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## Public Sector Equality Duty Report - 2021

All public sector organisations have a statutory obligation to publish equality data in order to meet the Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010). This data must be meaningful and relevant to the organisation and inform the development of its equality objectives.

## Diversity and Inclusion at St George's, University of London

We're proud of our diverse staff and student body and we're committed to creating a positive working and learning environment where all people are treated with dignity and respect.

St George's, University of London CORE Values:

Commitment - Working effectively and with dedication to perform to the highest standards. Being responsible and accountable for our choices and decisions.

Openness - Listening, treating each other fairly and honestly. Learning from experiences and reflecting on our choices and decisions.

Respect - Shaping an inclusive environment in which diversity is valued. Communicating openly and transparently.

Engagement - Participating in life at St George's and, through education and research, empowering our people to contribute to, influence and improve society and communities. Influencing effectively across the sectors in which we operate

## Our areas of focus 2021/22

- Continued progression of race equality work following our commitments to antiracism
- Introduction of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) strategy
- Evaluation and development of Fair Recruitment Specialist Initiative
- Development of Inclusive Education Framework
- Enhancement of EDI training offer (staff and students)
- Embedding equality analysis and equality impact assessments cross-organisationally
- Progression of disability inclusion support and provision
- Preparations for Athena SWAN Silver submission - July 2023


## PSED Data Report

This report is based on snapshot data on 31 July 2021 and shows establishment figures of 751. Our overall staff numbers have remained consistent, rising slightly each year, with a total number of 748 in 2020 and 734 in 2019.

Our staff are made up of academic staff who teach and/or conduct research, clinical staff who practice as healthcare professionals and also teach and/or conduct research within the university, technical staff and professional services and administration staff.

St George's partners with Kingston University to run the Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education. Staff in the Faculty work across Kingston and St George's, they are not captured in this data report as their records are kept by Kingston University HR department.

## A note on terminology

"BAME" is an acronym that stands for Black, Asian and minority ethnic. This term is currently widely used in analysis to explore and demonstrate differentials in relation to race and ethnicity. There are, however, widely recognised limitations and criticisms of this term due to the ways in which it groups together individuals from a diverse range of ethnic backgrounds. This grouping results in homogenisation and fails to acknowledge the differences between different groups.
There are instances however, where disaggregated numbers are too small for analysis and therefore this grouping provides the opportunity to indicate broad trends. This report uses "BAME" in consistency with Advance HE and the higher education sector. However, wherever possible, data is disaggregated beyond "BAME" with the aim of providing data which is as informative as possible.

In order to protect the identity of staff, figures have been adjusted based on the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) guidance. This strategy involves rounding all numbers to the nearest multiple of 5; therefore $0,1,2$ are rounded to 0 and 3,4 are rounded to 5 . This may affect overall staff total numbers in some tables.

Abbreviations<br>EDI - Equality, Diversity and Inclusion<br>EO - Education Operations<br>ESDO - Education Strategy and Development Office<br>HE - Higher Education<br>I\&I - Infection and Immunity<br>IMBE - Institute of Medical and Biomedical Education<br>MCS - Molecular and Clinical Sciences<br>PHRI - Population Health Research Institute<br>PNS - Prefer not to say<br>PSA - Professorial and Senior Administrative<br>PSS - Professional and Support Services<br>RO - Research Operations

## I. Staff Overall

St George's, University of London is made up of four academic institutes:

- Infection and Immunity Research Institute (I\&I)
- Institute of Medical and Biomedical Education (IMBE)
- Molecular \& Clinical Sciences Research Institute (MCS)
- Population Health Research Institute (PHRI)

I\&I, MCS and PHRI are research institutes whilst IMBE focuses on educational activities, including our medical, allied health, and biomedical programmes. Academic staff are split across these institutes as well as a small number of professional and support staff.

In addition to this, we have a number of departments and teams that are responsible for the management and support of these institutes and the University as a whole:

- Professional Services and Support Staff
- Research Operations
- Education Operations
- Education Strategy and Development Office

We also have a joint enterprise with Kingston University, the Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education. Staff within this Faculty are not included in this report, as their records are held within Kingston University.

The overall number of staff on 31 July 2020 was 751.

| Institute/Department | Count | \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Infection and Immunity Research Institute (I\&I) | 130 | $17 \%$ |
| Institute of Medical and Biomedical Education (IMBE) | 146 | $19 \%$ |
| Molecular \& Clinical Sciences Research Institute (MCS) | 92 | $12 \%$ |
| Population Health Research Institute (PHRI) | 41 | $5 \%$ |
| Research Operations | 26 | $3 \%$ |
| Education Strategy and Development Office | 29 | $4 \%$ |
| Education Operations | 52 | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ |
| Professional Services | 235 | $\mathbf{3 1 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

IMBE is the largest of our institutes, whilst PHRI is the smallest. The four academic institutes, as well as the Education Strategy and Development Office are comprised of both academic and professional services and support staff. A very small number of academic staff sit within Professional Services.

| Staff Role | Count | $\%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professional and Support Services Staff | 404 | $54 \%$ |  |  |
| Research Staff* | 86 | $11 \%$ |  |  |
| Teacher* $^{*}$ | 28 | $4 \%$ |  |  |
| Lecturer | 69 | $9 \%$ |  |  |
| Senior Lecturer | 71 | $9 \%$ |  |  |
| Reader | 35 | $5 \%$ |  |  |
| Professor | 58 | $8 \%$ |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |  |  |
| * Research Staff covers Research Fellows and Research Assistants |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ * Teacher covers Teaching Fellows and Problem Based Learning (PBL) Tutors |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

The majority of our academic staff are involved in both teaching and research, in roles such as Lecturers, Readers and Professors.

Professional and Support Staff incorporates all staff who work on non-academic contracts, this includes Research Operations staff, who support research within our four academic institutes and centrally; Education Operations staff, who support education and teaching; Education Strategy and Development Office staff, who support innovation and strategic direction of education; Institute Admin staff who support the academic institutes; and Professional Services staff, who work centrally across the university in a number of departments.

Professional Services and Support Staff make up the largest proportion of staff within the University (a small majority). This is in line with the Higher Education (HE) sector ${ }^{1}$. A breakdown of Professional and Support Staff is shown below.

| Staff Role | Count | \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Professional Services Staff | 231 | $57 \%$ |
| Research Operations | 26 | $6 \%$ |
| Education Operations | 52 | $13 \%$ |
| Education Strategy and Development Office | 21 | $5 \%$ |
| Institute Admin | 74 | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

The number of staff within Research Operations, Education Operations and the Education Strategy and Development Office have increased since last year, particularly for Education Operations. There has been a simultaneous reduction in staff numbers in Institute Admin and Professional Services. These changes are due to Research Operations, Education Operations and the Education Strategy and Development Office being relatively newly created areas at the University and a number of posts being restructured into these areas.

The majority of our staff are on non-clinical contracts, with $17 \%$ on clinical contracts. All clinical staff are within our four academic institutes. This is consistent with the previous year. Our staff who are on clinical contracts work across the University and the NHS and actively practice in their field. Their salaries are set by the NHS.

[^0]| Institute/Department | Clinical |  | Non-Clinical |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Infection and Immunity Research Institute | 41 | $32 \%$ | 89 | $68 \%$ | 130 |
| Institute of Medical and Biomedical Education | 41 | $28 \%$ | 105 | $72 \%$ | 146 |
| Molecular \& Clinical Sciences Research Institute | 37 | $40 \%$ | 55 | $60 \%$ | 92 |
| Population Health Research Institute | 10 | $24 \%$ | 31 | $76 \%$ | 41 |
| Research Operations | 0 | $0 \%$ | 26 | $100 \%$ | 26 |
| Education Operations | 0 | $0 \%$ | 39 | $100 \%$ | 29 |
| Education Strategy and Development Office | 0 | $0 \%$ | 52 | $100 \%$ | 52 |
| Professional Services | 0 | $0 \%$ | 235 | $100 \%$ | 235 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |



Figure 1 - Overall staff by institute or department and clinical status
A large proportion of our clinical staff work in the Molecular and Clinical Sciences Research Institute and Institute of Infection and Immunity. Across all areas, the majority of our staff are non-clinical.

| Staff Role | Clinical |  | Non-Clinical | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Professional and Support Services Staff | 5 | $1 \%$ | 399 | $99 \%$ | 404 |
| Research | 34 | $40 \%$ | 52 | $60 \%$ | 86 |
| Teacher | 8 | $29 \%$ | 20 | $71 \%$ | 28 |
| Lecturer | 18 | $26 \%$ | 51 | $74 \%$ | 69 |
| Senior Lecturer | 24 | $34 \%$ | 47 | $66 \%$ | 71 |
| Reader | 12 | $34 \%$ | 23 | $66 \%$ | 35 |
| Professor | 28 | $48 \%$ | 30 | $52 \%$ | 58 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |

[^1]

Figure 2 - Overall staff by staff role and clinical status

The highest proportion of clinical staff are Professors. 36\% of our Professors are on clinical contracts, this percentage has decreased significantly since the previous year when it was $52 \%$. We also have a significant percentage of clinical staff in research and teaching roles.

| Pay Scale | Count | \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| SGUL Professorial \& Senior Administrative | 48 | $6 \%$ |
| SGUL Pay Scale | 574 | $\mathbf{7 6 \%}$ |
| Clinical Pay Scale | 129 | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Our data shows that 622 members of our staff are on SGUL pay grades. This is consistent with the previous year. These are pay grades set by the university and include SGUL grades 1-8 and the Professorial and Senior Administrative (PSA) pay scale. The remaining 129 staff members are on clinical pay grades. This is very slightly higher than the previous year. The clinical pay grades are set by the NHS, St George's, University of London does not have control of these salaries.

