of the 104 staff within G6-7 Academic roles, $63 \%$ are female. This compares to only $37 \%$ in G8-9 Academic roles. When looking at Non Academic roles, of the 381 staff within G1-5 roles, nearly $77 \%$ are female - in contrast $56 \%$ of staff within G6-9 roles are female.

|  | Academic | Non <br> Academic | Research | Grades $1 \text { to } 5$ | Grades $6 \text { to } 9$ | Hawkshead | Camden | Other | Perm | Fixed <br> Term | Full Time | Part <br> Time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 99 | 156 | 37 | 96 | 196 | 200 | 92 | - | 231 | 61 | 270 | 22 |
| Female | 102 | 379 | 41 | 306 | 216 | 378 | 141 | 3 | 435 | 87 | 373 | 149 |

## Staff Profile by Ethnicity

Less than $10 \%$ of employees in the Academic or Non Academic categories have identified themselves as from the BAME group, with just under $10 \%$ employees overall at the College who are from the BAME group (this is the same when compared to 2013). Just over $5 \%$ of BAME employees at the College are within Grades 6 to 9 . The figures show that $6.2 \%$ of employees based at Hawkshead are from the BAME group compared to $19.3 \%$ of employees based in Camden (this broadly reflects the make-up of the local populations - the Camden figure has increased by $1.3 \%$ ). A larger percentage of employees who classified themselves as 'BAME' are in fixed term positions ( $24.6 \%$ ) compared to employees who have classified themselves as 'white' ( $17.2 \%$ - both figures have increased slightly when compared to 2013).

|  | Academic | Non <br> Academic | Research | Grades 1 to 5 | Grades 6 to 9 | Hawkshead | Camden | Other | Perm | Fixed Term | Full Time | Part Time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BAME | 18 | 50 | 13 | 39 | 42 | 36 | 45 | - | 61 | 20 | 70 | 11 |
| White | 177 | 472 | 64 | 356 | 357 | 527 | 183 | 3 | 590 | 123 | 558 | 155 |
| Unknown | 6 | 13 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 15 | 5 | - | 15 | 5 | 15 | 5 |

Table 31

## Research Excellence Framework 2014

The tables below show that 113 out of 136 eligible members of staff were returned in the RVC REF2014 submission - this equates to a return rate of $83 \%$.

## Number of Staff Eligible and Returned by Age

|  | Eligible | Returned |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 1 - 4 0}$ | 42 | 35 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 - 5 0}$ | 51 | 41 |
| $\mathbf{5 1 - 6 0}$ | 34 | 28 |
| $\mathbf{6 1 +}$ | 9 | 9 |

Table 32
Table 32 shows that apart from staff aged 61 or over, the return rate of eligible staff was at least $80 \%$ across all remaining age groups.

## Number of Staff Eligible and Returned by Disability Status

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eligible | Returned |
| Yes | 2 | 2 |
| No | 129 | 106 |
| Unknown | 5 | 5 |

Table 33

Table 33 shows $100 \%$ of eligible staff who had identified they had a disability or where the information was unknown were returned compared to $82 \%$ of staff who did not have a disability.

## Number of Staff Eligible and Returned by Gender



Table 34
Table 34 highlights that $85 \%$ of eligible female staff were returned compared to $81 \%$ of eligible male staff. Table 35 highlights similar figures ( $85 \%$ of eligible staff returned who had identified as 'BAME', compared to $82 \%$ of eligible staff returned who had identified as 'white').

Number of Staff Eligible and Returned by Ethnicity

|  | Eligible | Returned |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| BAME | 28 | 24 |
| White | 106 | 87 |
| Unknown | 2 | 2 |

Table 35

## Student Recruitment

Student recruitment data has been monitored for the period August 2012 to July 2013, for entry in September 2013. The number of undergraduate applications when compared to 2012 increased by $9 \%$.

