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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The university continues to receive more applications from female applicants and subsequently, continues to enrol more female students.
- The gender gap in recruitment is larger within certain faculties and departments: Engineering and Computer Science related programmes continue to recruit more male students; conversely, programmes across both Education and Nursing and Midwifery are predominantly female.
- This trend in recruitment is reflective of the sector; whilst student recruitment rates have fluctuated, the number of female entrants has consistently been higher than male entrants (see figure 1 ).
- In $15 / 16$, the non-continuation rate for male students is higher than it is for female students. Over time, there has been a great deal of fluctuation in the rate of noncontinuation for both genders but generally, most departments see a higher proportion of female students continuing to remain active in the university.
- Overall, male students are more satisfied with the university however, when results are broken down by the various measures of satisfaction, female students appear more satisfied with the students' union and the quality of teaching.
- Female students have consistently achieved a higher rate of good honours than male students have. However, over time the rate of good honours for male students has steadily improved.
- Graduate outcomes are generally more positive for female graduates: across the university, more female graduates are entering further study and slightly more are entering professional employment; furthermore, the rate of unemployment for male graduates is higher than it is for female graduates. Institutional patterns are typical of the sector: more female graduates are entering professional employment however, more male students are entering senior roles (see figure 4).


## APPLICATIONS

Table 1 shows application rates broken down by gender in 15/16

|  |  |  | Female | Male | Female \% | Male \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| University |  |  | 15,533 | 11,010 | 59\% | 41\% |
|  | ACE |  | 3898 | 1859 | 68\% | 32\% |
|  |  | Art and Design | 1470 | 593 | 71\% | 29\% |
|  |  | Arts and Cultural Industries | 645 | 397 | 62\% | 38\% |
|  |  | Education | 780 | 146 | 84\% | 16\% |
|  |  | Film and Journalism | 1003 | 723 | 58\% | 42\% |
|  | FBL |  | 2001 | 2297 | 47\% | 53\% |
|  |  | Accounting, Economics and Finance | 184 | 525 | 26\% | 74\% |
|  |  | Business and Management | 1134 | 1476 | 43\% | 57\% |
|  |  | Law | 683 | 296 | 70\% | 30\% |
|  | FET |  | 1071 | 4057 | 21\% | 79\% |
|  |  | Architecture and the Built Environment | 455 | 1100 | 29\% | 71\% |
|  |  | Computer Science and Creative Technologies | 166 | 1288 | 11\% | 89\% |
|  |  | Engineering, Design and Mathematics | 173 | 1198 | 13\% | 87\% |
|  |  | Geography and Environmental Management | 277 | 471 | 37\% | 63\% |
|  | HAS |  | 8172 | 2626 | 76\% | 24\% |
|  |  | Allied Health Professions | 1722 | 882 | 66\% | 34\% |
|  |  | Applied Sciences | 899 | 659 | 58\% | 42\% |
|  |  | Health and Social Sciences | 1936 | 717 | 73\% | 27\% |
|  |  | Nursing and Midwifery | 3615 | 368 | 91\% | 9\% |

Table 1 shows that proportionally, the university receives slightly more applications from female applicants than it does from male applicants. When broken down by faculty and department, application rates by gender vary:

- In ACE, a greater than average proportion of applications are from female applicants; this pattern is evident across all four departments, particularly in Education where $84 \%$ of applications are from female applicants and in Art and Design (71\%).
- In FBL, overall the gender split between female and male applicants is the most balanced of all the faculties however, when admissions data is broken down by department, this balance changes: Accounting, Economics and Finance receive a much higher proportion of applications from male applicants (48pp gap) and Law receive a higher proportion of applications from female applicants (40pp gap).
- In FET, there is a notable gender gap; overall, the faculty receives a far higher rate of applications from male applicants and this pattern is consistent across all departments
particularly in Computer Science and Creative Technologies where the rate of male applications is 78pp greater than the rate of female applications.
- HAS receive far more applications from female applicants, both as a faculty and across all four departments; the gender gap is most notable within Nursing and Midwifery where the proportion of male applicants is only $9 \%$.