## Pay Grades

A breakdown of staff by pay grade and scales is shown below, this demonstrates pay for all staff across the University.

## SGUL Salaried Staff

| Grade | Count | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| SGUL 1-3 | 22 | $4 \%$ |
| SGUL 4-5 | 172 | $28 \%$ |
| SGUL 6-7 | 291 | $47 \%$ |
| SGUL 8 | 89 | $14 \%$ |
| PSA | 48 | $8 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

The tables below show staff broken down by pay separately for academic and PSS staff.

## Academic Staff

| Grade | Count | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| SGUL 1-3 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| SGUL 4-5 | 11 | $3 \%$ |
| SGUL 6-7 | 110 | $32 \%$ |
| SGUL 8 | 71 | $20 \%$ |
| PSA | 31 | $9 \%$ |
| Clinical pay | 124 | $36 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

## Professional Services and Support Staff

| Grade | Count | \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| SGUL 1-3 | 22 | $5 \%$ |
| SGUL 4-5 | 161 | $40 \%$ |
| SGUL 6-7 | 181 | $45 \%$ |
| SGUL 8 | 18 | $4 \%$ |
| PSA | 17 | $4 \%$ |
| Clinical | 5 | $1 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

The data shows that, overall, academic staff are on higher salaries than PSS staff, this is in line with the HE sector. There are higher percentages of academic staff in grades SGUL 8 and PSA than PSS staff.

The majority of PSS staff are on grades 4-5 and 6-7. Advance HE's Staff Statistical Report 2020 finds that the majority of PSS staff are paid $£ 30,000$ or less ${ }^{2}$. This is not the case with our staff, as the majority are on grade 6-7 which is above this, however a significant proportion of our PSS staff are on grades $4-5$ for which the starting spine point is below $£ 30,000$.

Full time and part time staff


Figure 3 - Overall staff by contract mode
The majority of our staff work full time, however there is a significant proportion of staff who work part time, $26 \%$. This is consistent with previous years.

[^2]| Staff Role | Full Time |  | Part Time |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professional Services and Support Staff | 325 | 80\% | 79 | 20\% | 404 |
| Research Staff | 70 | 81\% | 16 | 19\% | 86 |
| Teacher | 5 | 17\% | 25 | 83\% | 30 |
| Lecturer | 36 | 52\% | 33 | 48\% | 69 |
| Senior Lecturer | 46 | 65\% | 25 | 35\% | 71 |
| Reader | 30 | 86\% | 5 | 14\% | 35 |
| Professor | 46 | 79\% | 12 | 21\% | 58 |
| Total | 558 | 74\% | 195 | 26\% | 753 |
| * Research Staff covers Research Fellows and Research Assistants <br> * Teacher covers Teaching Fellows and Problem Based Learning (PBL) Tutors |  |  |  |  |  |

A high proportion of our teaching staff work part time; this incorporates Teaching Fellows and Problem Based Learning (PBL) Tutors. There is also a significant proportion of staff across academic roles who work part time. Overall, staff in Professional and Support Staff roles are less likely to work part time than academic staff.

## Contract type



Figure 4 - Overall staff by contract type
The majority of our staff are on permanent contracts. However, the vast majority of our research staff are on fixed-term contracts; $92 \%$ of research staff and $34 \%$ of research support staff (counted within Professional Services and Support Staff) are on fixed-term contracts. This is in line with previous years and is impacted by grant funding being fixed term. There is also a substantial percentage of staff in Teacher and Lecturer roles who are on fixed-term contracts. In contrast, staff in Reader or Professor roles are less likely to be on fixed-term contracts, this reflects the nature of academic roles in the higher education sector.

| Staff Role | Permanent | Fixed Term | Total |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Professional Services and Support Staff | 331 | $82 \%$ | 73 | $18 \%$ | 404 |
| Research Staff | 7 | $8 \%$ | 79 | $92 \%$ | 86 |
| Teacher | 21 | $75 \%$ | 7 | $25 \%$ | 28 |
| Lecturer | 43 | $62 \%$ | 26 | $38 \%$ | 69 |
| Senior Lecturer | 64 | $90 \%$ | 7 | $10 \%$ | 71 |
| Reader | 35 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 35 |
| Professor | 55 | $95 \%$ | 5 | $5 \%$ | 60 |
| Total | 556 | $\mathbf{7 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 3}$ |
|  | *Research Staff covers Research Fellows and Research Assistants |  |  |  |  |
|  | * Teacher covers Teaching Fellows and Problem Based Learning (PBL) Tutors |  |  |  |  |

## II. Staff by Diversity Characteristics

## Overall staff by gender

| Female | 465 | $62 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Male | 286 | $38 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |



Figure 5 - Staff by gender

We have a higher percentage of female staff than male staff at $62 \%$, this is the case across each of our institutes and departments, this has been the case for many years. The percentage of female staff is higher than the sector average; the Advance HE 2020 Staff Statistical Report found that 54.6\% of staff working in UK HEls were female and $45.4 \%$ were male ${ }^{3}$.

| Institute/Department | Female |  | Male |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Infection and Immunity Research Institute | 80 | $62 \%$ | 50 | $38 \%$ | 130 |
| Institute of Medical and Biomedical Education | 94 | $64 \%$ | 52 | $36 \%$ | 146 |
| Molecular \& Clinical Sciences Research Institute | 45 | $49 \%$ | 47 | $51 \%$ | 92 |
| Population Health Research Institute | 26 | $63 \%$ | 15 | $37 \%$ | 41 |
| Research Operations | 16 | $62 \%$ | 10 | $38 \%$ | 26 |
| Education Strategy and Development Office | 22 | $76 \%$ | 7 | $24 \%$ | 29 |
| Education Operations | 39 | $75 \%$ | 13 | $25 \%$ | 52 |
| Professional Services | 143 | $61 \%$ | 92 | $39 \%$ | 235 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |

There is a significantly high percentage of female staff in our Education Strategy and Development Office and within Education Operations. This reflects the general trend of a higher number of women in teaching related roles (see below) which is in line with the Higher Education sector in general. The representation of male staff is highest in the Molecular and Clinical Sciences Institute.

[^3]

Figure 6 - Staff by gender and institute or department


Figure 7 - Staff by gender and clinical status

Male staff are more likely to be on clinical contracts than female staff, by $8 \%$. This difference is larger than the previous year, when the difference was $5 \%$.

| Staff Role | Female |  | Male |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professional Services and Support Staff | 267 | 66\% | 137 | 34\% | 404 |
| Research Staff | 54 | 63\% | 32 | 37\% | 86 |
| Teacher | 19 | 68\% | 9 | 32\% | 28 |
| Lecturer | 48 | 70\% | 21 | 30\% | 69 |
| Senior Lecturer | 37 | 52\% | 34 | 48\% | 71 |
| Reader | 17 | 49\% | 18 | 51\% | 35 |
| Professor | 23 | 40\% | 35 | 60\% | 58 |
| Total | 465 | 62\% | 286 | 38\% | 751 |
| * Research Staff covers Research Fell <br> * Teacher covers Teaching Fellows a | sased | tants <br> ing (PB) |  |  |  |



Figure 8 - Staff by gender and staff role
There is high representation of female staff among Professional and Support staff and in research staff who are often on fixed-term contracts. Furthermore, female staff are highly represented in Lecturer and Teacher roles; teaching fellows are teaching-only staff, Lecturers work across the 4 academic institutes.

The proportion of female staff decreases as the seniority of academic role increases, reducing significantly at Professor level. The representation of women at higher academic levels is increasing each year through successful promotions as well as through recruitment, reaching $40 \%$ in 2021. This is significantly higher than the sector average which is $24 \%$. We provide academic promotion workshops as well as a buddy system to support academic staff to successfully achieve promotion.

As a University we hold a Silver Athena SWAN award and are committed to improving gender equality at the institution. See our Athena SWAN webpages for more information.

Data on staff by pay grade and gender is explored below. This enables a breakdown by gender and grade of Professional and Support Staff roles.

| Grade | Female |  | Male |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SGUL 1-3 | 11 | $50 \%$ | 11 | $50 \%$ | 22 |
| SGUL 4-5 | 122 | $71 \%$ | 50 | $29 \%$ | 172 |
| SGUL 6-7 | 193 | $66 \%$ | 98 | $34 \%$ | 291 |
| SGUL 8 | 50 | $56 \%$ | 39 | $44 \%$ | 89 |
| PSA | 24 | $50 \%$ | 24 | $50 \%$ | 48 |
| Clinical | 65 | $50 \%$ | 64 | $50 \%$ | 129 |
| Total | 465 | $62 \%$ | 286 | $38 \%$ | 751 |



Figure 9 - Staff by gender and grade
Overall, female staff are overrepresented at SGUL grades 4-5 making up the majority of staff on these pay grades (71\%). These trends are in line with the sector, as found in the Advance HE Staff Statistical Report 2020 ${ }^{4}$. The breakdowns below show that the majority of roles at this grade are professional services and support roles.