## Undergraduate Student Recruitment by Age

The table below shows $33.6 \%$ of applicants were offered a place on an undergraduate course at the College, of which $94.2 \%$ were aged under 24 (this was the same as in the previous report). A large proportion of applicants applied for the BVetMed course ( $52.9 \%$ ), with $39.9 \%$ of offers being made (an increase from $27 \%$ in 2012). For the third year in a row, this course also had the highest number of applicants over the age of 30 , accounting for over $57 \%$ of those in this group who applied for any course. The overall success rate for applicants aged 30 or over was $20.6 \%$, which was lower than the success rate of 17 to 20 year old applicants ( $36.8 \%$ ) - these figures are relatively static to 2012.

|  | $\mathbf{1 7}$ to $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ to $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ to 29 | $\mathbf{3 0 +}$ | Not <br> Known | Grand Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BioVet Science | 280 | 16 | 7 | 5 | - | 308 |
| Conditional Offer | 205 | 6 | 4 | 1 | - | 216 |
| Unconditional Offer | 42 | 2 | - | 1 | - | 45 |
| Rejected | 33 | 8 | 3 | 3 | - | 47 |
| BVetMed | 985 | 198 | 91 | 36 | 1 | 1311 |
| Conditional Offer | 219 | 22 | 11 | 6 | - | 259 |
| Unconditional Offer | 33 | 27 | 10 | 3 | - | 73 |
| Rejected | 733 | 149 | 70 | 27 | - | 979 |
| Gateway | 153 | 16 | 3 | 6 | - | 178 |
| Conditional Offer | 53 | 1 | - | - | - | 54 |
| Unconditional Offer | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Rejected | 99 | 15 | 3 | 6 | - | 123 |
| Grad Accelerated Vet Med | 4 | 166 | 28 | 12 | - | 210 |
| Conditional Offer | - | 29 | 3 | 1 | - | 33 |
| Unconditional Offer | - | 13 | 3 | 2 | - | 18 |
| Rejected | 4 | 124 | 22 | 9 | - | 159 |
| Vet Nursing | 369 | 52 | 12 | 4 | - | 437 |
| Conditional Offer | 78 | 3 | 1 | - | - | 82 |
| Unconditional Offer | 16 | 5 | - | - | - | 21 |
| Rejected | 275 | 44 | 11 | 4 | - | 334 |
| Intercalated | 20 | 10 | - | - | - | 30 |
| Conditional Offer | 12 | 5 | - | - | - | 17 |
| Unconditional Offer | 8 | 5 | - | - | - | 13 |
| Rejected | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Grand Total | 1811 | 458 | 141 | 63 | 1 | 2474 |
| Conditional Offer | 567 | 65 | 19 | 7 | - | 661 |
| Unconditional Offer | 100 | 52 | 13 | 6 | - | 171 |
| Rejected | 1144 | 340 | 109 | 43 | - | 1642 |

Table 36

## Postgraduate Student Recruitment by Age

Tables 37 and 37a highlights that nearly $75 \%$ of applicants to a postgraduate course were over the age of 25 - this was an increase by $3 \%$ compared to 2012. More applications received for a PhD place than any other postgraduate course at the College.

|  | 20 to 24 | 25 to 29 | 30+ | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ILHP | 5 | - | 12 | 17 |
| Conditional Offer | - | - | 2 | 2 |
| Unconditional Offer | 3 | - | 9 | 12 |
| Rejected | - | - | - | - |
| Unknown | 2 | - | 1 | 3 |
| MSc | 47 | 52 | 31 | 130 |
| Conditional Offer | 15 | 20 | 16 | 51 |
| Unconditional Offer | 7 | 4 | 5 | 16 |
| Rejected | 20 | 9 | 3 | 32 |
| Unknown | 5 | 19 | 7 | 31 |
| MSc/PG Cert Vet Educ. | - | 2 | 53 | 55 |
| Conditional Offer | - | 1 | 14 | 15 |
| Unconditional Offer | - | - | 38 | 38 |
| Rejected | - | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Unknown | - | - | - | - |
| PG Risk Analysis | 1 | 5 | 10 | 16 |
| Conditional Offer | 1 | 3 | 6 | 10 |
| Unconditional Offer | - | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Rejected | - | - | - | - |
| Unknown | - | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Vet. Epid. | 11 | 20 | 25 | 56 |
| Conditional Offer | 6 | 11 | 12 | 29 |
| Unconditional Offer | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| Rejected | 1 | 1 | 6 | 8 |
| Unknown | 1 | 6 | 5 | 12 |
| Grand Total | 64 | 79 | 131 | 274 |
| Conditional Offer | 22 | 35 | 50 | 107 |
| Unconditional Offer | 13 | 7 | 56 | 76 |
| Rejected | 21 | 11 | 10 | 42 |
| Unknown | 8 | 26 | 15 | 49 |

