

**Table 4B: ALL Degree Students in 2011-12 session by type of programme split by Gender**  
And by domicile (include home (UK), EU & International students)

Row percentages	Home (UK) students N = 2940			EU students N = 916			International students		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
UG Cert/Dip	44.4%	55.6%		63.6%	36.4%		61.8%	38.2%	
	28	35	63	14	<10	22	199	123	322
Undergraduate	59.5%	40.5%		69.3%	30.7%		66.0%	34.0%	
	1040	707	1747	271	120	391	281	145	426
PG Cert / Dip	58.7%	41.3%		83.3%	16.7%		67.9%	32.1%	
	37	26	63	<10	<10	<10	19	<10	28
Taught Masters	62.1%	37.9%		68.6%	31.4%		70.1%	29.9%	
	469	286	755	232	106	338	417	178	595
Research	47.2%	52.8%		57.1%	42.9%		60.8%	39.2%	
	148	164	312	91	68	159	254	164	418
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>58.6%</b>	<b>41.4%</b>		<b>66.9%</b>	<b>33.1%</b>		<b>65.4%</b>	<b>34.6%</b>	
	<b>1722</b>	<b>1218</b>	<b>2940</b>	<b>613</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>916</b>	<b>1170</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>1789</b>
-									

**Table 5: Part 1 National Student profiles (home UK students only) of institutional groups**

A summary table sourced from "Table 5.14: All students by mission group of institution, gender, ethnicity, disability status, DSA take up and age group" [page 202-3, ECU, December 2012]

Student profiles of institutional groups							
	Million+	University Alliance	1994 group	Russell Group	GuildHE	No affiliation	SOAS students
<b>Age: students</b>							
<b>21 years and under</b>	45.6%	41.5%	57.0%	58.6%	57.4%	49.7%	UGs aged 21 & under: 46.5% of all home students
<b>22 – 25 years</b>	16.6%	14.2%	15.7%	17.3%	12.4%	16.3%	UGs aged 22 & over: 15.0% of all home students  PGs aged 25 & under: 14.6% of all home students
<b>26 – 35 years</b>	18.7%	20.7%	15.2%	13.9	13.4%	17.7%	PGs aged 26 & over: 23.9% of all home students
<b>36 years and over</b>	19.1%	23.5%	12.2%	10.2%	16.8%	16.3%	
Student profiles of institutional groups							
	Million+	University Alliance	1994 group	Russell Group	GuildHE	No affiliation	SOAS students
<b>Disabled Students (%)</b>	7.4%	8.9%	7.8%	6.3%	12.6%	8.2%	10.2%
<b>Non-disabled students</b>	92.6%	91.1%	92.2%	93.7%	87.4%	91.8%	89.8%
<b>Disabled: receives DSA [proportion of disabled students]</b>	43.4%	37.2%	39.6%	39.7%	52.1%	43.4%	34.33%
<b>Disabled: does not receive DSA [proportion of disabled students]</b>	46.3%	55.9%	42.1%	53.0%	39.0%	46.6%	65..67%
<b>Disabled: DSA take-up unknown [proportion of disabled students]</b>	10.4%	6.9%	18.2%	7.3%	8.9%	10.1%	n/a

**Table 5: Part 2 National Student profiles (home UK students only) of institutional groups**

A summary table sourced from "Table 5.14: All students by mission group of institution, gender, ethnicity, disability status, DSA take up and age group" [page 202-3, ECU, December 2012]

Student profiles of institutional groups							
	Million+	University Alliance	1994 group	Russell Group	GuildHE	No affiliation	SOAS students
<b>Ethnicity (UK students only):</b>							
Students (%) Asian	10.4%	6.8%	8.3%	7.9%	4.5%	7.9%	13.9%
Students (%) Black	11.6%	4.9%	5.3%	2.6%	4.4%	6.4%	6.3%
Students (%) Chinese	0.6%	0.6%	1.2%	1.6%	0.3%	0.8%	Chinese & Other Asian: 5.5%
Students (%) Mixed ethnicity	3.2%	2.3%	3.6%	3.0%	2.6%	2.5%	Mixed: 9.7%
Students (%) other ethnicity	1.4%	0.8%	1.3%	1.0%	0.6%	1.1%	7.7%
Students (%) White	72.8%	84.5%	80.3%	83.8%	87.6%	81.3%	52.4%
<b>Gender:</b>							
Female (%)	57.3%	56.5%	54.4%	53.9%	64.0%	57.5%	61.09%
Male (%)	42.7%	43.5%	45.6%	46.1%	36.0%	42.5%	38.91%

**Table 6:**  
**Key Benchmarks: Student-staff Comparison**

2011-12	% Female	% BME	% Disabled
<b>SOAS Staff</b>	52.3%	36%	2.3%
<b>SOAS Students</b>	62.1% of all students 58.6% of home (UK domiciled) students	48.1% all students 43.0% of home (UK domiciled) students	6.9% all students 10.2% of home (UK domiciled) students
<b>All HEIs Students*</b>	57.2% of home (UK domiciled) students	18.1% of home (UK domiciled) students	9.1% of home (UK domiciled) students

\*The national data is from the Equality Challenge Unit's "Equality in HE: statistical report 2012 Part 2: students" (published Nov, 2012)

## **Differences in undergraduate degree classification by age, disability, ethnicity and gender (diversity variables)**

Author: Dr. Graham Hobbs January 2013

### **Summary**

National data on undergraduate degree classification (attainment) shows some attainment gaps for some equality groups (ECU, Dec 2012), e.g., in terms of age, disability, ethnicity and gender. Previous analyses of SOAS attainment data (Hobbs, 2010) have suggested that there may be an attainment gap between students from different ethnic groups.

Therefore it was decided to investigate the SOAS data on home (UK domiciled) students more fully, looking at degree class data analysed by all four diversity variables (age, disability, ethnicity and gender) over the past 5 years.

1. This report is based on an analysis of 2,208 UK domiciled, final year UGs in 2006/7, 2007/8, 2008/9, 2009/10 and 2010/11.
2. It asks three questions:
  - 1) What differences were there in degree classification by a) gender, b) age, c) ethnicity and d) disability?
  - 2) Did students of different genders, ages, ethnicities and (dis)abilities differ in other characteristics too?
  - 3) What differences were there in degree classification by a) gender, b) age, c) ethnicity and d) (dis)ability, after taking account of these differences in characteristics?
3. Section 2 of the report looks at age, comparing students classified as 'Young' or 'Mature'.

4. Mature UGs were more likely than Young UGs to have had/been:
  - Lower socio-economic background;
  - White (as opposed to BME);
  - Disabled; and
  - Male.
  
5. **After taking these differences into account**, compared to Young UGs, Mature UGs were:
  - More likely to have achieved a First;
  - Less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1; and
  - More likely to have failed.
  
6. Section 3 of the report looks at gender.
  
7. Male UGs were more likely than female UGs to have had/been:
  - Higher socio-economic background;
  - White (as opposed to BME); and
  - Mature students.
  
8. **After taking these differences into account**, compared to female UGs, male UGs were:
  - More likely to have achieved a First;
  - Less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1; and
  - More likely to have failed.
  
9. Section 4 of the report compares students self-classified as from 'black & minority ethnic [BME]' or 'white' backgrounds.
  
10. White UGs were more likely than BME UGs to have had/been:
  - Higher educational achievement before the degree programme (measured by UCAS tariff);
  - Higher socio-economic background;
  - Mature students;
  - Disabled; and Male.

11. **After taking these differences into account**, compared to BME UGs, **white UGs** were:
  - **More** likely to have achieved a First;
  - **More** likely to have achieved at least a 2:1; and
  - **Less** likely to have failed.
  
12. Section 5 of the report compares students self-classified by ethnic group as ‘Asian/Asian British (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi), ‘black’, ‘Chinese and other Asian’, ‘mixed’ or ‘other’ or ‘white’.
  
13. **White UGs** were more likely than all other ethnic groups to have had/been:
  - **Higher** educational achievement before their degrees (except for Chinese and other Asian UGs);
  - **Higher** socio-economic background (except for mixed ethnic group UGs);
  - Mature students;
  - Disabled (except for UGs from ‘other’ ethnic groups); and
  - Male.
  
14. **After taking these differences into account**, compared to all other ethnic groups, **white UGs** were:
  - **More** likely to have achieved a First;
  - **More** likely to have achieved at least a 2:1; and
  - **Less** likely to have failed.
  
15. Section 6 of the report compares students classified as ‘Disabled’<sup>1</sup> and ‘No Known Disability’.
  
16. **Disabled UGs** are more likely than UGs who had not disclosed a disability to have had/been:
  - **Lower** educational achievement before the degree programme (measured by UCAS tariff);
  - Mature students; and
  - White (as opposed to BME).

17. **After taking these differences into account**, compared to UGs who had not disclosed a disability, Disabled UGs were:
  - Less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1; and
  - More likely to have failed.
  
18. Section 7 of the report compares Disabled UGs receiving the Disabled Student Allowances (DSAs), with those Disabled UGs not receiving the allowances.
  
19. Disabled UGs in receipt of DSAs were less likely than those not in receipt of DSAs to have achieved a First.
  
20. Section 8 of the report compares students classified as ‘No Known Disability’ to those who self-disclosed impairments, [i.e. ‘Blind/partially sighted’, ‘Deaf/hearing impairment’, ‘Wheelchair user/mobility difficulties’, ‘Personal care support’, ‘Mental health difficulties’, ‘An unseen disability, e.g. diabetes, epilepsy, asthma’, ‘Multiple disabilities’, ‘Autistic Spectrum Disorder’, ‘A specific learning difficulty, e.g. dyslexia’, or ‘Other disability’].
  