Whilst there are vast differences in representation at SGUL grades 4-5 and 6-7, at the highest grades, SGUL 8 and PSA, the representation of women and men is much more balanced, it is 50:50 at the most senior level. This demonstrates the progress we have made at senior levels, but demonstrates that improvements are still needed at lower grades.

## Academic Staff

| Grade | Female | Female | Male | Male | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| SGUL 1-3 | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 |
| SGUL 4-5 | 10 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 11 |
| SGUL 6-7 | 76 | $69 \%$ | 34 | $31 \%$ | 110 |
| SGUL 8 | 39 | $55 \%$ | 32 | $45 \%$ | 71 |
| PSA | 13 | $42 \%$ | 18 | $58 \%$ | 31 |
| Clinical | 60 | $48 \%$ | 64 | $52 \%$ | 124 |
| Total | 198 | $\mathbf{5 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 6}$ |

Professional Services and Support Staff

| Grade | Female | Female | Male | Male | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| SGUL 1-3 | 11 | $50 \%$ | 11 | $50 \%$ | 22 |
| SGUL 4-5 | 112 | $70 \%$ | 49 | $30 \%$ | 161 |
| SGUL 6-7 | 117 | $65 \%$ | 64 | $35 \%$ | 181 |
| SGUL 8 | 11 | $61 \%$ | 7 | $39 \%$ | 18 |
| PSA | 11 | $65 \%$ | 6 | $35 \%$ | 17 |
| Clinical | 5 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 4}$ |

[^4]For academic staff, female staff are overrepresented at grades 4-5 and at grades 6-7 whilst there is a more equal representation of staff at grades 8 and Professorial and Senior Administrative (PSA) grades. This reflects the higher proportion of female staff in less senior academic roles.

For Professional Services and Support (PSS) Staff, the representation of female staff is more consistent across pay grades, with a good representation at senior levels. Over the last few years, the representation of female staff at SGUL 8 and PSA level has increased steadily. This is due to both recruitment of women at senior levels as well as increased successful promotion applications.

The high representation of female staff in our lower pay quartiles contributes significantly to our gender pay gap. Our Pay Gap Report is available on our website and includes information on our actions and work so far in this area.

| Gender | Full Time |  | Part Time |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Female | 319 | $68 \%$ | 146 | $31 \%$ | 465 |
| Male | 237 | $83 \%$ | 49 | $17 \%$ | 286 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 4} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |

Female staff are significantly more likely to be on part time contracts than male staff. This is in line with the sector average; the Advance HE Staff Statistical Report 2020 shows $17 \%$ difference in the percentage of male staff and female staff working full-time ${ }^{5}$, the difference in our figures is $14 \%$. We have seen a very slight increase in the percentage of male staff on part-time contracts over the last three years. Since the pandemic more staff, including men, are working flexibly, including remotely for a proportion of the week.

| Gender | Fixed Term |  | Permanent |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Female | 128 | $28 \%$ | 337 | $72 \%$ | 465 |
| Male | 67 | $23 \%$ | 219 | $77 \%$ | 286 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |

Female staff are more likely to be on fixed term contracts than male staff, by $8 \%$. This reflects the higher percentage of female staff in research roles which are often fixed term and linked to specific grants and projects. We have seen a very slight shift to more staff on permanent contracts than the previous few years. To reduce barriers at critical transition points, we provide bridging funding for early-career researchers on fixed-term contracts ( $60 \%$ female) whilst they pursue research grants. This looks to support our staff to pursue permanent roles and aims to address gaps and underrepresentation in the academic pipeline.

[^5]
## Overall staff by Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | Count | \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| BAME | 208 | $28 \%$ |
| White | 516 | $69 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 27 | $4 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |



Figure 10 - Staff by ethnicity (grouped)

| Ethnicity | Count | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Asian or Asian British | 88 | $42 \%$ |
| Black or Black British | 50 | $24 \%$ |
| Chinese | 24 | $12 \%$ |
| Mixed/Multiple ethnic background | 30 | $14 \%$ |
| Other ethnic background | 16 | $8 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

In order to protect the identity of staff, figures have been adjusted based on the HESA guidance. This strategy involves rounding all numbers to the nearest multiple of 5; therefore $0,1,2$ are rounded to 0 and 3,4 are rounded to 5. This may affect overall staff total numbers in some tables, particularly where 'BAME' is disaggregated.

The data above shows staff grouped within the category Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) as well as broken down by groups within this category. Our data groupings seek to align with the UK Census categorisation whereby Asian incorporates staff who have identified their background as Asian Bangladeshi, Asian Indian, Asian Pakistani or any other Asian background, note that Chinese is listed as a separate group. Black incorporates staff who identify their background as Black African, Black Caribbean or any other Black Background.

In July 2021, 28\% of our staff are from Black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds This is consistent with the previous two years. We have a small proportion of staff who choose not to declare their ethnic background, this has also remained consistent over the last few years.

When broken down by ethnic group, the data indicates the higher percentage of staff from Asian backgrounds in comparison to other groups; of our staff from minority ethnic backgrounds, $42 \%$ are from Asian backgrounds, $22 \%$ are from Black Caribbean and African backgrounds, $12 \%$ are from a Chinese background and $14 \%$ from a mixed heritage background.

The Advance HE data finds of those UK staff in the sector with known ethnicity, $10.3 \%$ identified as BAME. The same report finds a high proportion of BAME staff were from outside of the UK $(30.7 \% .)^{6}$. Our staff population has a significantly higher percentage of BAME staff than this sector average (+13\%). Furthermore, of our staff who identify as BAME, the vast majority are from within the UK, in contrast to the sector.

[^6]It is important to note, however, that there are persistent issues of underrepresentation of BAME staff within the higher education sector, particularly with regards to Black academics and senior leadership. Therefore, benchmarking against the sector as a whole has limitations.

| Ethnicity | British |  | EU | Non-EU |  | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Asian or Asian British | 71 | $81 \%$ | 4 | $5 \%$ | 13 | $15 \%$ | 88 |
| Black or Black British | 45 | $90 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 5 | $10 \%$ | 50 |
| Chinese | 16 | $67 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 8 | $33 \%$ | 24 |
| Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Background | 30 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 30 |
| Any Other Ethnic Group | 11 | $69 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 5 | $31 \%$ | 16 |
| White - English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British | 405 | $89 \%$ | 31 | $7 \%$ | 17 | $4 \%$ | 453 |
| Other White background | 17 | $27 \%$ | 37 | $59 \%$ | 9 | $14 \%$ | 63 |
| Prefer not to say | 19 | $70 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 8 | $30 \%$ | 27 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |

Across ethnicities, the significant majority of staff are from the UK, with the exception of staff who are from other White backgrounds i.e. not White British backgrounds.

St George's, University of London is situated in Tooting, London Borough of Wandsworth. According to the 2011 census, the population of Wandsworth was $28.6 \%$ BAME. Our BAME staff population of $28 \%$, is therefore reflective of the local area. However, it is worth noting that Wandsworth is less diverse than other boroughs in London and that Tooting is significantly more diverse than other areas of the Borough.

We are proud of our diverse staff community and seek to continue to increase this, recognising the huge and wide-ranging value diversity brings to an organisation. To support this, we pay close attention to our recruitment and selection, analysing applicants and appointments by individual characteristics on an annual basis. This analysis has demonstrated disparities and underrepresentation of staff from Black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds. As part of addressing this, we have introduced a Fair Recruitment Specialist initiative which increases representation on recruitment panels and in decision making.

| Institute/Department | BAME |  | White |  | Prefer not to say | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Infection and Immunity Research Institute | 39 | $30 \%$ | 85 | $65 \%$ | 6 | $5 \%$ | 130 |
| Institute of Medical and Biomedical Education | 44 | $30 \%$ | 98 | $67 \%$ | 5 | $3 \%$ | 147 |
| Molecular \& Clinical Sciences Research | 19 | $21 \%$ | 68 | $74 \%$ | 5 | $5 \%$ | 92 |
| Institute | 7 | $18 \%$ | 33 | $83 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 40 |
| Population Health Research Institute | 6 | $24 \%$ | 19 | $76 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 25 |
| Research Operations | 14 | $48 \%$ | 15 | $52 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 29 |
| Education Strategy and Development Office | 14 | $26 \%$ | 35 | $65 \%$ | 5 | $9 \%$ | 54 |
| Education Operations | 65 | $28 \%$ | 163 | $69 \%$ | 7 | $3 \%$ | 235 |
| Professional Services | $\mathbf{2 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 2}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 11 - Staff by institute or department and ethnicity (grouped)
The majority of institutes and departments have a similar, good representation of BAME staff which is close to the representation at organisational level (28\%). There is a significantly higher percentage representation of BAME staff within the Education Strategy and development office where the balance is close to 50:50. The Population Health Research Institute has significantly less BAME staff than other areas of the University, however the percentage of BAME is consistently increasing in this institute from 13\% in 2018 to 18\% in 2020.