Table 37

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | to 24 | 25 to 29 | $30+$ | Grand |
| Total |  |  |  |  |$|$| Mres | - | 2 | 4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PhD | 66 | 102 | 66 |
| Post Doc | - | - | 4 |
| Grand Total | 66 | 104 | 74 |

Table 37 (a)

## Undergraduate Student Recruitment by Disability

Table 38 shows that disabled applicants accounted for $6.9 \%$ of total undergraduate applications, with offers made to $46.8 \%$ of these applicants (both of these were a slight decrease when compared to the previous report) - this compares to $32.6 \%$ of applicants who applied without declaring a disability who were subsequently offered a place. For the third consecutive report, disabled applicants were more likely to be offered a place across all of the undergraduate courses apart from the Grad Accelerated Vet Med, for example, for the applications for the BVetMed course, $40.3 \%$ of disabled applicants were offered a place, compared to $24.5 \%$ of non-disabled applicants.

|  | No Known Disability | Disabled | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BioVet Science | 286 | 22 | 308 |
| Conditional Offer | 200 | 16 | 216 |
| Unconditional Offer | 41 | 4 | 45 |
| Rejected | 45 | 2 | 47 |
| BVetMed | 1249 | 62 | 1311 |
| Conditional Offer | 239 | 20 | 259 |
| Unconditional Offer | 68 | 5 | 73 |
| Rejected | 942 | 37 | 979 |
| Gateway | 160 | 18 | 178 |
| Conditional Offer | 44 | 10 | 54 |
| Unconditional Offer | 1 |  | 1 |
| Rejected | 115 | 8 | 123 |
| Grad Accelerated Vet Med | 192 | 18 | 210 |
| Conditional Offer | 29 | 4 | 33 |
| Unconditional Offer | 18 | - | 18 |
| Rejected | 145 | 14 | 159 |
| Vet Nursing | 393 | 44 | 437 |
| Conditional Offer | 70 | 12 | 82 |
| Unconditional Offer | 20 | 1 | 21 |
| Rejected | 303 | 31 | 334 |
| Intercalated BSc | 21 | 9 | 30 |
| Conditional Offer | 13 | 4 | 17 |
| Unconditional Offer | 8 | 5 | 13 |
| Grand Total | 2301 | 173 | 2474 |
| Conditional Offer | 595 | 66 | 661 |
| Unconditional Offer | 156 | 15 | 171 |
| Rejected | 1550 | 92 | 1642 |

Table 38

## Postgraduate Student Recruitment by Disability

Tables 39 and 39a highlight disabled applicants accounted for $3.8 \%$ of all postgraduate applications (a decrease of $1.8 \%$ when compared to the previous report). The figures also highlight that $50 \%$ of disabled applicants to postgraduate courses applied for a place on a PhD course.

|  | No Known <br> Disability | Disabled | Grand Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ILHP | 17 | - | 17 |
| Conditional Offer | 2 | - | 2 |
| Unconditional Offer | 12 | - | 12 |
| Rejected | - | - | - |
| Unknown | 3 | - | 3 |
| MSc | 126 | 4 | 130 |
| Conditional Offer | 50 | 1 | 51 |
| Unconditional Offer | 16 | - | 16 |
| Rejected | 30 | 2 | 32 |
| Unknown | 30 | 1 | 31 |
| MSc/PG Cert Vet Educ. | 53 | 2 | 55 |
| Conditional Offer | 14 | 1 | 15 |
| Unconditional Offer | 37 | 1 | 38 |
| Rejected | 2 | - | 2 |
| Unknown | - | - | - |
| PG Risk Analysis | 16 | - | 16 |
| Conditional Offer | 10 | - | 10 |
| Unconditional Offer | 3 | - | 3 |
| Rejected | - | - | - |
| Unknown | 3 | - | 3 |
| Vet. Epid. | 53 | 3 | 56 |
| Conditional Offer | 29 | - | 29 |
| Unconditional Offer | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Rejected | 8 | - | 8 |
| Unknown | 11 | 1 | 12 |
| Grand Total | 265 | 9 | 274 |
| Conditional Offer | 105 | 2 | 107 |
| Unconditional Offer | 73 | 3 | 76 |
| Rejected | 40 | 2 | 42 |
| Unknown | 47 | 2 | 49 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 39

|  | No Known <br> Disability | Disabled | Grand <br> Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mres | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| PhD | 224 | 10 | 234 |
| Post Doc | 4 | - | 4 |
| Grand Total | 233 | 11 | 244 |