21. Compared to UGs with no known disability:
  - Those with ‘mental health difficulties’ were more likely to have failed;
  - Those with ‘an unseen disability’ were more likely to have achieved a First, more likely to have achieved at least a 2:1 and less likely to have failed (although these differences are not statistically significant);
  - Those with ‘a specific learning difficulty’ were less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1 and more likely to have failed;
  - Those that were ‘blind/partially sighted’ were more likely to have failed; and
  - Those with ‘multiple disabilities’ were less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1 and more likely to have failed.

22. The differences in degree classification by a) gender, b) age, c) ethnicity and d) disability not accounted for by the students' characteristics analysed here (namely, gender, age, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic background and educational achievement before the degree programme/UCAS tariff) could be accounted for a combination of:
- i) factors prior to the degree programme,
  - ii) factors during the programme 'outside' of SOAS, and
  - iii) factors during the programme 'inside' of SOAS.

---

<sup>1</sup> The "disabled" category includes all students who disclose a specific learning difference (e.g. dyslexia) or chronic medical condition or any other impairment.

## Differences in undergraduate degree classification by age, disability, ethnicity and gender (diversity variables)

Author: Dr. Graham Hobbs January 2013

### Section 1. Introduction

1. This report is based on an analysis of 2,208 UK domiciled, final year UGs in 2006/7, 2007/8, 2008/9, 2009/10 and 2010/11. The analysis excludes non-UK domiciled UGs because rich data on educational achievement prior to the degree programme are missing for most of these students.
2. It asks three questions:
  - 1) What differences were there in degree classification by a) gender, b) age, c) ethnicity and d) disability?
  - 2) Did students of different genders, ages, ethnicities and (dis)abilities differ in other characteristics too?
  - 3) What differences were there in degree classification by a) gender, b) age, c) ethnicity and d) (dis)ability, after taking account of these differences in characteristics?
3. The analysis is divided into 8 sections:

Section 2 looks at age, comparing students classified as 'Young' or 'Mature'. Section 3 looks at gender.

Sections 4 and 5 look at ethnicity, with the former comparing students classified as 'White' or 'BME', and the latter comparing students classified as 'White', 'Black', 'Asian/Asian British (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi)', 'Chinese and other Asian', 'Mixed' or 'Other'.

Sections 6 to 8 look at disability, with section 6 comparing students classified as 'Disabled' and 'No Known Disability', section 7 comparing Disabled UGs receiving Disabled Student Allowance, with those not receiving it, and section 8 comparing students classified as 'No Known Disability', 'Blind/partially sighted', 'Deaf/hearing impairment', 'Wheelchair user/mobility difficulties', 'Personal care support', 'Mental

health difficulties', 'An unseen disability, e.g. diabetes, epilepsy, asthma', 'Multiple disabilities', 'Autistic Spectrum Disorder', 'A specific learning difficulty, e.g. dyslexia', or 'Other disability'.

Section 9 offers a final comment.

## **Section 2. Age**

### **Summary**

4. **Mature UGs** were **more** likely than Young UGs to have had/been:
  - **Lower** socio-economic background;
  - White (as opposed to BME);
  - Disabled; and
  - Male.
  
5. **After taking these differences into account**, compared to Young UGs, **Mature UGs** were:
  - **More** likely to have achieved a First;
  - **Less** likely to have achieved at least a 2:1; and
  - **More** likely to have failed.

### **Analysis**

6. This part of the analysis compares UGs classified as i. Mature or ii. Young.
  
7. Of the 2,208 UGs, 454 (20.6%) were classified as Mature and the remaining 1,754 (79.4%) as Young.
  
8. There are statistically significant differences in the characteristics of Mature and Young UGs.<sup>1</sup> In particular:
  - Mature UGs ranked **lower** than Young UGs in socio-economic background (Table 1);<sup>2</sup>
  - Mature UGs were **more** likely than Young UGs to be White (as opposed to BME).

In particular, 66% of Mature UGs were White, compared to 46% of Young UGs (Table 2);<sup>3</sup>

- Mature UGs were more likely than Young UGs to be disabled.

In particular, 14.3% of Mature UGs were disabled, compared to 9.8% of Young UGs (Table 3);

- Mature UGs were more likely than Young UGs to be male.

In particular, 49% of Mature UGs were male, compared to 43% of Young UGs (Table 4).

9. **Before taking these differences into account**, in terms of degree classification, compared to Young UGs, Mature UGs were (Table 5):

- 5.7 percentage points more likely to have achieved a First, and this difference is statistically significant at the 1% level;
- 5.8 percentage points less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1, and this difference is statistically significant at the 5% level;
- 2.7 percentage points more likely to have failed, although this difference is only statistically significant at the 10% level.

This relationship between age and degree classification for the 5 years of final year UGs taken together (2006/7-2010/11) is repeated within 4 of the 5 (individual) years. In other words, for 4 of the 5 years of final year UGs, compared to Young UGs, Mature UGs were more likely to have achieved a First, but less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1, and more likely to have failed.

10. **After taking these differences into account**, in terms of degree classification, the differences which, taken together, improve the degree classification of Mature UGs, compared to Young UGs, Mature UGs were:

- 4.6 percentage points more likely to have achieved a First, but this is now only statistically significant at the 5% level;
- 9.3 percentage points less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level;
- 4.0 percentage points more likely to have failed, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level.<sup>4</sup>

**Table 1. Distributions of socio-economic background<sup>5</sup> by age (including row percentages)**

	Socio-economic group							Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>Young</b>	405	481	165	96	26	153	54	1,380
	29.35%	34.86%	11.96%	6.96%	1.88%	11.09%	3.91%	100.00%
<b>Mature</b>	36	98	53	27	8	52	25	299
	12.04%	32.78%	17.73%	9.03%	2.68%	17.39%	8.36%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>1,679</b>
	<b>26.27%</b>	<b>34.48%</b>	<b>12.98%</b>	<b>7.33%</b>	<b>2.03%</b>	<b>2.21%</b>	<b>4.71%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 2. Distributions of ethnicity by age (including row percentages)**

	White	BME	Total
<b>Young</b>	781	920	1,701
	45.91%	54.09%	100.00%
<b>Mature</b>	283	147	430
	65.81%	34.19%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,064</b>	<b>1,067</b>	<b>2,131</b>
	<b>49.93%</b>	<b>50.07%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 3. Distributions of disability by age (including row percentages)**

	<b>Not disabled</b>	<b>Disabled</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Young</b>	1,581	171	1,752
	90.24%	9.76%	100.00%
<b>Mature</b>	389	65	454
	85.68%	14.32%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,970</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>2,206</b>
	<b>89.30%</b>	<b>10.70%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 4. Distributions of gender by age (including, row percentages)**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Young</b>	758	996	1,754
	43.22%	56.78%	100.00%
<b>Mature</b>	224	230	454
	49.34%	50.66%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>1,226</b>	<b>2,208</b>
	<b>44.47%</b>	<b>55.53%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Table 5. Distribution of degree classification by age (including, row percentages)

	<b>1st</b>	<b>2:1</b>	<b>2:2</b>	<b>3rd</b>	<b>Pass</b>	<b>Did not pass</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Young</b>	224 12.77%	1,084 61.80%	279 15.91%	33 1.88%	7 0.40%	127 7.24%	1,754 100.00%
<b>Mature</b>	84 18.50%	228 50.22%	85 18.72%	3 0.66%	9 1.98%	45 9.91%	454 100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>308</b> 13.95%	<b>1,312</b> 59.42%	<b>364</b> 16.49%	<b>36</b> 1.63%	<b>16</b> 0.72%	<b>172</b> 7.79%	<b>2,208</b> 100.00%

### Section 3. Gender

#### Summary

11. Male UGs were more likely than female UGs to have had/been:
  - Higher socio-economic background;
  - White (as opposed to BME); and
  - Mature students.
  
12. After taking these differences into account, compared to female UGs, male UGs were:
  - More likely to have achieved a First;
  - Less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1; and
  - More likely to have failed.

#### Analysis

13. Of the 2,208 UGs analysed, 982 (44.5%) were male and 1,226 (55.5%) were female.

14. There are statistically significant differences in the characteristics of male and female UGs. In particular:
- Male UGs ranked higher than female UGs in socio-economic background (Table 6);<sup>6</sup>
  - Male UGs were more likely than female UGs to be White (as opposed to BME).  
In particular, 57% of males were White, compared to 44% of females (Table 7);
  - Male UGs were more likely than female UGs to be Mature students.  
In particular, 23% of males were Mature students, compared to 19% of females (Table 8).
- However, there were no differences between male and female UGs in terms of being disabled or not, or in educational achievement before the degree programme (measured by UCAS tariff).<sup>7</sup>
15. **Before** taking these differences into account, compared to female UGs, male UGs were (Table 9):
- 4.8 percentage points more likely to have achieved a First, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level;<sup>8</sup>
  - 1.4 percentage points less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1, although this is not statistically significant;<sup>9</sup>
  - 2.5 percentage points more likely to have failed, and this difference is statistically significant at the 5% level. However, this difference for the 5 years of final year UGs taken together (2006/7-2010/11) is not repeated within all 5 (individual) years. In fact, for 3 of the 5 years of final year UGs, male UGs were slightly less, not more, likely than female UGs to have failed.
16. However, **after** taking these differences into account, differences that taken together improve the degree classification of male UGs, compared to females, males were:
- 2.7 percentage points more likely to have achieved a First, but this difference is only statistically significant at the 10% level;
  - 4.0 percentage points less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1, and this is statistically significant at the 5% level;
  - 2.9 percentage points more likely to have failed, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level.<sup>10</sup>