## ENROLMENTS

Table 2 Breakdown of new enrolments in 15/16 by gender

|  |  |  | Female | Male | Female | Male |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| University |  |  | 3035 | 2701 | $53 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
|  | ACE |  | 782 | 382 | $67 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
|  |  | Art and Design | 224 | 109 | $67 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
|  |  | Arts and Cultural Industries | 166 | 97 | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
|  |  | Education | 187 | 21 | $90 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
|  | FBL |  | 206 | 156 | $57 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
|  |  | Accounting, Economics and <br> Finance | 622 | 712 | $42 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
|  |  | Business and Management | 283 | 438 | $28 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
|  | FET | Law | 170 | 102 | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
|  |  | Architecture and the Built <br> Environment | 106 | 189 | $36 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
|  |  | Computer Science and <br> Creative Technologies | 35 | 302 | $10 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
|  |  | Engineering, Design and <br> Mathematics | 49 | 323 | $13 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
|  |  | Geography and <br> Environmental Management | 67 | 135 | $33 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
|  | HAS |  | 1231 | 478 | $72 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
|  |  | Allied Health Professions | 197 | 82 | $71 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
|  |  | Applied Sciences |  |  |  |  |

Table 2 shows that overall; the university enrols slightly more female students than male. However, when broken down by faculty and department, there are greater differences across particular subject areas:

In both the Faculty of HAS and ACE, the proportion of female enrolments is far greater than male enrolments. This difference is most distinct within the department of Education where $90 \%$ of enrolments are female; this gender split is similar within the department of Nursing and Midwifery where $88 \%$ of enrolments are female.

In comparison, FBL and FET enrol a greater proportion of male students; this trend is more significant within FET where only $21 \%$ of enrolments are female. The gender difference is most notable within both the department of Computer Science and Creative Technologies ( $90 \%$ male) and department of Engineering, Design and Mathematics ( $87 \%$ male).

National Comparison: Figure 1 depicts HESA record of full-time UK-domiciled first-degree entrants by sex and shows that across the sector, numbers for both UK-domiciled male and female entrants have fluctuated at a comparable rate. However, the number of female student entrants has consistently remained higher than male. In 14/15, female students made up $56 \%$ of the student population. ${ }^{1}$

Figure 1


[^0]Table 3 Breakdown of enrolments by year and faculty broken down by gender

|  |  |  | $\mathbf{1 3 / 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 / 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 / 1 6}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male |
| University |  |  | $53 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
|  | ACE |  | $66 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
|  |  | Art and Design | $68 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
|  |  | Arts and Cultural Industries | $54 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
|  |  | Education | Film and Journalism | $52 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
|  | FBL |  | $42 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
|  |  | Accounting, Economics and <br> Finance | $25 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
|  |  | Business and Management | $41 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
|  |  | Law | $64 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
|  | FET | Architecture and the Built <br> Environment | $18 \%$ | $82 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $79 \%$ |
|  |  | Computer Science and <br> Creative Technologies | $11 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
|  |  | Engineering, Design and <br> Mathematics | $11 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
|  |  | Geography and <br> Environmental Management | $31 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
|  | HAS |  | $73 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
|  |  | Allied Health Professions | $74 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
|  |  | Applied Sciences | $45 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
|  |  | Health and Social Sciences | $74 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
|  | Nursing and Midwifery | $89 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $12 \%$ |  |

Table 3 shows a consistency in the gender split over the past three academic years the proportion of female enrolments has remained slightly higher than male.

The proportional gender split in enrolments remains consistent across all four faculties.

The department of Architecture and the Built Environment is the only department with a significant disparity in enrolments by gender that has seen an improvement over each academic year.
Most departments have enrolled similar proportions of genders over time.

Figure 2


Figure 2 shows the enrolment split by gender across the university in $15 / 16$; whilst there is only a gap of 6 pp, figure 3 shows huge variation within particular departments including, Education and Computer Science.