Table 39 (a)

## Undergraduate Student Recruitment by Ethnicity

Table 40 shows that $35 \%$ of undergraduate applications received from BAME applicants were successful (an increase of $5 \%$ when compared to the previous report). The figures highlight, unlike the previous report, there was an equal chance for offer made to those who had classified themselves as 'white or BAME - this is even though when looking at course by course, applicants who classified themselves as white had proportionally more offers made to them (apart from the Grad Accelerated Vet Med course).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BioVet Science | 213 | 44 | Refused/Unknown | Grand Total |
| Conditional Offer | 152 | 32 | 31 | 308 |
| Unconditional Offer | 37 | 6 | 216 |  |
| Rejected | 24 | 6 | 2 | 45 |
| BVetMed | 857 | 75 | 379 | 47 |
| Conditional Offer | 184 | 10 | 65 | 1311 |
| Unconditional Offer | 44 | 4 | 259 |  |
| Rejected | 629 | 61 | 289 | 73 |
| Gateway | 141 | 23 | 14 | 979 |
| Conditional Offer | 49 | 5 | - | 178 |
| Unconditional Offer | 1 | - | - | 54 |
| Rejected | 91 | 18 | 14 | 123 |
| Grad Accelerated Vet Med | 143 | 11 | 56 | 210 |
| Conditional Offer | 21 | 1 | 11 | 33 |
| Unconditional Offer | 6 | 3 | 9 | 18 |
| Rejected | 116 | 7 | 36 | 159 |
| Vet Nursing | 353 | 41 | 43 | 437 |
| Conditional Offer | 74 | 4 | 4 | 82 |
| Unconditional Offer | 15 | 4 | 21 |  |
| Rejected | 264 | 33 | 37 | 334 |
| Intercalated BSc | 23 | - | 7 | 30 |
| Conditional Offer | 13 | - | 4 | 17 |
| Unconditional Offer | 10 | - | 3 | 13 |
| Rejected | - | - | - | - |
| Grand Total | 1730 | 194 | 550 | 2474 |
| Conditional Offer | 493 | 52 | 116 | 171 |
| Unconditional Offer | 113 | 17 | 39 | 1642 |
| Rejected | 1124 | 125 | 393 |  |
| Taber |  |  |  | 23 |

Table 40

## Postgraduate Student Recruitment by Ethnicity

The tables below highlight that nearly $2.7 \%$ of postgraduate applicants had classified themselves as BAME, compared to $25.4 \%$ of applicants who had classified themselves as white. For the second year running, a large percentage of applicants had not returned their ethnicity ( $71.8 \%$ ) - this could be partly due to the College using the national UKPASS system where there is no requirement to complete equal opportunity data.

|  | White | BAME | Refused/Unknown | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ILHP | 11 | - | 6 | 17 |
| Conditional Offer | 1 | - | 1 | 2 |
| Unconditional Offer | 10 | - | 2 | 12 |
| Rejected | - | - | - | - |
| Unknown | - | - | 2 | 3 |
| MSc | 32 | 3 | 95 | 130 |
| Conditional Offer | 19 | 2 | 30 | 51 |
| Unconditional Offer | 11 | 1 | 4 | 16 |
| Rejected | 2 | - | 30 | 32 |
| Unknown | - | - | 31 | 31 |
| MSc/PG Cert Vet. Educ. | 39 | 6 | 10 | 55 |
| Conditional Offer | 11 | - | 4 | 15 |
| Unconditional Offer | 28 | 6 | 4 | 38 |
| Rejected | - | - | 2 | 2 |
| Unknown | - | - | - | - |
| PG Risk Analysis | 3 | - | 13 | 16 |
| Conditional Offer | - | - | 10 | 10 |
| Unconditional Offer | 3 | - | - | 3 |
| Rejected | - | - | - | - |
| Unknown | - | - | 3 | 3 |
| Vet. Epid. | 9 | 2 | 45 | 56 |
| Conditional Offer | 3 | 2 | 24 | 29 |
| Unconditional Offer | 5 | - | 2 | 7 |
| Rejected | 1 | - | 7 | 8 |
| Unknown | - | - | 12 | 12 |
| Grand Total | 94 | 11 | 169 | 274 |
| Conditional Offer | 34 | 4 | 69 | 107 |
| Unconditional Offer | 57 | 7 | 12 | 76 |
| Rejected | 3 | - | 39 | 42 |
| Unknown | - | - | 48 | 49 |