**Table 6. Distributions of socio-economic background by gender (including row percentages)**

	Socio-economic group							Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>Male</b>	225	273	88	53	14	68	29	750
	30.00%	36.40%	11.73%	7.07%	1.87%	9.07%	3.87%	100.00%
<b>Female</b>	216	306	130	70	20	137	50	929
	23.25%	32.94%	13.99%	7.53%	2.15%	14.75%	5.38%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>1,679</b>
	<b>26.27%</b>	<b>34.48%</b>	<b>12.98%</b>	<b>7.33%</b>	<b>2.03%</b>	<b>12.21%</b>	<b>4.71%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 7. Distributions of ethnicity by gender (including row percentages)**

	White	BME	Total
<b>Male</b>	532	398	930
	57.20%	42.80%	100.00%
<b>Female</b>	532	669	1,201
	44.30%	55.70%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,064</b>	<b>1,067</b>	<b>2,131</b>
	<b>49.93%</b>	<b>50.07%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 8. Distributions of age by gender (including row percentages)**

	<b>Young</b>	<b>Mature</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Male</b>	758	224	982
	77.19%	22.81%	100.00%
<b>Female</b>	996	230	1,226
	81.24%	18.76%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,754</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>2,208</b>
	<b>79.44%</b>	<b>20.56%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 9. Distribution of degree classification by gender (including row percentages)**

	<b>1st</b>	<b>2:1</b>	<b>2:2</b>	<b>3rd</b>	<b>Pass</b>	<b>Did not pass</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Male</b>	163	550	149	21	9	90	982
	16.60%	56.01%	15.17%	2.14%	0.92%	9.16%	100.00%
<b>Female</b>	145	762	215	15	7	82	1,226
	11.83%	62.15%	17.54%	1.22%	0.57%	6.69%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>1,312</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>2,208</b>
	<b>13.95%</b>	<b>59.42%</b>	<b>16.49%</b>	<b>1.63%</b>	<b>0.72%</b>	<b>7.79%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## Section 4. Ethnicity Part I

### Summary

17. White UGs were more likely than BME UGs to have had/been:
- Higher educational achievement before the degree programme (measured by UCAS tariff);
  - Higher socio-economic background;
  - Mature students;
  - Disabled; and
  - Male.
18. After taking these differences into account, compared to BME UGs, white UGs were:
- More likely to have achieved a First;
  - More likely to have achieved at least a 2:1; and
  - Less likely to have failed.

### Analysis

19. This part of the analysis compares UGs classified as either
- i. white or
  - ii. BME.

Of the 2,208 UGs, some 1,064 (48.2%) were self-classified as white, 1,067 (48.3%) were classified as BME, and the remaining 77 (3.5%) did not give information on their ethnicity.

20. There are statistically significant differences in the characteristics of White and BME UGs. In particular:
- White UGs had higher educational achievement before the degree programme (measured by UCAS tariff) than BME UGs (Table 10);<sup>11</sup>
  - White UGs ranked higher than BME UGs in socio-economic background (Table 11);<sup>12</sup>
  - White UGs were more likely than BME UGs to be Mature students.

In particular, 26.6% of White UGs were Mature students, compared to 13.8% of BME UGs (Table 12);

- White UGs were more likely than BME UGs to be disabled.

In particular, 13.5% of White UGs were disabled, compared to 8.2% of BME UGs (Table 13);

- White UGs were more likely than BME UGs to be male.

In particular, 50.0% of White UGs were male, compared to 37.3% of BME UGs (Table 14).

21. **Before taking these differences into account, compared to BME UGs, White UGs were** (Table 15):

- 11.4 percentage points more likely to have achieved a First, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level;
- 15.2 percentage points more likely to have achieved at least 2:1, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level;
- 3.7 percentage points less likely to have failed, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level.

This relationship between ethnicity and degree classification for the 5 years of final year UGs taken together (2006/7-2010/11) is repeated within all 5 (individual) years. In other words, for all 5 years of final year UGs (taken individually), compared to BME UGs, white UGs were more likely to have achieved a First, more likely to have achieved at least a 2:1, and less likely to have failed.

22. But the differences in the characteristics of white and BME UGs do not account for the differences in degree classification. **After taking them into account, compared to BME UGs, White UGs were still**:

- 10.2 percentage points more likely to have achieved a First, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level;
- 15.7 percentage points more likely to have achieved at least 2:1, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level;
- 4.8 percentage points less likely to have failed, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level.<sup>13</sup>

**Table 10. Distributions of educational achievement before the degree programme (measured by UCAS tariff) by ethnicity**

	Percentiles					Mean	Obs.
	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%		
White	240	320	370	440	500	367.0	736
BME	260	310	360	420	460	357.5	841

**Table 11. Distributions of socio-economic background by ethnicity (including row percentages)**

	Socio-economic group							Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
White	251	333	99	51	20	67	35	856
	29.32%	38.90%	11.57%	5.96%	2.34%	7.83%	4.09%	100.00%
BME	170	230	116	68	14	134	43	775
	21.94%	29.68%	14.97%	8.77%	1.81%	17.29%	5.55%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>1,631</b>
	<b>25.81%</b>	<b>34.52%</b>	<b>13.18%</b>	<b>7.30%</b>	<b>2.08%</b>	<b>12.32%</b>	<b>4.78%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 12. Distributions of age by ethnicity (including row percentages)**

	<u>Young</u>	<u>Mature</u>	<u>Total</u>
<b>White</b>	781	283	1,064
	73.40%	26.60%	100.00%
<b>BME</b>	920	147	1,067
	86.22%	13.78%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,701</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>2,131</b>
	<b>79.82%</b>	<b>20.18%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 13. Distributions of disability by ethnicity (including row percentages)**

	<u>Not disabled</u>	<u>Disabled</u>	<u>Total</u>
<b>White</b>	919	143	1,062
	86.53%	13.47%	100.00%
<b>BME</b>	980	87	1,067
	91.85%	8.15%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,899</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>2,129</b>
	<b>89.20%</b>	<b>10.80%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 14. Distributions of gender by ethnicity (including row percentages)**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>White</b>	532	532	1,064
	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%
<b>BME</b>	398	669	1,067
	37.30%	62.70%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>930</b>	<b>1,201</b>	<b>2,131</b>
	<b>43.64%</b>	<b>56.36%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 15. Distribution of degree classification by ethnicity (including row percentages)**

	<b>1st</b>	<b>2:1</b>	<b>2:2</b>	<b>3rd</b>	<b>Pass</b>	<b>Did not pass</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>White</b>	206	653	129	7	7	62	1,064
	19.36%	61.37%	12.12%	0.66%	0.66%	5.83%	100.00%
<b>BME</b>	85	614	229	29	8	102	1,067
	7.97%	57.54%	21.46%	2.72%	0.75%	9.56%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>1,267</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>2,131</b>
	<b>13.66%</b>	<b>59.46%</b>	<b>16.80%</b>	<b>1.69%</b>	<b>0.70%</b>	<b>7.70%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## **Section 5. Ethnicity Part II**

### Summary

23. White UGs were more likely than all other ethnic groups to have had/been:
- Higher educational achievement before their degrees (except for ‘Chinese and other Asian’ UGs);
  - Higher socio-economic background (except for Mixed UGs);
  - Mature students;
  - Disabled (except for Other ethnic group UGs); and
  - Male.
24. **After taking these differences into account**, compared to all other ethnic groups, white UGs were:
- More likely to have achieved a First;
  - More likely to have achieved at least a 2:1; and
  - Less likely to have failed.

### Analysis

25. This part of the analysis compares UGs classified as ‘white’ (1,064 UGs - 48.2%), ‘black’ (177 UGs - 8.0%), ‘Asian/Asian British (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi)’ (394 UGs - 17.8%), ‘Chinese and other Asian’ (193 UGs - 8.7%), ‘mixed ethnicity’ (217 UGs - 9.8%), ‘other ethnic group’ (86 UGs - 3.9%) or ‘Information refused’ (77 UGs - 3.5%).
26. There are statistically significant differences in the characteristics of White UGs and other ethnic groups.