Figure 12 - Staff by clinical status and ethnicity (grouped)


Figure 13 - Staff by clinical status and ethnicity (disaggregated)

The proportion of staff on clinical contracts is balanced across ethnicities when grouped as BAME (Figure 12). However, when disaggregated, the data shows a significant lack of representation of Black staff on clinical contracts as well as a considerably lower representation of staff from mixed/multiple ethnic backgrounds. Staff from Asian backgrounds and from ethnic groups not specifically listed ("any other ethnic group") have the highest representations of clinical staff. The salaries for our clinical staff are set by the NHS and not the University.

| Staff Role | BAME |  | White |  | Prefer not to say | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Professional Service and Support Staff | 123 | $30 \%$ | 267 | $66 \%$ | 14 | $3 \%$ | 404 |
| Research Staff | 26 | $30 \%$ | 57 | $66 \%$ | 3 | $3 \%$ | 86 |
| Teacher | 12 | $43 \%$ | 16 | $57 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 28 |
| Lecturer | 16 | $23 \%$ | 52 | $75 \%$ | 1 | $1 \%$ | 69 |
| Senior Lecturer | 19 | $27 \%$ | 48 | $68 \%$ | 4 | $6 \%$ | 71 |
| Reader | 6 | $17 \%$ | 26 | $74 \%$ | 3 | $9 \%$ | 35 |
| Professor | 6 | $10 \%$ | 50 | $86 \%$ | 2 | $3 \%$ | 58 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |

* Research Staff covers Research Fellows and Research Assistants
* Teacher covers Teaching Fellows and Problem Based Learning (PBL) Tutors


Figure 14 - Staff by staff role and ethnicity (grouped)

BAME staff are highly represented in Teaching roles, making up almost half of the staff in these roles at $43 \%$. BAME staff are also highly represented in Professional and Support Staff, and Research roles. In senior academic roles such as Reader and Professor, however, the representation of BAME staff is significantly lower.

The table below shows the representation of staff roles by ethnicity in more detail, disaggregating the BAME grouping. This data shows that for all ethnicities, the majority of staff sit within Professional Services and Support. However, Asian staff are well represented across staff roles, this is in part due to a larger number of staff within this group. In contrast, there is significantly low representation of staff from Black backgrounds outside of Professional Services and Support staff roles. This is also the case for staff from mixed/multiple ethnic backgrounds as well as from
additional ethnic backgrounds that are not specifically listed; with these groups it is important to note the low numbers of staff within these groups, some of which are rounded to zero following the HESA rounding approach as mentioned above.

| Staff Role | Asian/Asian British |  | Black/Black British |  | Chinese |  | Mixed/ Multiple ethnic background |  | Any other ethnic group |  | White |  | Prefer not to say |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professional <br> Services \& Support <br> Staff | 44 | 11\% | 41 | 10\% | 5 | 1\% | 23 | 6\% | 10 | 2\% | 267 | 66\% | 14 | 3\% | 404 |
| Research Staff | 13 | 15\% | 5 | 6\% |  | 8\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 57 | 66\% | 5 | 6\% | 87 |
| Teacher | 6 | 22\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 19\% | 16 | 59\% | 0 | 0\% | 27 |
| Lecturer | 8 | 12\% | 5 | 8\% | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 52 | 80\% | 0 | 0\% | 65 |
| Senior Lecturer | 8 | 12\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 9\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 48 | 72\% | 5 |  | 67 |
| Reader | 5 | 14\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 26 | 72\% | 5 | 14\% | 36 |
| Professor | 5 | 9\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 50 | 91\% | 0 | 0\% | 55 |
| Total | 89 | 12\% | 51 | 7\% |  |  | 23 | 3\% | 15 | 2\% | 516 | 70\% | 29 | 4\% | 741 |

* Research Staff covers Research Fellows and Research Assistants
* Teacher covers Teaching Fellows and Problem Based Learning (PBL) Tutors

A breakdown of staff by ethnicity and grade is below, which enables a view of the representation of BAME staff in different grades and seniority.

| Ethnicity | SGUL 1-3 |  | SGUL 4-5 |  | SGUL 6-7 |  | SGUL 8 |  | PSA |  | Clinical |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BAME | 6 | 3\% | 63 | 30\% | 83 | 40\% | 19 | 9\% | 0 | 0\% | 36 | 17\% | 207 |
| White | 15 | 3\% | 103 | 20\% | 199 | 39\% | 65 | 13\% | 47 | 9\% | 87 | 17\% | 516 |
| Prefer not to say | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 23\% | 9 | 35\% | 5 | 19\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 23\% | 26 |
| Total | 21 | 3\% | 172 | 23\% | 291 | 39\% | 89 | 12\% | 47 | 6\% | 129 | 17\% | 749 |



Figure 13 - Staff by SGUL pay grade and ethnicity (grouped)

| Ethnicity | SGUL 1-3 |  | SGUL 4-5 |  | SGUL 6-7 |  | SGUL 8 |  | PSA |  | Clinical |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian/Asian British | 0 | 0\% | 23 | 27\% | 34 | 40\% | 6 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 23 | 27\% | 86 | 11\% |
| Black/Black British | 5 | 10\% | 22 | 43\% | 19 | 37\% | 5 | 10\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 51 | 7\% |
| Chinese | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 12 | 55\% | 5 | 23\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 23\% | 22 | 3\% |
| Mixed/Multiple ethnic background | 0 | 0\% | 9 | 27\% | 14 | 42\% | 5 | 15\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 15\% | 33 | 4\% |
| Any other ethnic group | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 41\% | 5 | 29\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 29\% | 17 | 2\% |
| White | 15 | 3\% | 103 | 20\% | 199 | 39\% | 65 | 13\% | 47 | 9\% | 87 | 17\% | 516 | 69\% |
| Prefer not to say | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 23\% | 9 | 35\% | 5 | 19\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 23\% | 26 | 3\% |
| Total | 20 | 3\% | 170 | 23\% | 292 | 39\% | 91 | 12\% |  | 6\% | 131 | 17\% | 751 | 100\% |

When broken down by ethnicity, the data shows a higher representation of Black staff and staff from "any other ethnic group" on pay grades SGUL 4-5 in comparison to Asian staff and White staff in particular.

At grades SGUL 6-7 and SGUL 8 there is a better range of representation by ethnicity, for SGUL 6-7 this is likely because this is the pay grade with the largest number of staff. At Professorial and Senior Administrative (PSA) pay grade, there is a lack of representation of staff from Black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds. As explored above, the representation on Clinical pay scales varies in terms of ethnic background with a significant lack of representation of Black staff.

These factors impact on our ethnicity pay gap. We have been reporting on our ethnicity pay gap since 2019. More information can be found in our most recent pay gap report.

## Academic Staff Only

| Ethnicity | SGUL 1-3 |  | SGUL 4-5 |  | SGUL 6-7 |  | SGUL 8 |  | PSA |  | Clinical |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BAME | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 6\% | 31 | 36\% | 14 | 16\% | 0 | 0\% | 35 | 41\% | 85 |
| White | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 3\% | 77 | 31\% | 52 | 21\% | 30 | 12\% | 83 | 33\% | 249 |
| Prefer not to say | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 45\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 55\% | 11 |
| Total | 0 | 0\% | 12 | 3\% | 108 | 31\% | 71 | 21\% | 30 | 9\% | 124 | 36\% | 345 |

## Professional Services and Support Staff Only

| Ethnicity | SGUL 1-3 |  | SGUL 4-5 |  | SGUL 6-7 |  | SGUL 8 |  | PSA |  | Clinical |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BAME | 6 | 5\% | 59 | 48\% | 52 | 43\% | 5 | 4\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 122 |
| White | 15 | 6\% | 96 | 36\% | 122 | 46\% | 13 | 5\% | 17 | 6\% | 5 |  | 268 |
| Prefer not to say | 0 | 7\% | 6 | 46\% | 7 | 54\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |  | 13 |
| Total | 21 | 5\% | 161 | 40\% | 181 | 45\% | 18 | 4\% | 17 | 4\% | 5 | 1\% | 403 |

For academic staff, there is a good level of representation across ethnicities at grades SGUL 4-5 and SGUL 6-7. However, at higher grades the representation of BAME staff reduces, with a significant lack of representation at PSA level.

For professional services and support staff (PSS), there is an overrepresentation of staff from Black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds at SGUL grades 4-5 in comparison to staff from White backgrounds. Representation of staff across ethnicities is more balanced at grades SGUL 6-7 and SGUL 8. Similar to academic staff, there is an underrepresentation of PSS staff from Black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds at PSA level.