Table 41

|  |  |  |  | Grand |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | White | BAME | Refused/Unknown | Total |
| Mres | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| PhD | 32 | - | 202 | 234 |
| Post Doc | 4 | - | - | 4 |
| Grand Total | 38 | 3 | 203 | 244 |

Table 41 (a)
Overall, although, the figures for undergraduate courses reveal proportionally more offers were made to those who had classified themselves as 'white' for all undergraduate courses offered at the College, there is minimal statistical differences in the offer rates between 'white' and 'BME' applicants.

## Undergraduate Student Recruitment by Gender

The table below shows that $81.6 \%$ of applications received for a place on an undergraduate course were from female applicants (a slight decrease of $0.6 \%$ when compared to the previous report) - of these $32.9 \%$ were successful in receiving an offer (a increase of over $2 \%$ ). This compares to $36.6 \%$ of male applicants who received an offer (this was a decrease of nearly $4 \%$ when compared to the previous report). The female/male split for the BVetMed course was nearly $80 / 20$ respectively (with only slightly more male applicants being offered a place compared to female applicants - $25.8 \%$ compared to $25.1 \%$ - this is the same as the previous report however the gap was smaller in this period). Male applicants were also more likely, proportionately, to be offered a place on all other undergraduate courses when each course was compared individually apart from the Grad Accelerated Vet Med and the Vet Nursing courses (this is similar when compared to the previous report).

|  | Female | Male | Grand Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BioVet Science | 233 | 75 | 308 |
| Conditional Offer | 160 | 56 | 216 |
| Unconditional Offer | 34 | 11 | 45 |
| Rejected | 39 | 8 | 47 |
| BVetMed | 1044 | 267 | 1311 |
| Conditional Offer | 205 | 54 | 259 |
| Unconditional Offer | 58 | 15 | 73 |
| Rejected | 781 | 198 | 979 |
| Gateway | 148 | 30 | 178 |
| Conditional Offer | 45 | 9 | 54 |
| Unconditional Offer | - | 1 | 1 |
| Rejected | 103 | 20 | 123 |
| Grad Accelerated Vet Med | 162 | 48 | 210 |
| Conditional Offer | 28 | 5 | 33 |
| Unconditional Offer | 15 | 3 | 18 |
| Rejected | 119 | 40 | 159 |
| Vet Nursing | 413 | 24 | 437 |
| Conditional Offer | 81 | 1 | 82 |
| Unconditional Offer | 19 | 2 | 21 |
| Rejected | 313 | 21 | 334 |
| Intercalated BSc | 21 | 9 | 30 |
| Conditional Offer | 12 | 5 | 17 |
| Unconditional Offer | 9 | 4 | 13 |
| Rejected | - | - | - |
| Grand Total | 2021 | 453 | 2474 |
| Conditional Offer | 531 | 130 | 661 |
| Unconditional Offer | 135 | 36 | 171 |
| Rejected | 1355 | 287 | 1642 |

Table 42

## Postgraduate Student Recruitment by Gender

The table below highlights that nearly $59 \%$ of applications were received from females (this is almost identical to the previous report).

|  | Female | Male | Grand Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ILHP | 8 | 9 | 17 |
| Conditional Offer | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Unconditional Offer | 5 | 7 | 12 |
| Rejected | - | - | - |
| Unknown | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| MSc | 79 | 51 | 130 |
| Conditional Offer | 34 | 17 | 51 |
| Unconditional Offer | 14 | 2 | 16 |
| Rejected | 19 | 13 | 32 |
| Unknown | 12 | 19 | 31 |
| MSc/PG Cert Vet. Educ. | 32 | 23 | 55 |
| Conditional Offer | 9 | 6 | 15 |
| Unconditional Offer | 22 | 16 | 38 |
| Rejected | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Unknown | - | - | - |
| PG Risk Analysis | 6 | 10 | 16 |
| Conditional Offer | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| Unconditional Offer | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Rejected | - | - | - |
| Unknown | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Vet. Epid. | 21 | 35 | 56 |
| Conditional Offer | 14 | 15 | 29 |
| Unconditional Offer | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Rejected | 1 | 7 | 8 |
| Unknown | 1 | 11 | 12 |
| Grand Total | 146 | 128 | 274 |
| Conditional Offer | 61 | 46 | 107 |
| Unconditional Offer | 47 | 29 | 76 |
| Rejected | 21 | 21 | 42 |
| Unknown | 32 | 49 |  |
| Uar |  |  |  |