27. White UGs had higher educational achievement before the degree programme (measured by UCAS tariff) than all other ethnic groups, except 'Chinese and other Asian' UGs.
- The mean UCAS tariff of White UGs was 367 points, compared to:
  - 338 for black UGs;
  - 360 for Asian - Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi UGs;
  - 374 for Chinese and other Asian UGs;
  - 352 for mixed ethnicity UGs; and
  - 363 for Other ethnicity UGs (Table 16).<sup>14</sup>
- However, only the white/black and white/mixed difference in mean UCAS tariff is statistically significant (the former at the 1% level, the latter at the 10% level only).
28. White UGs ranked higher than all other ethnic groups, except mixed ethnicity, in socio-economic background.
- 68.2 % of white UGs were from the top two socio-economic classes, compared to:
  - 51.2 % of Black UGs;
  - 42.7 % of Asian - Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi UGs;
  - 48.9 % of Chinese and other Asian UGs;
  - 68.0 % of Mixed ethnicity UGs; and
  - 52.7 % of Other ethnicity UGs (Table 17).<sup>15</sup>
29. White UGs were more likely than all other ethnic groups to be mature students.
- 26.6 % of white UGs were mature students, compared to:
  - 18.6 % of black UGs;
  - 8.6 % of Asian - Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi UGs;
  - 10.9 % of Chinese and other Asian UGs;
  - 19.4 % of mixed ethnicity UGs; and
  - 19.8 % of other ethnicity UGs (Table 18).<sup>16</sup>

30. White UGs were more likely than all other ethnic groups, except other ethnicity, to be disabled.
- 13.5 % of white UGs were disabled, compared to:
  - 9.0 % of black UGs;
  - 7.4 % of Asian - Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi UGs;
  - 5.2 % of Chinese and other Asian UGs;
  - 9.2 % of mixed ethnicity UGs; and
  - 14.0 % of other ethnicity UGs (Table 19).<sup>17</sup>
31. White UGs were more likely than all other ethnic groups to be male.
- 50.0 % of white UGs were male, compared to:
  - 26.6 % of black UGs;
  - 40.1 % of Asian - Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi UGs;
  - 46.1 % of Chinese and other Asian UGs;
  - 35.0 % of mixed ethnicity UGs; and
  - 32.6 % of other ethnicity UGs (Table 20).<sup>18</sup>
32. **Before taking these differences in the characteristics of students from different ethnic groups into account**, white UGs were more likely to have achieved a First, more likely to have achieved at least a 2:1, and less likely to have failed, than all other ethnic groups (Table 21). For example, the gaps between white UGs and UGs from the other ethnic groups in the probability of having achieved at least a 2:1 were:
- 26.5 percentage points for black UGs;
  - 13.7 percentage points for Asian - Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi UGs;
  - 17.0 percentage points for Chinese and other Asian UGs;
  - 8.4 percentage points for mixed ethnicity UGs; and
  - 12.1 percentage points for Other ethnicity UGs.<sup>19</sup>

33. But the differences in the characteristics of students from different ethnic groups account for little of these gaps in degree classification between white UGs and other ethnic groups. Even after taking these differences into account, white UGs were still more likely to have achieved a First, more likely to have achieved at least a 2:1, and less likely to have failed, than all other ethnic groups. For example, the gaps between white UGs and other ethnic groups in the probability of having achieved at least a 2:1 remained:
- 21.8 percentage points for Black UGs;
  - 14.7 percentage points for Asian - Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi UGs;
  - 16.8 percentage points for Chinese and other Asian UGs;
  - 9.7 percentage points for mixed ethnicity UGs; and
  - 4.5 percentage points for other ethnicity UGs.<sup>20</sup>

**Table 16. Distributions of educational achievement before the degree programme (measured by UCAS tariff) by ethnicity**

	Percentiles					Mean	Obs.
	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%		
<b>Black</b>	230	300	355	390	440	338.0	138
<b>Chinese &amp; other Asian</b>	260	320	380	440	490	373.5	144
<b>Indian, Pakistani &amp; Bangladeshi</b>	270	316	360	420	460	360.3	340
<b>Mixed</b>	220	300	350	420	500	351.7	158
<b>White</b>	240	320	370	440	500	367.0	736
<b>Other</b>	280	310	360	400	460	363.1	61
<b>Information refused</b>	250	320	400	460	520	381.4	52
<b>Total</b>	260	310	360	420	490	362.6	1,629

Table 17. Distributions of socio-economic background by ethnicity (including, row percentages)

	Socio-economic group							Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>Black</b>	27	36	31	6	1	19	3	123
	21.95%	29.27%	25.20%	4.88%	0.81%	15.45%	2.44%	100.00%
<b>Chinese &amp; other Asian</b>	30	39	14	13	2	37	6	141
	21.28%	27.66%	9.93%	9.22%	1.42%	26.24%	4.26%	100.00%
<b>Indian, Pakistani &amp; Bangladeshi</b>	56	64	44	31	9	56	21	281
	19.93%	22.78%	15.66%	11.03%	3.20%	19.93%	7.47%	100.00%
<b>Mixed</b>	48	71	20	13	0	14	9	175
	27.43%	40.57%	11.43%	7.43%	0.00%	8.00%	5.14%	100.00%
<b>White</b>	251	333	99	51	20	67	35	856
	29.32%	38.90%	11.57%	5.96%	2.34%	7.83%	4.09%	100.00%
<b>Other</b>	9	20	7	5	2	8	4	55
	16.36%	36.36%	12.73%	9.09%	3.64%	14.55%	7.27%	100.00%
<b>Information refused</b>	20	16	3	4	0	4	1	48
	41.67%	33.33%	6.25%	8.33%	0.00%	8.33%	2.08%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>1,679</b>
	<b>26.27%</b>	<b>34.48%</b>	<b>12.98%</b>	<b>7.33%</b>	<b>2.03%</b>	<b>12.21%</b>	<b>4.71%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 18. Distributions of age by ethnicity (including, row percentages)**

	<b>Young</b>	<b>Mature</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Black</b>	144	33	177
	81.36%	18.64%	100.00%
<b>Chinese &amp; other Asian</b>	172	21	193
	89.12%	10.88%	100.00%
<b>Indian, Pakistani &amp; Bangladeshi</b>	360	34	394
	91.37%	8.63%	100.00%
<b>Mixed</b>	175	42	217
	80.65%	19.35%	100.00%
<b>White</b>	781	283	1,064
	73.40%	26.60%	100.00%
<b>Other</b>	69	17	86
	80.23%	19.77%	100.00%
<b>Information refused</b>	53	24	77
	68.83%	31.17%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,754</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>2,208</b>
	<b>79.44%</b>	<b>20.56%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 19. Distributions of disability by ethnicity (including, row percentages)**

	<b>Not disabled</b>	<b>Disabled</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Black</b>	161 90.96%	16 9.04%	177 100.00%
<b>Chinese &amp; other Asian</b>	183 94.82%	10 5.18%	193 100.00%
<b>Indian, Pakistani &amp; Bangladeshi</b>	365 92.64%	29 7.36%	394 100.00%
<b>Mixed</b>	197 90.78%	20 9.22%	217 100.00%
<b>White</b>	919 86.53%	143 13.47%	1,062 100.00%
<b>Other</b>	74 86.05%	12 13.95%	86 100.00%
<b>Information refused</b>	71 92.21%	6 7.79%	77 100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,970 89.30%</b>	<b>236 10.70%</b>	<b>2,206 100.00%</b>

**Table 20. Distributions of gender by ethnicity (including, row percentages)**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
<b>Black</b>	47	130	177
	26.55%	73.45%	100.00%
<b>Chinese &amp; other Asian</b>	89	104	193
	46.11%	53.89%	100.00%
<b>Indian, Pakistani &amp; Bangladeshi</b>	158	236	394
	40.10%	59.90%	100.00%
<b>Mixed</b>	76	141	217
	35.02%	64.98%	100.00%
<b>White</b>	532	532	1,064
	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%
<b>Other</b>	28	58	86
	32.56%	67.44%	100.00%
<b>Information refused</b>	52	25	77
	67.53%	32.47%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>1,226</b>	<b>2,208</b>
	<b>44.47%</b>	<b>55.53%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 21. Distribution of degree classification by ethnicity (including, row percentages)**

	<b>1st</b>	<b>2:1</b>	<b>2:2</b>	<b>3rd</b>	<b>Pass</b>	<b>Did not pass</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Black</b>	7	89	52	4	1	24	177
	3.95%	50.28%	29.38%	2.26%	0.56%	13.56%	100.00%
<b>Chinese &amp; other Asian</b>	15	108	47	8	1	14	193
	7.77%	55.96%	24.35%	4.15%	0.52%	7.25%	100.00%
<b>Indian, Pakistani &amp; Bangladeshi</b>	25	239	76	11	2	41	394
	6.35%	60.66%	19.29%	2.79%	0.51%	10.41%	100.00%
<b>Mixed</b>	33	124	35	4	4	17	217
	15.21%	57.14%	16.13%	1.84%	1.84%	7.83%	100.00%
<b>White</b>	206	653	129	7	7	62	1,064
	19.36%	61.37%	12.12%	0.66%	0.66%	5.83%	100.00%
<b>Other</b>	5	54	19	2	0	6	86
	5.81%	62.79%	22.09%	2.33%	0.00%	6.98%	100.00%
<b>Information refused</b>	17	45	6	0	1	8	77
	22.08%	58.44%	7.79%	0.00%	1.30%	10.39%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>1,312</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>2,208</b>
	<b>13.95%</b>	<b>59.42%</b>	<b>16.49%</b>	<b>1.63%</b>	<b>0.72%</b>	<b>7.79%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## **Section 6. Disability Part I**

### **Summary**

34. **Disabled UGs** were more likely than UGs who have not disclosed a disability to have had/been:
- **Lower** educational achievement before the degree programme (measured by UCAS tariff);
  - Mature students; and
  - White (as opposed to BME).
35. **After taking these differences into account**, compared to UGs who have not disclosed a disability, **Disabled UGs** were:
- **Less** likely to have achieved at least a 2:1; and
  - **More** likely to have failed.

### **Analysis**

36. This part of the analysis compares UGs classified as
- i. Disabled or
  - ii. Students who had not disclosed a disability.
- Of 2,206 UGs, 236 (10.7%) were classified as disabled and the remaining 1,970 (89.2%) had not disclosed a disability.<sup>21</sup>
37. There are statistically significant differences in the characteristics of disabled UGs and UG students who had not disclosed a disability. In particular:
- Disabled UGs had **lower** educational achievement before the degree programme (measured by UCAS tariff) than UGs who had not disclosed a disability (Table 22);<sup>22</sup>
  - Disabled UGs were **more** likely than UGs who had not disclosed a disability to be mature students.
- In particular, 27.5% of disabled UGs were mature students, compared to 19.8% of UG Students who had not disclosed a disability (Table 23);

- Disabled UGs were more likely than UGs who had not disclosed a disability to be white (as opposed to BME).