When separated by academic and professional services and support, staff numbers are not disaggregated further than the BAME grouping due to small numbers.

| Ethnicity | Full Time |  | Part Time |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| BAME | 154 | $74 \%$ | 54 | $26 \%$ | 208 |
| White | 382 | $74 \%$ | 134 | $26 \%$ | 516 |
| Prefer not to say | 20 | $74 \%$ | 7 | $26 \%$ | 27 |
| Total | 556 | $\mathbf{7 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |

There is no difference in the proportion of staff working full time and part time when broken down by ethnicity.

| Ethnicity | Permanent |  | Fixed Term |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| BAME | 142 | $68 \%$ | 66 | $32 \%$ | 208 |
| White | 394 | $76 \%$ | 122 | $24 \%$ | 516 |
| Prefer not to say | 20 | $74 \%$ | 7 | $26 \%$ | 27 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |


| Ethnicity | Permanent | Fixed Term | Total |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Asian | 56 | $64 \%$ | 32 | $36 \%$ | 88 |
| Black | 43 | $86 \%$ | 7 | $14 \%$ | 50 |
| Chinese | 10 | $42 \%$ | 14 | $58 \%$ | 24 |
| Mixed | 23 | $77 \%$ | 7 | $23 \%$ | 30 |
| Any other ethnic group | 10 | $63 \%$ | 6 | $38 \%$ | 16 |
| White | 394 | $76 \%$ | 122 | $24 \%$ | 516 |
| Prefer not to say | 20 | $74 \%$ | 7 | $26 \%$ | 27 |
| Total | 556 | $\mathbf{7 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |

In general, white staff are slightly more likely to be on permanent contracts than BAME staff. When disaggregated, however, the data shows that Chinese staff in particular, as well as Asian staff and staff of ethnic backgrounds not listed ("any other ethnic group") have high percentages of fixed term staff. In contrast, the majority of Black staff are on permanent contracts, this reflects the lack of representation of Black staff on academic staff, which are more likely fixed term.

The differentials evident in the data above demonstrate a persistent underrepresentation of Black, Asian and minority ethnic staff in senior roles. St George's is committed to addressing the barriers
leading to underrepresentation and differential experiences. As previously mentioned, we have introduced the Fair Recruitment Specialist initiative to try to improve our recruitment outcomes. We also participate in the B-MEntor scheme and provide additional development offers. We deliver a number of training courses which seek to educate staff on these issues, fostering engagement and shared ownership in improving racial equality across the organisation, for example our Talk and Transform Workshop series. In addition, we have undertaken an institutional review of race equality, which has created an action plan for further improvement. Our Pay Gap Working Group is also concentrating on the ethnicity pay gap.

## Overall staff by gender and ethnicity

In order to protect the identity of staff, figures have been adjusted based on the HESA guidance. This strategy involves rounding all numbers to the nearest multiple of 5; therefore $0,1,2$ are rounded to 0 and 3,4 are rounded to 5 . This may affect overall staff total numbers in some tables.

| Gender | Female |  | Male |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| BAME | 134 | $64 \%$ | 74 | $36 \%$ | 208 |
| White | 320 | $62 \%$ | 196 | $38 \%$ | 516 |
| Prefer not to say | 11 | $41 \%$ | 16 | $59 \%$ | 27 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |



Figure 14 - Staff by gender and ethnicity (grouped)

We have a slightly higher proportion of female BAME staff than male BAME staff. This higher proportion of women is in line with the overall gender balance at the University. It is worth noting, however, that a higher percentage of male staff chose not to declare their ethnicity than female staff and the percentage of White staff is consistent across genders. Since the previous year, the representation of staff by ethnicity and gender has remained consistent with very marginal fluctuations in numbers which are consistent with usual staff changes over a one-year period.

In contrast to our data, the Advance HE 2020 Staff Statistical Report finds that a higher proportion of male staff in the sector were from BAME backgrounds than female staff ( $15.6 \%$ compared with $13.6 \%$ of female staff).

| Ethnicity | Female |  | Male |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Asian or Asian British | 54 | $61 \%$ | 34 | $39 \%$ | 88 |
| Black or Black British | 34 | $68 \%$ | 16 | $32 \%$ | 50 |
| Chinese | 13 | $54 \%$ | 11 | $46 \%$ | 24 |
| Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Background | 18 | $60 \%$ | 12 | $40 \%$ | 30 |
| Any Other Ethnic Group | 15 | $94 \%$ | 1 | $6 \%$ | 16 |
| White | 320 | $62 \%$ | 196 | $38 \%$ | 516 |
| Prefer not to say | 11 | $41 \%$ | 16 | $59 \%$ | 27 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |


| Institute/Department | Female |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BAME |  | White |  | Prefer not to say |  |  |
| Infection and Immunity Research Institute (I\&I) | 25 | 32\% | 53 | 69\% | 0 | 0\% | 78 |
| Institute of Medical and Biomedical Education (IMBE) | 28 | 29\% | 62 | 65\% | 5 | 5\% | 95 |
| Molecular \& Clinical Sciences Research Institute (MCS) | 9 | 21\% | 34 | 79\% | 0 | 0\% | 43 |
| Population Health Research Institute (PHRI) | 5 | 19\% | 22 | 81\% | 0 | 0\% | 27 |
| Research Operations (RO) | 5 | 28\% | 13 | 72\% | 0 | 0\% | 18 |
| Education Strategy and Development Office (ESDO) | 10 | 45\% | 12 | 55\% | 0 | 0\% | 22 |
| Education Operations (EO) | 8 | 22\% | 29 | 78\% | 0 | 0\% | 37 |
| Professional Services (PS) | 47 | 33\% | 95 | 66\% | 0 | 0\% | 142 |
| Total | 137 | 30\% | 320 | 69\% | 5 | 1\% | 462 |


| Institute/Department | Male |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BAME |  | White |  | Prefer not to say |  |  |
| Infection and Immunity Research Institute (I\&I) | 14 | 27\% | 32 | 63\% | 5 | 10\% | 51 |
| Institute of Medical and Biomedical Education (IMBE) | 16 | 31\% | 36 | 69\% | 0 | 0\% | 52 |
| Molecular \& Clinical Sciences Research Institute (MCS) | 10 | 20\% | 34 | 69\% | 5 | 10\% | 49 |
| Population Health Research Institute (PHRI) | 5 | 31\% | 11 | 69\% | 0 | 0\% | 16 |
| Research Operations (RO) | 5 | 45\% | 6 | 55\% | 0 | 0\% | 11 |
| Education Strategy and Development Office (ESDO) | 5 | 50\% | 5 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 10 |
| Education Operations (EO) | 6 | 50\% | 6 | 50\% | 0 | 0\% | 12 |
| Professional Services (PS) | 18 | 20\% | 68 | 74\% | 6 | 7\% | 92 |
| Total | 79 | 27\% | 198 | 68\% | 16 | 6\% | 293 |

Whilst IMBE, I\&I and PHRI had the highest representations of female staff overall, when broken down by gender and ethnicity, the higher representation of female BAME staff is within Professional and Support Services and in Education Strategy and Development Office. Overall female BAME staff are relatively evenly represented across the institutes and departments, with the lowest representation in PHRI, which aligns with the findings in the analysis on ethnicity overall.

The representation of Male BAME staff however is much more variable. This could be slightly impacted by the lower number of male BAME staff overall. Male BAME staff are highly represented in Research Operations, however it is important to recognise the overall numbers in this department are very small. They are also well represented in IMBE. In the last year, the representation of male BAME staff in Education Operations and in the Education Strategy and Development Office has significantly improved. These departments have a small number of staff and therefore a small number of changes impact significantly on percentage representation. However, this is positive and encouraging to see and we hope to maintain this.


Figure 15 - Staff by institute/department and gender and ethnicity (grouped)


Figure 16 - Staff by clinical status and gender and ethnicity (grouped)

Overall, male staff are more likely to be on clinical contracts than female staff across genders, however this difference is more significant within BAME staff, with a larger percentage of BAME male clinical staff (27\%) than white male clinical staff (21\%). As noted in the section above, the majority of BAME clinical staff are from Asian backgrounds

| Staff role | Female |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BAME |  | White |  | Prefer not to say |  |  |
| Professional Service and Support Staff | 85 | $32 \%$ | 177 | $66 \%$ | 5 | $2 \%$ | 267 |
| Research Staff | 14 | $26 \%$ | 40 | $74 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 54 |
| Teacher | 10 | $53 \%$ | 9 | $47 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 19 |
| Lecturer | 11 | $23 \%$ | 36 | $77 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 47 |
| Senior Lecturer | 8 | $21 \%$ | 26 | $67 \%$ | 5 | $13 \%$ | 39 |
| Reader | 5 | $29 \%$ | 12 | $71 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 17 |
| Professor | 0 | $0 \%$ | 20 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 20 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 9} \%$ | $\mathbf{3 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 3}$ |


| Staff role | Male |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | BAME |  | White |  | Prefer not to <br> say |  |  |
| Professional Service and Support Staff | 38 | $28 \%$ | 90 | $66 \%$ | 9 | $7 \%$ | 137 |
| Research Staff | 12 | $35 \%$ | 17 | $50 \%$ | 5 | $15 \%$ | 34 |
| Teacher | 0 | $0 \%$ | 7 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 7 |
| Lecturer | 5 | $24 \%$ | 16 | $76 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 21 |
| Senior Lecturer | 11 | $33 \%$ | 22 | $67 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 33 |
| Reader | 0 | $0 \%$ | 14 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 14 |
| Professor | 5 | $14 \%$ | 30 | $86 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 35 |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 5} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{5} \%$ | $\mathbf{2 8 1}$ |