Figure 3
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## NON-CONTINUATION

Table 4 shows non-continuation rates across the university

|  |  |  | 13/14 |  | 14/15 |  | 15/16 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male |
| University |  |  | 7.2\% | 11.3\% | 6.2\% | 7.7\% | 6.3\% | 8.6\% |
|  | ACE |  | 8.4\% | 10.5\% | 7.2\% | 7.1\% | 8.3\% | 8.6\% |
|  |  | Art and Design | 13.7\% | 12.4\% | 7.3\% | 6.1\% | 8.6\% | 14.3\% |
|  |  | Arts and Cultural Industries | 5.7\% | 7.2\% | 2.8\% | 12.1\% | 8.1\% | 8.5\% |
|  |  | Education | 3.8\% | 14.3\% | 6\% | 0\% | 7.1\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Film and Journalism | 11.2\% | 11.8\% | 12.3\% | 5\% | 9\% | 6\% |
|  | FBL |  | 5.8\% | 9.2\% | 6.4\% | 5.2\% | 6.7\% | 7.7\% |
|  |  | Accounting, Economics and Finance | 6.1\% | 9.4\% | 3.7\% | 5.6\% | 5.3\% | 8.3\% |
|  |  | Business and Management | 5.9\% | 8.8\% | 8.4\% | 4.9\% | 9.3\% | 7.9\% |
|  |  | Law | 5.6\% | 10.1\% | 4\% | 5.6\% | 3.4\% | 5.4\% |
|  | FET |  | 10.3\% | 13.1\% | 6.4\% | 10\% | 6.6\% | 9.7\% |
|  |  | Architecture and the Built Environment | 7.5\% | 11.2\% | 4.2\% | 7.4\% | 3.7\% | 6.5\% |
|  |  | Computer Science and Creative Technologies | 12.2\% | 15.2\% | 13.2\% | 14.8\% | 11.8\% | 12.1\% |
|  |  | Engineering, Design and Mathematics | 22.2\% | 12.7\% | 10\% | 8.6\% | 10\% | 9.1\% |
|  |  | Geography and Environmental Management | 4.9\% | 12.1\% | 3.9\% | 4.5\% | 6.8\% | 10.2\% |
|  | HAS |  | 6.4\% | 10.9\% | 5.5\% | 6.7\% | 4.9\% | 7.6\% |
|  |  | Allied Health Professions | 2.9\% | 0\% | 3.8\% | 5.1\% | 2.5\% | 4.1\% |
|  |  | Applied Sciences | 13.1\% | 16.2\% | 8.6\% | 12.1\% | 9.7\% | 7.8\% |
|  |  | Health and Social Sciences | 6.7\% | 10.5\% | 4.3\% | 3\% | 5.5\% | 11.3\% |
|  |  | Nursing and Midwifery | 5.1\% | 4.8\% | 5.8\% | 4.2\% | 3.8\% | 5\% |

Across the university, non-continuation rates for male students have consistently remained higher than for female students; table 4 shows that this trend is consistent across most faculties however, when broken down by department, non-continuation rates vary:

- In ACE, non-continuation rates improved and had decreased in $14 / 15$; however, in $15 / 16$ overall rates appear to have increased slightly. Across the four departments, non-continuation rates vary considerably: in Education, since $14 / 15$, all male students remain active in the university whilst non-continuation rates for female students have increased over time; in contrast to the overall trend across the university, within Film and Journalism, non-continuation rates for female students have increased to become greater than the rate for male students.
- In FBL, non- continuation rates for male and female students vary: in Law, whilst non-continuation rates for male students have improved, they are still higher than the non-continuation rate for female students; in comparison, the non-continuation rate for female students has increased within Business and Management and since $14 / 15$, has been greater than the rate for male students.
- In FET, the non-continuation rate for male students is consistently higher than it is for female students. When broken down by department, this trend is evident within all departments except for Engineering, Design and Mathematics where the non-continuation rate for female students is higher ( 0.9 pp in $15 / 16$ ). Over time, there is improvement for both female and male students in all departments.
- In HAS, over time, non-continuation rates have improved for both female and male students particularly, within Applied Sciences (female 3.4 pp and male -8.4 pp ). In $15 / 16$, there is a higher non-continuation rate for male students in all departments within HAS except for Applied Science (1.9pp gap).