In particular, 62.2% of disabled UGs were white, compared to 48.4% of UG students who had not disclosed a disability (Table 24).

However, there were no differences between disabled and UG Students who had not disclosed a disability in terms of gender and socio-economic background.<sup>23</sup>

38. **Before** taking these differences into account, compared to UGs who had not disclosed a disability, disabled UGs were (Table 25):

- 2.2 percentage points less likely to have achieved a First, although this is not statistically significant;
- 6.2 percentage points less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1, and this is statistically significant at the 5% level;
- 5.5 percentage points more likely to have failed, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level.<sup>24</sup>

39. **However, after** taking these differences into account, differences that taken together improve the degree classification of disabled UGs, compared to UGs who had not disclosed a disability, disabled UGs were:

- 2.7 percentage points less likely to have achieved a First, although this is not statistically significant;
- 11.5 percentage points less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level;
- 7.4 percentage points more likely to have failed, and this is statistically significant at the 1% level.<sup>25</sup>

**Table 22. Distributions of UCAS tariff by disability**

	Percentiles					Mean	Obs.
	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%		
Not disabled	260	320	370	420	490	365.4	1,467
Disabled	225	280	340	400	460	337.0	160

**Table 23. Distributions of age by disability (including, row percentages)**

	Young	Mature	Total
Not disabled	1,581 80.25%	389 19.75%	1,970 100.00%
Disabled	171 72.46%	65 27.54%	236 100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,752 79.42%</b>	<b>454 20.58%</b>	<b>2,206 100.00%</b>

Table 24. Distributions of ethnicity by disability (including, row percentages)

	White	BME	Total
<b>Not disabled</b>	919	980	1,899
	48.39%	51.61%	100.00%
<b>Disabled</b>	143	87	230
	62.17%	37.83%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,062</b>	<b>1,067</b>	<b>2,129</b>
	<b>49.88%</b>	<b>50.12%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Table 25. Distribution of degree classification by disability (including, row percentages)

	1st	2:1	2:2	3rd	Pass	Did not pass	Total
<b>Not disabled</b>	278	1,180	323	36	11	142	1,970
	14.11%	59.90%	16.40%	1.83%	0.56%	7.21%	100.00%
<b>Disabled</b>	28	132	41	0	5	30	236
	11.86%	55.93%	17.37%	0.00%	2.12%	12.71%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>1,312</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>2,206</b>
	<b>13.87%</b>	<b>59.47%</b>	<b>16.50%</b>	<b>1.63%</b>	<b>0.73%</b>	<b>7.80%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## Section 7. Disabled student allowance (DSA)

### Summary

40. Disabled UGs in receipt of DSAs were less likely than those not in receipt of DSAs to have achieved a First.

### Analysis

41. This part of the analysis compares disabled UGs classified as
- in receipt of DSAs,
  - not in receipt of DSAs, or
  - information about DSAs is not known / not sought.
- Of the 236 UGs classified as disabled, 136 (57.6%) were in receipt of DSAs, 75 (31.8%) were not in receipt of DSAs, and for the remaining 25 (10.6%) information about DSAs was not known / not sought.
42. The sample characteristics of disabled UGs in receipt of DSAs and those not in receipt of DSAs were (very) similar in terms of ethnicity (white / BME), age (Mature / Young) and socio-economic background. Those in receipt of DSAs were less likely than those not in receipt of DSAs to be male (43.4% vs. 50.7%). In addition, the mean UCAS tariff of those in receipt of DSAs was 15.3 points lower than those not in receipt of DSAs. However, neither of these differences were (even close to) statistically significant (even at the 10% level).
43. Compared to Disabled UGs not in receipt of DSAs, those in receipt of DSAs were (Table 26):
- 8.5 percentage points less likely to have achieved a First, and this difference is statistically significant at the 10% level;
  - 1.7 percentage points more likely to have achieved at least a 2:1, although this is not statistically significant;
  - 6.4 percentage points less likely to have failed, although this is not statistically significant.

Table 26. Distribution of degree classification by DSAs (including, row percentages)

	1st	2:1	2:2	3rd	Pass	Did not pass	Total
Not Disabled	278	1,180	323	36	11	142	1,970
	14.11%	59.90%	16.40%	1.83%	0.56%	7.21%	100.00%
Disabled - not in receipt of DSAs	13	37	11	0	2	12	75
	17.33%	49.33%	14.67%	0.00%	2.67%	16.00%	100.00%
Disabled - in receipt of DSAs	12	81	28	0	2	13	136
	8.82%	59.56%	20.59%	0.00%	1.47%	9.56%	100.00%
Disabled - data missing on DSAs	3	14	2	0	1	5	25
	12.00%	56.00%	8.00%	0.00%	4.00%	20.00%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>1,312</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>2,206</b>
	<b>13.87%</b>	<b>59.47%</b>	<b>16.50%</b>	<b>1.63%</b>	<b>0.73%</b>	<b>7.80%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## Section 8. Disability Part II

### Summary

44. Compared to UGs who did not disclose a disability:
- Those with ‘mental health difficulties’ were more likely to have failed;
  - Although not statistically significantly so, those with ‘an unseen disability’ were more likely to have achieved a First, more likely to have achieved at least a 2:1 and less likely to have failed;
  - Those with ‘a specific learning difficulty’ were less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1 and more likely to have failed;
  - Those that were ‘blind/partially sighted’ were more likely to have failed;
  - Those with ‘multiple disabilities’ were less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1 and more likely to have failed.

## Analysis

45. This part of the analysis compares UGs classified as
- i. not Disabled (1,970 UGs) (i.e. have not disclosed any impairments)
  - ii. Blind/partially sighted (6 UGs),
  - iii. Deaf/hearing impairment (3 UGs),
  - iv. Wheelchair user/mobility difficulties (6 UGs),
  - v. Personal care support (1 UG),
  - vi. Mental health difficulties (22 UGs),
  - vii. An unseen disability, e.g. diabetes, epilepsy, asthma (21 UGs),
  - viii. Multiple disabilities (7 UGs),
  - ix. Autistic Spectrum Disorder (3 UGs),
  - x. A specific learning difficulty, e.g. dyslexia (152 UGs), or
  - xi. Other disability (15 UGs).
46. The degree classification of all students is presented in Table 27, but the analysis focuses on UGs with mental health difficulties, an unseen disability, and, especially, those with a specific learning difficulty, given the (very) small number of UGs in the other categories.
47. Compared to UGs with no known disability, those with ‘mental health difficulties’ were:
- Almost as likely to have achieved a First (13.6% vs. 14.1%);
  - Less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1 (59.1% vs. 74.0%, although this difference is not quite statistically significant even at the 10% level);
  - More likely to have failed (18.2% vs. 7.2%, and this difference is statistically significant at the 10% level).
48. Compared to UGs with no known disability, those with ‘an unseen disability’ were:
- More likely to have achieved a First (19.1% vs. 14.1%);
  - More likely to have achieved at least a 2:1 (76.2% vs. 74.0%);
  - Less likely to have failed (4.8% vs. 7.2%).
- However, none of these differences were (even close to) statistically significant.

49. Compared to UGs with no known disability, those with ‘a specific learning difficulty’ were/had:
- More likely to be white (as opposed to BME) (68.0% vs. 48.4%, and this difference is statistically significant at the 1% level);
  - More likely to be mature students (26.3% vs. 19.8%, and this difference is statistically significant at the 10% level);
  - Lower educational achievement before the degree programme (mean UCAS tariff of 325 vs. 365 points, and this difference is statistically significant at the 1% level).
- However, there were no statistically significant differences between these students in terms of gender or socio-economic background.
50. Without taking these differences in characteristics into account, those with ‘a specific learning difficulty’ were:
- Less likely to have achieved a First (9.9% vs. 14.1%, although this difference is not statistically significant at the 10% level);
  - Less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1 (67.1% vs. 74.0%, and this difference is statistically significant at the 10% level);
  - More likely to have failed (11.2% vs. 7.2%, and this difference is statistically significant at the 10% level).
- However, these gaps in degree classification remained after taking the differences in characteristics into account.<sup>26</sup>
51. Compared to UGs with no known disability, those that were ‘blind/partially sighted’ were:
- More likely to have failed (33.3% vs. 7.2%, and this difference is statistically significant at the 10% level).
52. Compared to UGs with no known disability, those with ‘multiple disabilities’ were:
- Less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1 (42.9% vs. 74.0%, and this difference is statistically significant at the 10% level);
  - More likely to have failed (28.6% vs. 7.2%, and this difference is statistically significant at the 10% level).

