Proportion of undergraduate & postgraduate student numbers by subject discipline, 1998/99 - 2003/04

- **Biological Sciences**
  - 1998-1999: 65% Undergraduate, 35% Postgraduate
  - 2003-2004: 68% Undergraduate, 32% Postgraduate

- **Computer Science**
  - 1998-1999: 55% Undergraduate, 45% Postgraduate
  - 2003-2004: 65% Undergraduate, 35% Postgraduate

- **Engineering & Technology**
  - 1998-1999: 8% Undergraduate, 92% Postgraduate
  - 2003-2004: 12% Undergraduate, 88% Postgraduate

- **Mathematical Sciences**
  - 1998-1999: 60% Undergraduate, 40% Postgraduate
  - 2003-2004: 67% Undergraduate, 33% Postgraduate

- **Physical Sciences**
  - 1998-1999: 30% Undergraduate, 70% Postgraduate
  - 2003-2004: 36% Undergraduate, 64% Postgraduate

Proportion of female staff among Academic & Research staff in science departments by grade, 2001-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SET Academic staff numbers (all grades) by gender, August 2001 – July 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female staff numbers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proportion of female staff among Academic & Research staff by department, 2001-06
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Proportion of female applicants to Academic & Research posts advertised by science departments during 2005
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Commentary on Statistics

Data Sources

The historical information was based on the data extracted from the HESA staff returns produced by the University in 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 and 2004-05. The final year of the data was based on an extract from the personnel database as of 1 March 2006 and it was noted that this might lead to some small differences when comparing the data sets.

Recruitment data

Recruitment data (applicants, interviewees and appointments) was available from January 2005. The data was based on advertised academic and research posts based in science departments advertised during the 2005 calendar year.

Analysis of Data

The base line analysis demonstrated that even the SET disciplines, there are significant differences in the gender balance, with some subjects such as Biology having significantly more female staff than, for example, Electronics (though the Working Group was very pleased to note that the Electronics department had recently appointed a female academic). It was also noted that whilst the science subjects were male dominated, the proportion of males on each grade were similar to that of females. This indicated that whilst not yet acceptable, some of the pattern of employment was a function of historical recruitment and staffing issues. A comparison between the gender groups suggested that the female academic group was younger than its male counterpart, which might indicate the entry of a new generation of female academics.

Looking at the historical trends in staffing periods, the number of female academic staff grew by three, from 38 to 41 (an increase of 8%). The number of female research staff grew from 94 to 122 over the period from August 2001 to March 2006, a 30% increase. Overall the representation of women among the research staff group grew from 36% to 38%. In particular, the University had managed to increase the number of female staff in SET overall and in particular had increased the percentage of female staff in senior academic posts from 29% to 46%. The Working Group also looked at recruitment data, in terms of the gender balance of applicants per department and the eventual recruitment. This analysis suggested that one main area that needed to be improved was the encouragement of females to apply for posts and at other key progression points such as applying to move from research to lecturing posts. However, it is clear that much more work needs to be undertaken on attitudes of women in science.

Future use of the data

The University already monitors figures relating to Equal Opportunities and will continue to do so, in line with its HR strategy. The data has been passed to Departments for analysis and comment and the Working Group will continue to work with the Departments to identify areas of weakness in the recruitment and selection of staff.
The key issue that has been identified is that of the difficulties relating to key career transition points. It is unclear what the specific barriers are and further work is planned to try to identify what actions need to be undertaken in order to encourage women in SET disciplines.

The continued monitoring of the data will be vital in identifying whether the University is successful in implementing strategies to increase the number of women in SET disciplines.