* Research Staff covers Research Fellows and Research Assistants
* Teacher covers Teaching Fellows and Problem Based Learning (PBL) Tutors


Figure 17 - Staff by staff role and gender and ethnicity (grouped)

When staff role is split by ethnicity and gender, we can see that all Black, Asian and minority ethnic Teachers (staff who are Teaching Fellows or Problem Based Learning Tutors) are female.
Furthermore, we see significantly less representation of BAME female staff in Professorial roles, all are male. There is, however, a small number of BAME female Readers which demonstrates a positive pipeline emerging. Representation is balanced by gender and ethnicity for Professional Services and Support staff and staff in Lecturer roles.

| Pay grade | Female |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | BAME |  | White |  | Prefer not to say |  |  |
| SGUL 1-3 | 5 | $38 \%$ | 8 | $62 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 120 |
| SGUL 4-5 | 47 | $39 \%$ | 73 | $61 \%$ | 0 | $3 \%$ | 195 |
| SGUL 6-7 | 55 | $28 \%$ | 135 | $69 \%$ | 5 | $10 \%$ | 52 |
| SGUL 8 | 12 | $23 \%$ | 35 | $67 \%$ | 5 | $0 \%$ | 23 |
| PSA | 0 | $0 \%$ | 23 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $7 \%$ | 67 |
| Clinical | 16 | $24 \%$ | 46 | $69 \%$ | 5 | $\mathbf{3} \%$ | $\mathbf{4 7 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 9} \%$ | $\mathbf{3 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ |  |  |


| Pay grade | Male |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | BAME |  | White |  | Prefer not to say |  |  |
| SGUL 1-3 | 5 | $42 \%$ | 7 | $58 \%$ | 0 |  | $0 \%$ | 12 |
| SGUL 4-5 | 16 | $31 \%$ | 30 | $59 \%$ | 5 | $10 \%$ | 51 |
| SGUL 6-7 | 28 | $29 \%$ | 64 | $65 \%$ | 6 | $6 \%$ | 98 |
| SGUL 8 | 7 | $19 \%$ | 30 | $81 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 37 |
| PSA | 0 | $0 \%$ | 24 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 24 |
| Clinical | 20 | $30 \%$ | 41 | $62 \%$ | 5 | $8 \%$ | 66 |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 6} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{6} \%$ | $\mathbf{2 8 8}$ |

The data above and in Figure 18 below demonstrate the representation of staff on different pay grades by gender and ethnicity. Data is not disaggregated beyond BAME due to small numbers. The differences in pay representation by ethnicity are not largely different across male and female staff.


Figure 18 - Staff by pay grade and gender and ethnicity (grouped)

| Contract Type | Female |  |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | Permanent |  | Fixed Term |  |  |
| BAME | 95 | $71 \%$ | 39 | $29 \%$ | 134 |
| White | 233 | $73 \%$ | 87 | $27 \%$ | 320 |
| Prefer not to say | 9 | $82 \%$ | 2 | $18 \%$ | 11 |
| Total | 337 | $72 \%$ | 128 | $28 \%$ | 465 |


| Contract Type | Male |  |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | Permanent |  | Fixed Term |  |  |
| BAME | 47 | $64 \%$ | 27 | $36 \%$ | 74 |
| White | 161 | $82 \%$ | 35 | $18 \%$ | 196 |
| Prefer not to say | 11 | $69 \%$ | 5 | $31 \%$ | 16 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 6}$ |

The data on contract type demonstrates differences between ethnicities and across genders. For female staff, the representation of White and BAME staff on both permanent and fixed-term contracts is balanced. However, for male staff, there is a large difference in contract type by ethnicity, with male BAME staff being less likely than male White staff to be on permanent contracts. This may be explained by the higher proportion of BAME men in research roles, which are often fixed-term due to being linked to projects and grant funding.

| Contract Type | Female |  |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | Permanent |  | Fixed Term |  |  |
| Asian | 37 | $69 \%$ | 17 | $31 \%$ | 54 |
| Black | 29 | $85 \%$ | 5 | $15 \%$ | 34 |
| Chinese | 5 | $38 \%$ | 8 | $62 \%$ | 13 |
| Mixed | 15 | $75 \%$ | 5 | $25 \%$ | 20 |
| Any other ethnic group | 9 | $60 \%$ | 6 | $40 \%$ | 15 |
| White | 233 | $73 \%$ | 87 | $27 \%$ | 320 |
| Prefer not to say | 9 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 9 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 5}$ |


| Contract Type | Male |  |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | Permanent |  | Fixed Term |  |  |
| Asian | 19 | $56 \%$ | 15 | $44 \%$ | 34 |
| Black | 14 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 14 |
| Chinese | 5 | $45 \%$ | 6 | $55 \%$ | 11 |
| Mixed | 8 | $62 \%$ | 5 | $38 \%$ | 13 |
| Any other ethnic group | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 |
| White | 161 | $82 \%$ | 35 | $18 \%$ | 196 |
| Prefer not to say | 11 | $69 \%$ | 5 | $31 \%$ | 16 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 4}$ |

BAME is disaggregated in the tables above, demonstrating the differences between Black, Asian and minority ethnic groups. For example, Black staff across both genders are more likely to be on permanent contracts than any other ethnic groups. This may be linked to the underrepresentation of Black staff in academic roles. Staff from Chinese and Asian backgrounds are less likely to be on permanent contracts than staff from other groups, this is the case across genders. This is likely due
to the higher representation of staff from these backgrounds in academic roles, particularly in research and teaching (teaching fellows and PBL tutor roles).

## Contract Type

| Contract Type | Female |  |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | Full Time |  | Part Time |  |  |
| BAME | 60 | $60 \%$ | 40 | $40 \%$ | 100 |
| White | 164 | $62 \%$ | 102 | $38 \%$ | 266 |
| Prefer not to say | 13 | $72 \%$ | 5 | $28 \%$ | 18 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 4}$ |


| Contract Type | Male |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | Full Time |  | Part Time |  | Total |
| BAME | 60 | $81 \%$ | 14 | $19 \%$ | 74 |
| White | 164 | $84 \%$ | 32 | $16 \%$ | 196 |
| Prefer not to say | 13 | $72 \%$ | 5 | $28 \%$ | 18 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 8}$ |

There are no significant differences in staff working full time or part time when split by gender and ethnicity. Across groups, the majority work full time. As explored above, the most significant trend is the higher number of women working part-time than men, this remains true across ethnicities.

| Contract Type | Female |  |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | Full Time |  | Part Time |  |  |
| Asian | 25 | $57 \%$ | 19 | $43 \%$ | 44 |
| Black | 16 | $62 \%$ | 10 | $38 \%$ | 26 |
| Chinese | 8 | $62 \%$ | 5 | $38 \%$ | 13 |
| Mixed | 10 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 10 |
| Any other ethnic group | 0 | $0 \%$ | 5 | $100 \%$ | 5 |
| White | 164 | $62 \%$ | 102 | $38 \%$ | 266 |
| Prefer not to say | 13 | $72 \%$ | 5 | $28 \%$ | 18 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 2}$ |


| Contract Type | Male |  |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | Full Time |  | Part Time |  |  |
| Asian | 25 | $74 \%$ | 9 | $26 \%$ | 34 |
| Black | 16 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 16 |
| Chinese | 8 | $62 \%$ | 5 | $38 \%$ | 13 |
| Mixed | 10 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 10 |
| Any other ethnic group | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 |
| White | 164 | $84 \%$ | 32 | $16 \%$ | 196 |
| Prefer not to say | 13 | $72 \%$ | 5 | $28 \%$ | 18 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 8} \%$ | $\mathbf{2 8 7}$ |

When disaggregated further by ethnicity, it is generally the groups with a higher number of staff who have more representation across both full-time and part-time. For female staff, there is more staff working part-time across all ethnicities than male staff, with the exception of Chinese staff where the representation is the same across genders.