**Table 27. Distribution of degree classification by disability (including, row percentages)**

	1st	2:1	2:2	3rd	Pass	Did not pass	Total
<b>Not Disabled</b>	278	1,180	323	36	11	142	1,970
	14.11%	59.90%	16.40%	1.83%	0.56%	7.21%	100.00%
<b>Blind/ partially sighted</b>	1	3	0	0	0	2	6
	16.67%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	100.00%
<b>Deaf/hearing impairment</b>	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
<b>Wheelchair user/ mobility difficulties</b>	1	4	1	0	0	0	6
	16.67%	66.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
<b>Personal care support</b>	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
<b>Mental health difficulties</b>	3	10	3	0	2	4	22
	13.64%	45.45%	13.64%	0.00%	9.09%	18.18%	100.00%
<b>An unseen disability</b>	4	12	4	0	0	1	21
	19.05%	57.14%	19.05%	0.00%	0.00%	4.76%	100.00%
<b>Multiple disabilities</b>	0	3	1	0	1	2	7
	0.00%	42.86%	14.29%	0.00%	14.29%	28.57%	100.00%
<b>Autistic Spectrum Disorder</b>	0	2	0	0	0	1	3
	0.00%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	100.00%
<b>A specific learning disability</b>	15	87	31	0	2	17	152
	9.87%	57.24%	20.39%	0.00%	1.32%	11.18%	100.00%
<b>Other disability</b>	2	9	1	0	0	3	15
	13.33%	60.00%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>1,312</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>2,206</b>
	<b>13.87%</b>	<b>59.47%</b>	<b>16.50%</b>	<b>1.63%</b>	<b>0.73%</b>	<b>7.80%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## Section 9. Final comment

53. The differences in degree classification by a) gender, b) age, c) ethnicity and d) disability not accounted for by the students' characteristics analysed here (namely, gender, age, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic background and educational achievement before the degree programme/UCAS tariff) could be accounted for a combination of i) factors prior to the degree programme, ii) factors during the programme 'outside' of SOAS, and iii) factors during the programme 'inside' of SOAS.

## References

ECU (November 2012) *"Equality in HE: statistical report 2012. Part 2: students"*

Equality Challenge Unit, [www.ecu.ac.uk](http://www.ecu.ac.uk)

Hobbs, G (2010) *"Differences in undergraduate degree classification by ethnicity,"*

Appendix H, SOAS Equality & Diversity Committee, Nov. 2010.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, I have not been able to look at differences in the educational achievement of Mature and Young UGs before the degree programme (measured by UCAS tariff). This is because UCAS tariff is missing for a much higher percentage of Mature UGs (58.6%) than Young UGs (17.8%).

<sup>2</sup> Socio-economic classification is missing for 529 (24.0%) of 2,208 UGs. A slight concern for this analysis is that it is missing for a higher percentage of Mature UGs (34.1%) than Young UGs (21.3%).

<sup>3</sup> 77 (3.5%) of the 2,208 UGs refused to give information on their ethnicity.

<sup>4</sup> These are the estimated marginal effects from probit regressions of the three dependent variables (achieving a First, achieving at least a 2:1, and not passing) on the following independent variables: age (Mature/Young), ethnicity (All white; All black; Asian/Asian British; Chinese & other Asian; All mixed; Other; Information refused), disability (No known disability; Blind/partially sighted; Deaf/hearing impairment; Wheelchair user/mobility difficulties; Personal care support; Mental health difficulties; An unseen disability, e.g. diabetes, epilepsy,

---

asthma; Autistic Spectrum Disorder; A specific learning difficulty; Multiple disabilities; Other disability), disabled student allowance (No known disability; Disabled - not in receipt; Disabled - in receipt; Disabled - Missing), gender, and socio-economic background.

<sup>5</sup> Socio-economic classification is the socio-economic background of students aged 21 and over at the start of their programme, or for students under 21 the socio-economic background of their parent, step-parent or guardian who earns the most. It is based on occupation, and if the parent or guardian is retired or unemployed, this is based on their most recent occupation. The classification is as follows:

1. Higher managerial & professional occupations;
2. Lower managerial & professional occupations;
3. Intermediate occupations
4. Small employers & own account workers;
5. Lower supervisory & technical occupations;
6. Semi-routine occupations;
7. Routine occupations;
8. Never worked & long-term unemployed;
9. 'Not classified' includes 3 categories: students, occupations not stated or inadequately described, and not classifiable for other reasons.

<sup>6</sup> Reassuringly, socio-economic classification is missing for an almost identical percentage of male UGs (23.6%) and female UGs (24.2%).

<sup>7</sup> Reassuringly, UCAS tariff is missing for a similar percentage of male (27.5%) and female UGs (25.2%).

<sup>8</sup> Males are more likely than females to achieve a First in all 5 years.

<sup>9</sup> Males are less likely than females to achieve at least a 2:1 in 4 out of the 5 years.

<sup>10</sup> These are the estimated marginal effects from probit regressions of the three dependent variables (achieving a First, achieving at least a 2:1, and not passing) on the following independent variables: gender, age (Mature/Young), ethnicity (All white; All black; Asian/Asian British; Chinese & other Asian; All mixed; Other; Information refused), disability (No known disability; Blind/partially sighted; Deaf/hearing impairment; Wheelchair user/mobility difficulties; Personal care support; Mental health difficulties; An unseen disability, e.g. diabetes, epilepsy, asthma; Autistic Spectrum Disorder; A specific learning difficulty; Multiple disabilities; Other disability), disabled student allowance (No known disability; Disabled - not in receipt; Disabled - in receipt; Disabled - Missing), and socio-economic background.

---

<sup>11</sup> In particular, the mean UCAS tariff is 367 for White UGs and 358 for BME UGs. This difference in means (9.5 points) is statistically significant at the 10% level. The standard deviation of UCAS tariff is 103 points. UCAS tariff is missing for 579 (26.2%) of the 2,208 UGs. A slight concern for this analysis is that it is missing for a higher percentage of White UGs (30.8%) than BME UGs (21.2%).

<sup>12</sup> Socio-economic classification is missing for 529 (24.0%) of 2,208 UGs. A slight concern for this analysis is that it is missing for a higher percentage of BME UGs (27.4%) than White UGs (19.5%).

<sup>13</sup> These are the estimated marginal effects from probit regressions of the three dependent variables (achieving a First, achieving at least a 2:1, and not passing) on the following independent variables: ethnicity (White; BME; Information refused), gender, age (Mature/Young), disability (No known disability; Blind/partially sighted; Deaf/hearing impairment; Wheelchair user/mobility difficulties; Personal care support; Mental health difficulties; An unseen disability, e.g. diabetes, epilepsy, asthma; Autistic Spectrum Disorder; A specific learning difficulty; Multiple disabilities; Other disability), disabled student allowance (No known disability; Disabled - not in receipt; Disabled - in receipt; Disabled - Missing), socio-economic background, and UCAS tariff.

<sup>14</sup> The standard deviation of UCAS tariff is 103 points. UCAS tariff is missing for 579 (26.2%) of the 2,208 UGs. A slight concern for this analysis is that the percentage of UGs missing UCAS tariff varies across ethnic groups: it is missing for 31% of All White, 22% of All Black, 14% of Indian, Pakistani & Bangladeshi, 25% of Chinese & other Asian, 27% of All Mixed and 29% of Other UGs.

<sup>15</sup> The difference between White UGs and other ethnic groups in socio-economic background rank is statistically significantly at the 1% level for all ethnic groups (except Mixed). Socio-economic background is missing for 529 (24.0%) of 2,208 UGs. A slight concern for this analysis is that the percentage of UGs missing socio-economic background varies across ethnic groups: it is missing for 20% of All White, 31% of All Black, 29% of Indian, Pakistani & Bangladeshi, 27% of Chinese & other Asian, 19% of All Mixed and 36% of Other UGs.

<sup>16</sup> The difference between White UGs and other ethnic groups in the likelihood of being a Mature student is statistically significant at the 5% level (at least) for all ethnic groups, except Other, which is not even statistically significant at the 10% (the p-value from the Chi-squared test is 0.165 for this ethnic group).

<sup>17</sup> The difference between White UGs and other ethnic groups in the likelihood of being Disabled is statistically significant at the 10% level (at least) for all ethnic groups, except Other UGs. Actually, the p-value from the Chi-squared test is 0.103 for All Black UGs, but this is very close to statistically significant at the 10% level.

---

<sup>18</sup> The difference between White UGs and other ethnic groups in the likelihood of being Male is statistically significant at the 1% level for all ethnic groups, except Chinese and other Asian (the p-value from the Chi-squared test is 0.320 for this ethnic group).

<sup>19</sup> These (sample) differences between White UGs and other ethnic groups in the probability of having achieved at least a 2:1 are statistically significant at the 1% level for all ethnic groups. The (sample) differences between White UGs and other ethnic groups in the probability of having achieved a First are statistically significant at the 1% level for all ethnic groups, except Mixed UGs (the p-value from the Chi-squared test is 0.152 for this ethnic group). The (sample) differences between White UGs and other ethnic groups in the probability of having failed are statistically significant at the 1% level for both Black UGs and Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi UGs, but are not statistically significant, even at the 10% level, for the other ethnic groups.

<sup>20</sup> These are the estimated marginal effects from probit regressions of achieving at least a 2:1 (the dependent variable) on the following independent variables: ethnicity (White; Black; Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi; Chinese and other Asian; Mixed; Other; Information refused), gender, age (Mature/Young), disability (No known disability; Blind/partially sighted; Deaf/hearing impairment; Wheelchair user/mobility difficulties; Personal care support; Mental health difficulties; An unseen disability, e.g. diabetes, epilepsy, asthma; Autistic Spectrum Disorder; A specific learning difficulty; Multiple disabilities; Other disability), disabled student allowance (No known disability; Disabled - not in receipt; Disabled - in receipt; Disabled - Missing), socio-economic background, and UCAS tariff. These estimated marginal effects on the probability of having achieved at least a 2:1 are statistically significant at the 1% level for all ethnic groups, except Other UGs. The estimated marginal effects on the probability of having achieved a First (not reported here) are statistically significant at the 5% level (at least) for all ethnic groups. The estimated marginal effects on the probability of having failed (not reported here) are statistically significant at the 5% level (at least) for both Black UGs and Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi UGs, but are not statistically significant, even at the 10% level, for the other ethnic groups.

<sup>21</sup> Only 2 of the 2,208 UGs were missing data on Disability.