Table 43

|  |  |  | Grand <br>  <br>  <br> Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mres | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| PhD | 150 | 84 | 234 |
| Post Doc | - | 4 | 4 |
| Grand Total | 153 | 191 |  |

Table 43 (a)

## Student Profile

The following figures are based on data relating to students enrolled on an undergraduate or postgraduate taught/research course at the College at the end of the 2013/14 academic year ( 1 August 2013 to 31 July 2014). A total of 1,873 students were registered on a course* at the College in the period above (an increase by $1.6 \%$ when compared to the previous report). *Note, data was unavailable for PG Research courses at the time of writing this report.

## Student Profile by Age

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| UG Students | PG Students (Taught) |  |
| Under 20 | 469 | - |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ to $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 813 | 26 |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ to $\mathbf{2 9}$ | 261 | 61 |
| 30+ | 107 | 134 |
| Unknown | - | 2 |

Table 44
Table 44 details that $77.6 \%$ of undergraduate students were under the age of 25 compared to almost $11.6 \%$ of postgraduate taught students. In contrast, $6.4 \%$ of undergraduate students were over the age of 30 compared to $60 \%$ of postgraduate taught students.

## Student Profile by Disability



Table 45
The number of students with a disability accounted for $19.7 \%$ of current students (a slight decrease of $0.3 \%$ ), with $95 \%$ of these students on an undergraduate course. In 2013, students who had declared a disability accounted for nearly $20 \%$ of total students.

## Student Profile by Ethnicity



Table 46
Table 46 details that nearly $10.6 \%$ of students had classified their ethnicity as BAME - this is $2.6 \%$ higher than the number in 2013 ( $8 \%$ ). The majority of BAME students are on an undergraduate course.

## Student Profile by Gender



Table 47
Female students accounted for $76.3 \%$ of total students, a slight decrease when compared to 2013 (the female/male split across undergraduate students and postgraduate students was relatively even ( $78 \%$ females on undergraduate courses and $62 \%$ females on postgraduate courses). These figures are broadly similar when compared against the 2013 report.

The following tables relate to the number of undergraduate and postgraduate (taught) students who were awarded a degree in 2013/2014.

## Student Degree Awards by Age

|  |  |  |  | $30+$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 20 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Awards | 21 to 24 | 25 to 29 | 99 | 2 |

Table 48 (plus 2 unknown)
Table 48 details that of the 472 students who were awarded a degree, nearly $51.6 \%$ were aged 21 to 24 and $20.9 \%$ aged 30 or over.

## Student Degree Awards by Disability



Table 49
The data above highlights that nearly $20 \%$ of students (this is the same as 2013) who were awarded a degree had identified they had a disability with table 46 (below) detailing that $17.3 \%$ of students awarded a degree were classified as BAME.

## Student Degree Awards by Ethnicity

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BAME | White | Information refused |
| Total Awards | 82 | 362 | 28 |

Table 50

## Student Degree Awards by Gender



Table 51
Table 51 shows that the majority of those who achieved a degree award were female (77.7\%).

## Other Equality Strands

At the current time, the College does not require current and future staff or students to provide details relating to the following protected characteristics:

- Gender Reassignment
- Marriage \& Civil Partnership
- Religion \& Belief
- Sexual Orientation

In addition, Academic Registry currently do not record information relating to Pregnancy and Maternity and as such, figures relating to the protected characteristics detailed above are not included.

## Publication \& dissemination of the Equal Opportunities Monitoring Report

This Annual Report has been approved for publication by the College's Senior Management Group (December 2014) and by College Council (March 2015).

Alternative formats will be made available upon request.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hawkshead figures include applications received for 'other locations' through the online system which are not Camden