## Overall staff by disability

In order to protect the identity of staff, figures have been adjusted based on the HESA guidance. This strategy involves rounding all numbers to the nearest multiple of 5; therefore $0,1,2$ are rounded to 0 and 3,4 are rounded to 5. This may affect overall staff total numbers in some tables.

| Disability | Count | \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Declared disability | 38 | $5 \%$ |
| No known disability | 680 | $91 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 33 | $4 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |



Figure 19 - Staff by disability

Overall, $5 \%$ of staff in 2021 declared a disability, consistent with previous years. This is in line with the sector average which is also $5 \%^{7}$. However, it is generally accepted that in reality the actual percentage of staff with disabilities across the UK will be higher and that rates of declaration tend to be low due to fears of stigma and discrimination. According to government statistics, around 18 per cent of the UK's workforce has a declared disability. ${ }^{8}$

In 2017 St George's joined the Disability Confident Scheme which requires employers to take various action to recruit and retain disabled people and people with health conditions for their skills and talent, creating a more inclusive workforce. We have renewed our Level 2 Disability Confident accreditation in 2021 and aim to enhance our support for staff with disabilities. Our Staff Disability Network launched in 2018 and has been providing ongoing support for disabled staff as well as working with the University to progress disability inclusion.

| Disability | Count | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| A long-standing illness or health condition | 16 | $2 \%$ |
| A mental health condition | 6 | $1 \%$ |
| A physical impairment or mobility issues | 5 | $1 \%$ |
| A specific or general learning difficulty | 8 | $1 \%$ |
| Deaf or serious hearing impairment | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| A disability, impairment or medical condition that is not listed above | 5 | $1 \%$ |
| No known disability | 680 | $91 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 33 | $\mathbf{4} \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

[^7]Looking at disabilities in more detail as shown in the table above, whilst overall numbers of declared disabilities is small, there is a range of different conditions. The most common is long-standing illness or health condition.

| Institute/Department | Declared Disability | No known <br> disability |  | Prefer not to <br> say | Total |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Infection and Immunity Research Institute | 5 | $4 \%$ | 125 | $96 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 130 |
| Institute of Medical and Biomedical Education | 9 | $6 \%$ | 133 | $90 \%$ | 5 | $3 \%$ | 147 |
| Molecular \& Clinical Sciences Research | 5 | $5 \%$ | 81 | $87 \%$ | 7 | $8 \%$ | 93 |
| Institute |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population Health Research Institute | 5 | $11 \%$ | 35 | $78 \%$ | 5 | $11 \%$ | 45 |
| Research Operations | 0 | $0 \%$ | 22 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 22 |
| Education Strategy \& Development Office | 0 | $0 \%$ | 27 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 27 |
| Education Operations | 5 | $9 \%$ | 46 | $82 \%$ | 5 | $9 \%$ | 56 |
| Professional Services and Support | 12 | $5 \%$ | 211 | $90 \%$ | 12 | $5 \%$ | 235 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | $5 \%$ | $\mathbf{6 8 0}$ | $90 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 4}$ | $5 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 5 5}$ |

When broken down by institutes and departments, the numbers of staff with a declared disability are very small and are unable to be included for some institutes/departments. This is particularly the case in the smaller institutes and departments. It is therefore difficult to draw any conclusions.


Figure 20 - Staff by Institute/Department and disability


Figure 21 - Staff by Clinical status and disability

The proportion of staff on a clinical contract with a declared disability is $7 \%$ lower than those without a declared disability. This is a marginally smaller gap than the previous year.

| Staff Role | Declared <br> Disability |  | No known <br> Disability |  | Prefer not to <br> say | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Professional Service and Support Staff | 23 | $6 \%$ | 360 | $89 \%$ | 21 | $5 \%$ | 404 |
| Research Staff | 5 | $6 \%$ | 79 | $89 \%$ | 5 | $6 \%$ | 89 |
| Teacher | 0 | $0 \%$ | 26 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 26 |
| Lecturer | 0 | $0 \%$ | 66 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 66 |
| Senior Lecturer | 5 | $7 \%$ | 63 | $86 \%$ | 5 | $7 \%$ | 73 |
| Reader | 5 | $14 \%$ | 30 | $86 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 35 |
| Professor | 0 | $0 \%$ | 56 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 56 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 9}$ |

> * Research Staff covers Research Fellows and Research Assistants
> $*$ Teacher covers Teaching Fellows and Problem Based Learning (PBL) Tutors


Figure 22 - Staff by staff role and disability

Staff with a declared disability are represented in the majority of roles across the University, most significantly at Reader level. This is in contrast to the previous year where there was no representation of disabled staff at this level. As the overall number of staff who have declared a
disability is small, slight changes in staffing can cause large percentage changes year on year. Despite this, it is positive to see an increase in representation at this senior level.

| Pay Grade | Declared Disability |  | No known disability | Prefer not to |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| SGUL $1-3$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 19 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 19 |
| SGUL $4-5$ | 17 | $10 \%$ | 147 | $85 \%$ | 8 | $5 \%$ | 172 |
| SGUL 6-7 | 10 | $3 \%$ | 267 | $92 \%$ | 14 | $5 \%$ | 291 |
| SGUL 8 | 6 | $7 \%$ | 79 | $88 \%$ | 5 | $6 \%$ | 90 |
| PSA | 0 | $0 \%$ | 47 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 47 |
| Clinical | 5 | $4 \%$ | 121 | $92 \%$ | 5 | $4 \%$ | 131 |
| Total | 38 | $5 \%$ | $\mathbf{6 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 0}$ |



Figure 23 - Staff by pay grade and disability
Staff with a declared disability are represented across SGUL pay grades but at a significantly higher rate in the grades 4 and 5 . This needs further exploration and understanding to address the causes of this. This year, we are introducing disability inclusion training for line managers, recognising the essential role they play in how a staff member is able to work alongside managing their disability/disabilities.

| Disability | Permanent |  | Fixed Term |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Declared disability | 28 | $74 \%$ | 10 | $26 \%$ | 38 |
| No known disability | 503 | $74 \%$ | 177 | $26 \%$ | 680 |
| Prefer not to say | 25 | $76 \%$ | 8 | $24 \%$ | 33 |
| Total | 556 | $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 8}$ |

There are no differentials in representations of staff by contract type and disability.

| Disability | Full Time | Full Time | Part Time | Part Time | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Declared disability | 25 | $66 \%$ | 13 | $34 \%$ | 38 |
| No known disability | 508 | $75 \%$ | 172 | $25 \%$ | 680 |
| Prefer not to say | 23 | $70 \%$ | 10 | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | 33 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 8}$ |

Staff with a declared disability are more likely to work part-time than those without a declared disability.

Over the last year, we have undertaken action to better understand the experiences of our disabled staff, including running focus groups, to identify priority areas for action. The findings from this work has informed various initiatives and action such as the disability inclusion training for managers mentioned above, changes to policies and increased focus on discussion and awareness of the experiences of staff with disabilities. These learnings also informed our renewal application for Disability Confident accreditation.

## Overall staff by age

| Under 25 | 12 | $2 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $25-35$ | 196 | $26 \%$ |
| $36-45$ | 219 | $29 \%$ |
| $46-55$ | 163 | $22 \%$ |
| $56-65$ | 138 | $18 \%$ |
| $66+$ | 23 | $3 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |



Figure 24 - Overall staff by age

The majority of our staff are between the ages $25-55$, this is in line with the sector average. We do, however, have a significant percentage of staff aged 56-65. At age 66 and above we have significantly less staff, this is likely due to retirement.

The representation of staff across age ranges is consistent with the previous years.

| Institute/Department | Under 25 |  | 25-35 |  | 36-45 |  | 46-55 |  | 56-65 |  | 66+ |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Infection and Immunity Research Institute | 5 | 4\% | 43 | 33\% | 35 | 27\% | 23 | 17\% | 21 | 16\% | 5 | 4\% | 132 |
| Institute of Medical and Biomedical Education | 0 | 0\% | 27 | 18\% | 46 | 32\% | 33 | 23\% | 35 | 24\% | 5 | 3\% | 146 |
| Molecular \& Clinical Sciences Research Institute | 0 | 0\% | 26 | 29\% | 32 | 35\% | 13 | 14\% | 15 | 16\% | 5 | 5\% | 91 |
| Population Health Research Institute | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 14\% | 7 | 17\% | 14 | 33\% | 10 | 24\% | 5 | 12\% | 42 |
| Research Operations | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 26\% | 6 | 26\% | 11 | 48\% | 0 | 0\% | 23 |
| Education Strategy \& Development Office | 0 | 0\% | 9 | 32\% | 8 | 29\% | 6 | 21\% | 5 | 18\% | 0 | 0\% | 28 |
| Education Operations | 0 | 0\% | 14 | 27\% | 15 | 29\% | 13 | 25\% | 9 | 18\% | 0 | 0\% | 51 |
| Professional Services and Support Staff | 0 | 0\% | 69 | 29\% | 70 | 30\% | 55 | 24\% | 34 | 15\% | 5 | 2\% | 233 |
| Total | 5 | 1\% | 194 | 26\% | 219 | 29\% | 163 | 22\% | 140 | 19\% | 25 | 3\% | 746 |

The distribution of staff by age is relatively consistent across institutes and departments. Across all areas the majority of our staff are aged between 25 and 55. The Education Strategy and Development Office and the Immunity Research Institute have higher percentages of staff aged under 35. Whilst Research Operations has the highest percentage of staff aged over 55.