<sup>22</sup> In particular, the mean UCAS tariff is 337 for Disabled UGs and 365 for non-Disabled UGs. This difference in means (28.3 points) is statistically significant at the 1% level. The standard deviation of UCAS tariff is 103 points. UCAS tariff is missing for 579 (26.2%) of the 2,208 UGs. A slight concern for this analysis is that it is missing for a higher percentage of disabled UGs (32.2%) than non-disabled UGs (25.5%).

<sup>23</sup> Reassuringly, socio-economic classification is missing for a similar percentage of disabled UGs (22.5%) and non-disabled UGs (24.2%).

<sup>24</sup> Disabled UGs were less likely than non-Disabled UGs to have achieved a First in 4 out of 5 years. Moreover, they were less likely to have achieved at least a 2:1 and more likely to have failed in all 5 years.

<sup>25</sup> These are the estimated marginal effects from probit regressions of the three dependent variables (achieving a First, achieving at least a 2:1, and not passing) on the following independent variables: disability (Disabled; Not Disabled), gender, age (Mature/Young), ethnicity (All white; All black; Asian/Asian British; Chinese & other Asian; All mixed; Other; Information refused), and UCAS tariff.

<sup>26</sup> Based on probit regressions of the three dependent variables (achieving a First, achieving at least a 2:1, and not passing) on the following independent variables: disability (No known disability; Blind/partially sighted; Deaf/hearing impairment; Wheelchair user/mobility difficulties; Personal care support; Mental health difficulties; An unseen disability, e.g. diabetes, epilepsy, asthma; Autistic Spectrum Disorder; A specific learning difficulty; Multiple disabilities; Other disability), gender, age (Mature/Young), ethnicity (All white; All black; Asian/Asian British; Chinese & other Asian; All mixed; Other; Information refused), socio-economic background and UCAS tariff.

**Report on the work of the Equality & Diversity Committee**  
Spring Term 2013

Academic Board and Resources Planning Committee are asked to note the following report.

**Remit (excerpt from *the SOAS Standing Orders Annex X* document edition published April 2012)**

(iii) The Equality & Diversity Committee will have the following **terms of reference**

(a) To consider strategic planning and policy development matters relating to equality and diversity, and to make recommendations to Academic Board, Resources & Planning Committee and other committees as appropriate;

(b) To monitor the delivery of aspects of approved School strategy relating to equality and diversity, and to ensure that any additional monitoring required to enable the School to meet its legal obligations is carried out in a suitable and timely fashion.

**Summary of actions and reviews completed during the academic year**

The School's Diversity webpages at <http://www.soas.ac.uk/equalitydiversity/> include a range of reports and guidance on various topics.

The latest additions include:

The Annual Student Diversity Report 2011-12 [Parts 1-3, Feb 2013]

The Annual Staff Diversity Report 2011-12 [Feb 2013]

The SOAS Equal Pay Audit Report 2013 & its Executive Summary [Feb 2013]

Report to Academic Development Committee from the EDC concerning the ethnicity attainment gap [Oct 2012]

NSS 2012 Key Findings [Oct 2012]

NSS 2006 - 2011 May 2012 Disability breakdown [Oct 2012]

Guidance for students who are also parents [Sept 2012]

The **Annual Student Diversity Report 2010-11 [Parts 4-5 concerned with progression and withdrawal]** was due to be published in May 2012, there were some difficulties in obtaining the data, this should now be ready for publication in the Summer Term 2013 (priority was given to publication of the Report for 2011-12 which has been produced on time (Feb 2013)).

The ***Dignity at SOAS suite of policies & procedures*** are in place and operating well. We are including this policy in a review of complaints procedures in the current academic year and expect to have a revised draft of the policy & procedure for Equality & Diversity Committee in May 2013.

As required by the Equality Act (2010) SOAS published its one **Equality Objective** which is to complete the actions outlined in the Equality & Diversity sub-strategy, which was

approved by EDC on 21 Feb 2012. We have been publishing a range of monitoring data for some years. The Public Sector Equality Duty Working Group will meet shortly to consider what actions are appropriate for the next edition of the Equality & Diversity Sub-strategy.

## Data Monitoring

The School has established a routine of Annual Reports on Student and Staff diversity in the Spring and Summer Terms of each year. The reports include recruitment, retention and attainment, progression & withdrawal figures and reports on take up of staff training and number of formal grievances.

The School also produces occasional reports on specific aspects of the available student data. A recent example is a pair of reports to EDC on 19 February 2013 from Dr. Graham Hobbs concerning the academic achievement (in terms of degree classification) of students from various diversity groups (young / mature; disabled / not; various ethnicities; female/male) and various widening participation groups (e.g. from low participation neighbourhoods; state or private school; & socio-economic background).

The monitoring reports are considered by the Equality & Diversity Committee and the findings inform the development of strategic / action plans as appropriate. Once the committee has met, these reports can be found at [www.soas.ac.uk/equalitydiversity/reports](http://www.soas.ac.uk/equalitydiversity/reports)

## On-going work:

The EDC receives a report each term on progress against the current Equality & Diversity Sub-strategy.

The planned all-**staff training** days were held in September 2012 & January 2013, a further day is planned for 28 May 2013.

Efforts to embed explicit consideration of diversity issues in the course validation and review processes are on-going and will be followed by training for staff in their disciplines. Guidelines for academic staff who are developing course proposals and reviewing courses have been developed.

The EDC maintains its interest in improving internal communications and wishes to further encourage the development of various staff groups and forums (e.g. the BME staff group; the Bloomsbury LGBT Staff Group). The BME group undertook several events last year including some coaching around promotion applications. The leader of the BME staff group has taken on the additional role of Equality Officer within the local UCU branch and is attending Equality & Diversity Committee this year. There was a student-led inter-faith concert last year and plans are well in hand to repeat that in early 2013.

Under the new Equality Act **Equality Impact Assessments** have become known as **Equality Analyses** and their focus is on the outcome of the analysis, rather than the process by which it is achieved. EB agreed in April 2012 that in future SOAS EB & GB papers will have a cover sheet which includes a risk assessment and also an equality analysis – this is part of the School's effort to demonstrate due regard for the Equality Act. The Diversity Advisor will review these sheets on a regular basis.

## Equality & Diversity Sub-strategy

Report on progress Spring Term 2013 prepared by Deb Viney, Diversity Advisor

The Equality & Diversity sub-strategy objectives (agreed Feb 2012) are:	Specific Actions:	Progress: up to 08.02.2013
<p>COMMUNICATIONS: foster better two-way communication within the School.</p> <p><b>Objective 1.</b> Consider the development of a School-wide Forum for discussion of general and diversity issues. E.g. one such Forum could be a modification of the Director and Principal's new academic year address to permit more question &amp; answer time.</p> <p><b>Objective 2:</b> Create and maintain a network of Anti-harassment Contacts across the School who will provide a "listening ear" for any concerns about discrimination, harassment or victimization.</p>	<p>1.i. The Internal Communications Working Group will consider the development of a School-wide forum.</p> <p>1.ii. The Diversity Advisor will join the ICWG to ensure that diversity issues are considered in all of its work.</p> <p>2.i. The Diversity Advisor will run a publicity campaign for Anti-harassment Contacts &amp; Dignity at SOAS policy &amp; procedure.</p> <p>2.ii. The Anti-harassment contacts will collect anonymised data from the Contacts so that we can monitor annually the level of such complaints and publish this data in the annual diversity reports.</p>	<p>Diversity Advisor is a member of the ICWG and has requested that the idea of a School-wide forum is on the agenda for the next meeting. The ICWG has not met recently but in the interim a 'Staff Q&amp;As' section on the website is intended to enable a freer flow of questions and answers between staff and senior management. The first SOAS News Bulletin (to go out weekly from Feb 2013) should reduce all-staff emails and disseminate news of key decisions and developments more effectively.</p> <p>Posters and flyers were circulated during the summer term 2012 concerning the Dignity at SOAS procedures.</p>
<p>SOCIAL NETWORKS: continue to foster stronger social networks within the School and across the Bloomsbury Colleges.</p> <p><b>Objective 3.</b> Encourage and support the development of social networks within the School (e.g. BME and inter-faith groups).</p> <p><b>Objective 4.</b> Encourage and support the development of social networks across the Bloomsbury Colleges (e.g. the Bloomsbury LGBT group).</p>	<p>3. Each within-SOAS staff group to hold one meeting / event per term.</p> <p>4. Each Bloomsbury staff group to hold one meeting / event per term.</p>	<p>The BME staff group held three successful events during 2011-12, including the planned coaching sessions focussing on applying for promotion and career progression.</p> <p>The LGBT staff group did not meet during 2011-12 and need some attention as the SOAS contact person (Simon Button) has now left the School.</p>