## STUDENT SATISFACTION

Table 5 NSS Satisfaction rates for 15/16 broken down by gender

|  | No of <br> respondents | Response <br> rate | Teaching | Assessment <br> and feedback | Academic <br> support | Organisation <br> and <br> management | Learning <br> Resources | Personal <br> Development | Students' <br> Union | Overall <br> satisfaction |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | 1944 | $86 \%$ | 90 | 75 | 84 | 78 | 91 | 87 |  | 73 |
| Male | 1560 | $85 \%$ | 89 | 76 | 86 | 84 | 90 | 86 | 70 | 88 |

Table 5 shows that overall, male students are slightly more satisfied than female students are. However, this is not a consistent pattern across the range of measures; female students are more satisfied with the students' union and slightly more satisfied with the quality of teaching. Male students show a marked increase in satisfaction with organisation and management when compared to female students.

## GOOD HONOURS AND DEGREE CLASSIFICATION

Table 6 shows good honours rates for the university by gender over time

|  | $\mathbf{1 3 / 1 4}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 4 / 1 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 5 / 1 6}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Enrols | Good <br> Hons $\%$ | Enrols | Good <br> Hons $\%$ | Enrols | Good <br> Hons \% |
| FEMALE | 2,739 | $79.1 \%$ | 2,338 | $77.8 \%$ | 2,357 | $79.6 \%$ |
| MALE | 2,249 | $71.9 \%$ | 1,858 | $72.4 \%$ | 1,771 | $74.0 \%$ |

Table 6 shows that female students have consistently achieved a higher rate of good honours than male students have. However, over time, the rate of good hons for male students has steadily improved, reducing the gap from 7.2 pp in $13 / 14$ to 5.6 pp in 15/16.

Table 7 Breakdown of degree classification rate by year and broken down by gender

|  | 13/14 |  |  |  | 14/15 |  |  |  | 15/16 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% | 1st | U2 | L2 | 3rd | 1st | U2 | L2 | 3rd | 1st | U2 | L2 | 3rd |
| Female | 24.5\% | 54.6\% | 18.7\% | 2.26\% | 25.5\% | 52.3\% | 19.1\% | 3.08\% | 25.1\% | 54.5\% | 17.9\% | 2.50\% |
| Male | 21.3\% | 50.5\% | 25.2\% | 2.98\% | 21.7\% | 50.6\% | 24.4\% | 3.23\% | 23.9\% | 50.1\% | 23.0\% | 2.99\% |

Table 7 shows that over the three-year period, female students are consistently achieving a higher rate of firsts and 2.1 s ; conversely, male students are achieving a higher rate of 2.2 s and thirds.

Across the three-year period, male students have seen a steady increase in the rate of good honours achieved; table 7 shows that this is likely to be due to male students increasingly achieving firsts (increase of 2.6 pp ) given the male rate of 2.1 s has stayed at a similar level. Whilst the rate of achieving a third has remained steady for male students, over time there has been a gradual reduction in the rate of 2.2 s (decrease of 2.2 pp ).

Table 8 Breakdown of good honours rate by year and faculty broken down by gender

|  |  | $\mathbf{1 3 / 1 4}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 4 / 1 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 5 / 1 6}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Faculty | Category | Enrols | Good <br> Hons <br> $\%$ | Enrols | Good <br> Hons <br> $\%$ | Enrols | Good <br> Hons <br> $\%$ |
|  | Female | 861 | $82.2 \%$ | 688 | $79.5 \%$ | 637 | $84.3 \%$ |
|  | Male | 361 | $75.4 \%$ | 296 | $76.9 \%$ | 324 | $78.4 \%$ |
| Business and Law | Female | 415 | $80.2 \%$ | 409 | $84.5 \%$ | 374 | $85.0 \%$ |
|  | Male | 593 | $70.5 \%$ | 530 | $75.8 \%$ | 463 | $78.7 \%$ |
| Environment and <br> Technology | Female | 156 | $75.6 \%$ | 137 | $82.5 \%$ | 136 | $73.5 \%$ |
|  | Male | 719 | $75.5 \%$ | 572 | $74.8 \%$ | 558 | $72.2 \%$ |
| Health and Applied <br> Sciences | Female | 1133 | $78.3 \%$ | 941 | $75.9 \%$ | 1019 | $77.3 \%$ |
|  | Male | 476 | $70.1 \%$ | 348 | $67.3 \%$ | 326 | $72.5 \%$ |

Table 8 shows the variation in good honours rates by faculty over the three-year period. In ACE, the differential for $15 / 16$ is 5.9 pp, which is greater than $14 / 15$ however, the rate of good honours achieved has increased for both female and male students. FBL has seen a slight reduction in differential over the period and is now 6.3 pp . In FET, the gap widened in $14 / 15$ but in $15 / 16$, reduced by 1.3 pp . In HAS, the differential has been variable but has reduced over the three-year period to 4.8 pp in $15 / 16$.