Figure 25 - Staff by Institute/Department and age


Figure 26 - Staff by clinical status and age
The proportion of staff on clinical contracts is highest at ages $36-45$ and at above 66. There is slight fluctuation between ages 46 and 65 .

| Staff Role | Under 25 |  | 25-35 |  | 36-45 |  | 46-55 |  | 56-65 |  | 66+ |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professional Service and Support Staff | 10 | 2\% | 127 | 31\% | 112 | 28\% | 89 | 22\% | 59 | 15\% | 7 | 2\% | 404 |
| Research Staff | 0 | 0\% | 43 | 52\% | 25 | 30\% | 9 | 11\% | 6 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 83 |
| Teacher | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 21\% | 7 | 24\% | 5 | 17\% | 6 | 21\% | 5 | 17\% | 29 |
| Lecturer | 0 | 0\% | 18 | 26\% | 36 | 52\% | 10 | 14\% | 5 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | 69 |
| Senior Lecturer | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 31 | 45\% | 19 | 28\% | 19 | 28\% | 0 | 0\% | 69 |
| Reader | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 20\% | 15 | 43\% | 13 | 37\% | 0 | 0\% | 35 |
| Professor | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 16 | 29\% | 31 | 55\% | 9 | 16\% | 56 |
| Total | 10 | 1\% | 194 | 26\% | 218 | 29\% | 163 | 22\% | 139 | 19\% | 21 | 3\% | 745 |

> * Research Staff covers Research Fellows and Research Assistants
> $*$ Teacher covers Teaching Fellows and Problem Based Learning (PBL) Tutors

Staff in age groups 25-35 are represented highly in academic roles such as Teacher, Researcher and Lecturer. Staff in Professor and Reader roles are in more likely to be in age groups 46-55 than other staff roles. This trend reflects to the nature of the academic career pathway in which staff progress as they gain experience over time. Professional and Support Staff are the most diverse in terms of staff age. This is because this staff role group includes a range of grade and seniority.

Professional Services and Support Staff shows the most range in age as this groups all staff together and therefore does not indicate seniority or role types in the way that academic roles do.


Figure 27 - Staff by staff role and age

| Age | SGUL 1-3 |  | SGUL 4-5 |  | SGUL 6-7 |  | SGUL 8 |  | PSA |  | Clinical |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 25 | 0 | 0\% | 10 | 100\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 10 |
| 25-35 | 6 | $3 \%$ | 69 | 35\% | 89 | 45\% | 5 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | 28 | 14\% | 197 |
| 36-45 | 6 | 3\% | 37 | 17\% | 94 | 44\% | 25 | 12\% | 7 | 3\% | 50 | 24\% | 212 |
| 46-55 | 5 | 3\% | 24 | 17\% | 67 | 46\% | 33 | 23\% | 18 | 12\% | 16 | 11\% | 145 |
| 56-65 | 5 | 4\% | 28 | 23\% | 36 | 29\% | 26 | 21\% | 16 | 13\% | 29 | 23\% | 124 |
| $66+$ | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 31\% | 5 | 31\% | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 44\% | 6 | 38\% | 16 |
| Total | 22 | 3\% | 173 | 23\% | 291 | 39\% | 89 | 12\% | 48 | 6\% | 129 | 17\% | 752 |



Figure 28 - Staff by pay grade and age

The data on staff by grade and age group indicates that members of staff aged $25-45$ are represented well across most grades, however less so at senior grade 8 and PSA levels. In these higher grades the majority of staff are aged over 46. Again, this reflects the expected level of progression as staff gain experience the more years they are in employment. Staff on clinical pay are reasonably diverse in terms of age group.

| Age | Permanent |  | Fixed Term |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Under 25 | 0 | $0 \%$ | 10 | $100 \%$ | 10 |
| $25-35$ | 113 | $58 \%$ | 83 | $42 \%$ | 196 |
| $36-45$ | 156 | $71 \%$ | 63 | $29 \%$ | 219 |
| $46-55$ | 140 | $86 \%$ | 23 | $14 \%$ | 163 |
| $56-65$ | 125 | $91 \%$ | 13 | $9 \%$ | 138 |
| $66+$ | 20 | $87 \%$ | 5 | $13 \%$ | 25 |
| Total | 556 | $\mathbf{7 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |

The percentage of staff on fixed-term contracts is $100 \%$ for staff aged under 25 , this is consistent with the previous year but an increase from 2019 in which it was $75 \%$. It is worth noting that these are small numbers in this age bracket.

A significant proportion of our staff aged $25-35$ are on fixed-term contracts, this percentage decreases slightly for staff aged 36-45. The percentages of staff on fixed term contracts falls significantly at age 46 . These trends may reflect academic career progression as more senior academic roles tend to be permanent whilst early career roles tend to be fixed term.

The percentage of staff on fixed term contracts increases again slightly for staff aged above 66. This will be due to staff returning to part-time, fixed term roles after taking partial retirement.

| Age | Full Time | Part Time | Total |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Under 25 | 9 | $75 \%$ | 3 | $25 \%$ | 12 |
| $25-35$ | 171 | $87 \%$ | 25 | $13 \%$ | 196 |
| $36-45$ | 143 | $65 \%$ | 76 | $35 \%$ | 219 |
| $46-55$ | 126 | $77 \%$ | 37 | $23 \%$ | 163 |
| $56-65$ | 95 | $69 \%$ | 43 | $31 \%$ | 138 |
| $66+$ | 12 | $52 \%$ | 11 | $48 \%$ | 23 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ |

The percentage of staff working part-time is highest for staff aged 66 and above, the majority of whom work part-time. This will largely be due to staff returning to work part-time after taking partial retirement. The percentage of part-time workers is also high for staff aged 36-45 which likely reflects staff working part-time for childcare reasons. Staff aged 56-65 also have a higher percentage of part-time workers, the reasons for this may be linked to phased retirements and caring responsibilities.

## Overall staff by Sexual Orientation

| Bisexual | 10 | $1 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Gay Woman / Lesbian | 8 | $1 \%$ |
| Gay Man | 15 | $2 \%$ |
| Heterosexual | 517 | $69 \%$ |
| Other | 8 | $1 \%$ |
| Prefer not to say | 193 | $26 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |



Figure 29 - Staff by sexual orientation

The data shows a low percentage of staff who identify as lesbian, gay and bisexual and other. There is however a large proportion of staff who choose to select "Prefer not to say" which indicates a number of staff who do not wish to share this information.

At St George's we have a Staff LGBT+ Network which exists for University and hospital staff who identify as LGBT+ or other non-binary identities to feel included and supported in the St George's community. The Network also welcomes staff who would like to join as LGBT+ allies. The network aims to work with other groups, committees and senior management to progress LGBT+ equality at St George's.

The Network holds events and seminars to raise awareness and bring people together. In the past, activities have been held that have focussed on representation at the annual Pride in London, LGBT+ history month, seminars such as LGBT and faith and fundraising initiatives.

Further breakdowns for staff by sexual orientation are not given due to small numbers.

## Overall staff by Religion and Belief

| Buddhist | 9 | $1 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Christian | 221 | $29 \%$ |
| Hindu | 28 | $4 \%$ |
| Jewish | 5 | $1 \%$ |
| Muslim | 39 | $5 \%$ |
| Sikh | 7 | $1 \%$ |
| Spiritual | 14 | $2 \%$ |
| Any Other Religion or Belief | 10 | $1 \%$ |
| No Religion/Belief | 278 | $37 \%$ |
| Prefer not to Say | 141 | $19 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |



Figure 30 - Overall staff by religion and belief

Of the staff who do disclose a religion or belief, the largest group is staff identifying as Christian. The data also shows a diverse range of religion and beliefs other than Christianity, but this is a significantly smaller proportion.

Looking at religion and belief collectively, a larger proportion of our staff declare having a religion or belief than those who declare no religion or belief.

There is also a number of staff who choose 'Prefer not to Say' with regards to their religion or belief. This percentage is significantly smaller than the previous year, in which $35 \%$ of staff chose 'Prefer not to Say'.

St George's is an inclusive environment in which we have an InterFaith Forum which ensures inclusivity of all faiths within the university as well as a multi-faith prayer room for all staff and students to use.

Further breakdowns for staff by religion are not given due to small numbers.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Advance HE Staff Statistical Report 2020, https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/equality-higher-education-statistical-report-2020 states the percentage of professional services staff in UK HEls overall was 50.7\% in 2018/19

[^1]:    * Research Staff covers Research Fellows and Research Assistants
    * Teacher covers Teaching Fellows and Problem Based Learning (PBL) Tutors

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ Advance HE Staff Statistical Report 2020, https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/equality-higher-education-statistical-report-2020

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ Advance HE Staff Statistical Report 2020, https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/equality-higher-education-statistical-report-2020

[^4]:    ${ }^{4}$ Advance HE Staff Statistical Report 2020, https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/equality-higher-education-statistical-report-2020

[^5]:    ${ }^{5}$ Advance HE Staff Statistical Report 2020, https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/equality-higher-education-statistical-report-2020

[^6]:    ${ }^{6}$ Advance HE Staff Statistical Report 2020, https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/equality-higher-education-statistical-report-2020

[^7]:    ${ }^{7}$ Advance HE Staff Statistical Report 2020, https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/equality-higher-education-statistical-report-2020
    ${ }^{8}$ Department of Work and Pensions Report, The Employment of Disabled People https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment data/file/875199/ employment-of-disabled-people-2019.pdf