<p><b>The Equality &amp; Diversity sub-strategy objectives (agreed Feb 2012) are:</b></p>	<p><b>Specific Actions:</b></p>	<p><b>Progress: up to 08.02.2013</b></p>
<p>HUMAN RESOURCES</p> <p><b>Objective 5:</b> Increase staff awareness of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the roles of the HR Manager with responsibility for equality &amp; diversity and the Diversity Advisor.</li> <li>b) The Equality Act and its implications</li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 6:</b> undertake actions identified from the annual staff diversity monitoring report.</p>	<p>5.i. Diversity Advisor and HR Manager will produce (by Sept 2012) website material and document(s) for inclusion in Staff Induction Pack which covers the Equality Act and details the roles of the HR Manager with responsibility for equality &amp; diversity and the Diversity Advisor.</p> <p>5.ii. Continue including equality issues in a range of training events including Recruitment &amp; Selection training.</p> <p>6. i. Conduct research to investigate why the proportion of successful applicants from BME backgrounds is far lower than the proportion of applicants from BME backgrounds.</p> <p>6.ii. Develop and roll out mentoring schemes for under-represented groups / grades.</p>	<p>The draft was sent to Staff Development by 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012, as agreed, however it was decided that it would be inappropriate to put more materials in the pack if they were not to be discussed. This was because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the School is moving to a web first policy and</li> <li>b) a number of other actions better address the early mention of equality responsibility to staff.</li> </ul> <p>For example: The Induction checklist for new starters has the Equality statement as one of the things that all staff should read.</p> <p>On the web page for new staff there are reminders about the Equality Overview as part of Orientation and a link to your page the equality &amp; diversity pages. The HR E&amp;D role is already mentioned in the HR presentation which participants receive.</p> <p>Additionally with the support of Equality Committee we are being much more rigorous about chasing staff up to attend the Equality Overview, even if they are unable to attend several sessions, and managers have been asked to encourage all their staff to attend which has led to a number of staff attending who are not new to SOAS.</p> <p>On-going. We had some discussions with two colleagues from Birkbeck about this research, but it was felt that their proposal was too labour intensive. The HR Manager and Diversity Advisor have agreed to undertake some analysis of the applications to a selection of posts during the next few months and to report back in the Autumn term 2013.</p> <p>The BME staff group specifically requested and undertook some coaching on promotion and career progression during 2011-12.</p> <p>The Staff Development Manager has put a paper to Executive Board concerning a new mentoring scheme for new &amp; continuing staff; it is expected this will be returned to EB with amendments by the end of Feb 2013.</p>

<p><b>STAFF INDUCTION and DEVELOPMENT:</b></p> <p><b>Objective 7:</b> Continue to offer a wide range of events which address equality issues in a variety of ways.</p>	<p>7.i. continue to encourage maximal participation in new staff induction sessions.</p> <p>7.ii. [link to QAA Institutional Review in March 2013] encourage all academic staff to attend disability equality training (e.g. by providing this during Faculty meetings).</p> <p>7.iii. continue to trial new training sessions on a variety of equality related topics.</p>	<p>The Staff Development Manager put papers to EDC for 15 May 2012 and 23 Oct 2012 specifically concerning attendance at Staff Orientation training.</p> <p>An email from the Chair of the Equality &amp; Diversity Committee was sent on [20.12.2012] to staff encouraging them to attend equality training and referring to the Institutional Audit.</p> <p>c) Recruitment and selection training: continues to have a high equality element. The Staff Development Manager and the new HR Manager with responsibility for Equality &amp; Diversity (who will start in March 2013) will discuss a 2 hour 'refresher' training for those who took the original training some time ago. The issue of getting staff on panels to attend the training (especially those in more senior positions or those with lots of experience) remains problematic.</p> <p>The HR Director has raised attendance by panel members at the DoPs meeting and by email, and this has led to an increase in attendance at the R&amp;S training course. There will be a Part 1 course specifically for senior managers in early March, and we will have completed 2 full programmes by then. This should raise our number of completions to around 136.</p>
--	---	---

The Equality & Diversity sub-strategy objectives (agreed Feb 2012) are:	Specific Actions:	Progress: up to 08.02.2013
<p>MARKETING / PUBLICITY</p> <p><b>Objective 8:</b> To adequately reflect the School's E &amp; D strategy within publicity, in particular corporate publications such as prospectus and the annual review.</p>	<p>8. Images used for Marketing will reflect the School's diversity in terms of ethnic groups, gender and disabled students (not confined to wheelchair users).</p>	<p>The School used a good range of individual photographs in the graduation celebrations for 2012.</p> <p>The Diversity Advisor has assisted the colleagues responsible for collating the prospectuses to contact some diverse students to feature in the photos and vignettes used in the Prospectuses.</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT INFORMATION / MONITORING:</p> <p><b>Objective 9.</b> Continue to publish annual student &amp; staff diversity reports, enhancing these as new data becomes available.</p>	<p>9.i. Extend the range of student data collected for the HESA return to include optional questions on religion, sexual orientation &amp; transgender status from September 2012.</p> <p>9.ii. Use the regular data cleansing exercises to encourage staff reporting in these categories and begin to include results in the Annual Diversity reports when the responses reach a suitable level.</p>	<p>It was not possible to change the student enrolment / registration forms for 2012-13. It may be possible to amend the EO data monitoring forms, however the Head of Planning is concerned about whether / how we can limit access to the data once it is collected.</p> <p>A data cleansing / update exercise for the staff data occurred in the week commencing 30<sup>th</sup> April 2012. Such requests are made on a fairly regular basis.</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT INFORMATION / MONITORING:</p> <p><b>Objective 10.</b> Ensure that analyses of student diversity variables from the routine statistical monitoring undertaken annually (see Annual Student Diversity Reports on the E &amp; D webpages) are made available to Faculties, so that such analyses can be included in the planning cycle and in any annual reports etc..</p>	<p>10. Diversity Advisor to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. request Faculty breakdown along with the other analyses in Spring term each year,</li> <li>ii. to include Faculty comparisons in the Annual Student Diversity Reports and</li> <li>iii. to pass on the data to the Faculties for their consideration.</li> </ul>	<p>The data has been made available to the Diversity Advisor; once the Annual report for the whole School is completed (Parts 1 &amp; 2 in Spring Term, Parts 3 &amp; 4 in the Summer term), then the analysis by Faculty can commence.</p>

<b>The Equality &amp; Diversity sub-strategy objectives (agreed Feb 2012) are:</b>	<b>Specific Actions:</b>	<b>Progress: up to 08.02.2013</b>
<p>MANAGEMENT INFORMATION / MONITORING:</p> <p><b>Objective 11.</b> Ensure that staff and student feedback reports show separately the responses of people from different diversity groups (in addition to overall statistics) and that these diversity analyses are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. used to inform planning and</li> <li>ii. resulting changes are fed back to students and staff</li> </ul> <p>(e.g. National Student Survey breakdowns; Staff Pulse Survey; Staff two / three-yearly survey)</p>	<p>11.i. The Planning Department will make some School &amp; Faculty diversity data available to Faculties in time for the planning round each year.</p> <p>11.ii. The Diversity Advisor will ensure that the diversity analyses of the NSS data (which become available each August) are reported to EDC in either the Autumn or Spring terms so that any comments from EDC can be forwarded to the Faculties for consideration in the Spring / Summer term each year.</p>	<p>Some data has been made available to Faculties.</p> <p>To be actioned from 2012-13.</p>
<p>DIVERSITY &amp; CURRICULUM: to recognise the inclusion of diversity issues in the curriculum.</p> <p><b>Objective 12:</b> to support the achievement of the objectives of the SOAS Learning &amp; Teaching strategy.</p>	<p><b>[Some examples of Objectives from the L&amp;T strategy]</b></p> <p>12.i. To develop innovative modes of assessment which value diverse forms of learning and enhance student engagement with learning opportunities.</p> <p>12.ii. To develop through training, workshops and consultation a broad portfolio of assessment methods reflecting the diversity of learning styles of students.</p> <p>12.iii. To ensure that curriculum design reflects equality of opportunity and diversity issues.</p>	<p>The Diversity Advisor was involved in the programme development process for several new programmes from 2011-12 onwards year and there is evidence that a wider range approaches to both teaching and assessment are being considered.</p> <p>The preparatory paperwork includes requests for such reflection.</p> <p>The Diversity Advisor has developed a guideline document for colleagues covering this matter.</p>

<p><b>The Equality &amp; Diversity sub-strategy objectives (draft Feb 2012) are:</b></p>	<p>Specific Actions:</p>	<p><b>Progress: up to 08.02.2013</b></p>
<p><b>Objective 13.</b> Demonstrate the consideration of diversity issues in the curriculum e.g. through the use of diversity data in programme approval and review processes; through identifying and disseminating good practice.</p>	<p>13. Recommend to LTQC consideration of the inclusion in the Periodic Programme Reviews discussion and analysis of the diversity breakdown of Faculty / Departmental student data.</p>	<p>To be actioned in 2012-13 once the data is available.</p>
<p>COMPLIANCE with equalities legislation:</p> <p><b>Objective 14.</b> Publish data as required; establish the School's Equality Objective(s) and update the School's published documentation as appropriate to maintain compliance with the legislation and other appropriate frameworks.</p> <p><b>Objective 15:</b> Develop mechanism(s) through which the School can demonstrate its due regard for the provisions of the Equality Act, including, where appropriate conduct of Equality Analyses.</p>	<p>14.i. Publish Annual Staff Diversity Report</p> <p>14.ii. Publish Annual Student Diversity Report</p> <p>14.iii. Publish Annual Equal Pay Audits</p> <p>14.iv. Publish other data and materials as appropriate.</p> <p>15.i. Diversity Advisor to report to EB &amp; GB on the implications of the Act.</p> <p>15.ii. EB &amp; GB to consider what mechanisms they will adopt to demonstrate due regard for the provisions of the Equality Act (e.g. possibly a cover sheet for all papers which would include risks, consideration of equality issues, etc.).</p> <p>15.iii. Other Committees to consider what mechanisms they need to adopt for this purpose.</p>	<p>These reports are now available at <a href="http://www.soas.ac.uk/equalitydiversity/reports">www.soas.ac.uk/equalitydiversity/reports</a> The 2011-12 data has been reported during the Spring term 2013 in the Annual Student &amp; Staff Diversity Reports, as is usual.</p> <p>EB &amp; GB have agreed to adopt the cover sheet process for EB &amp; GB papers. Diversity Advisor to review the cover sheets at regular intervals.</p>