Table 9 Breakdown of degree classification rate by year, faculty and gender

| Faculty / Gender |  | 13/14 |  |  |  | 14/15 |  |  |  | 15/16 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1st | 2:1 | 2:2 | 3rd | 1st | 2:1 | 2:2 | 3rd | 1st | 2:1 | 2:2 | 3rd |
| ACE | FEMALE | 21.6\% | 60.7\% | 16.0\% | 1.74\% | 23.4\% | 56.1\% | 17.7\% | 2.76\% | 22.5\% | 61.8\% | 13.2\% | 2.51\% |
| ACE | MALE | 20.2\% | 55.2\% | 21.2\% | 3.32\% | 18.2\% | 58.6\% | 20.4\% | 2.70\% | 24.1\% | 54.3\% | 18.5\% | 3.09\% |
| FBL | FEMALE | 29.0\% | 51.2\% | 17.9\% | 1.86\% | 29.8\% | 54.7\% | 14.5\% | 0.98\% | 29.8\% | 55.2\% | 14.6\% | 0.35\% |
| FBL | MALE | 20.9\% | 49.5\% | 26.4\% | 3.12\% | 22.1\% | 53.7\% | 21.8\% | 2.45\% | 21.7\% | 57.0\% | 18.0\% | 3.24\% |
| FET | FEMALE | 28.2\% | 47.4\% | 22.4\% | 1.92\% | 29.2\% | 53.3\% | 16.8\% | 0.73\% | 32.4\% | 41.2\% | 19.9\% | 6.62\% |
| FET | MALE | 27.8\% | 47.7\% | 23.4\% | 1.11\% | 30.4\% | 44.4\% | 23.4\% | 1.75\% | 31.0\% | 41.2\% | 26.2\% | 1.61\% |
| HAS | FEMALE | 25.3\% | 53.0\% | 19.3\% | 2.41\% | 26.1\% | 49.8\% | 20.4\% | 3.72\% | 23.5\% | 53.8\% | 20.6\% | 2.03\% |
| HAS | MALE | 15.1\% | 55.0\% | 26.2\% | 3.68\% | 14.4\% | 52.9\% | 28.7\% | 4.02\% | 18.0\% | 54.5\% | 25.4\% | 2.15\% |

Table 9 provides
further evidence of differentials in degree outcome by gender.

- In ACE, more male students have consistently achieved a 2.2 than female students. In comparison, females are more likely to achieve good honours. The proportion of male students achieving a first has gradually increased over the period.
- In FBL, the proportion of male students achieving a 2.2 or a third is consistently higher than the proportion of females achieving both results.
- In FET, both male and female students are achieving good honours at a comparable rate however, over the three-year period, the differential in achieving a third has widened to a 5.01 pp difference.
- In HAS, rates of 2.1 and thirds are comparable however, differences can be seen in the higher proportion of male students achieving 2.2 and female students achieving a first.


## GRADUATE OUTCOMES

Table 10 Graduate destinations broken down by gender

|  | KPI \% | Prof \% | Study \% | Self- <br> employed \% | U/E \% | R.R. \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $79 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
| Male | $75 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $87 \%$ |

Table 10 shows that there was a slight difference between the rates of professional employment (1pp); Male students had a higher unemployment rate than female students and a slightly lower further study rate but had a higher rate of self-employment.

Prof = professional/ graduate level work and constitutes a 'good' outcome
KPI = our institutional KPI
$\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{E}=$ unemployed
R.R. $=$ response rate

## Figure 4

National Comparison: 'The percentage of males in the Managers, directors and senior officials group was almost double that of females. ( $4.2 \%$ male and $2.3 \%$ female). However, the percentage of females in Professional occupations exceeded that of males. (47.4\% female and 42.3\% male). ${ }^{13}$
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