## Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Report 2021-22 Part B

Equality data is central to equality and diversity work. It is essential to understanding the context of the Institution and identifying where action is needed.

The University collects equality monitoring data on the protected characteristics of age, disability, sex, race (ethnicity), religion or belief, and sexual orientation, and analyses this information in relation to key stages of the higher education lifecycle.

The data on the following pages presents key staff and student equality information at an institutional level. It informs Part A of our annual Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Report 2021-22.

## Contents

How to read the charts in the report......................................................................... 2
Part 1: Staff Data......................................................................................................... 3
1a. Staff in Post...................................................................................................... 3
Staff in post at Manchester Metropolitan shown as trend data (last three years) 3
Staff in Post at Manchester Metropolitan by Staff Group .................................... 12
Staff in Post at Manchester Metropolitan by Contract Level .............................. 18
1b. Staff Progression ............................................................................................. 26
1c. Staff Leavers .................................................................................................. 30
1d. Recruitment and Selection.............................................................................. 34
Part 2: Student Data............................................................................................... 38
2a. Student enrolments at Manchester Metropolitan shown as trend data (last
three years)...................................................................................................... 42
2b. Student Progression ...................................................................................... 51
2c. Student Satisfaction ......................................................................................... 57
2d. Student Good Honours ................................................................................... 60
2e. Graduate Outcomes........................................................................................ 67

## How to read the charts in this report

The charts in this appendix are formatted to show:

1) the proportion of the total population (specified in grey text underneath the chart)
2) who share each protected characteristic (labelled on the $y$ axis)
3) comparison over time or staff / student group (indicated by the legend and bar colour)
4) with the population size as a headcount rounded to 5 (in grey text on the $y$ axis)

The chart below, for example, shows that in 2022, $55.3 \%$ of all staff (excluding casual and sessional on the $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date) were female. The total population size in 2022 was 4,415 , of which 2,445 were female and 1,970 male.


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

Some categories of staff or students are very small - particularly where we look at subsets of the total populations such as staff who have left, or students who graduated, in a particular year. Comparisons of percentage data should be considered carefully where population sizes are small; and where the total population size (denominator) is less than 30 percentage data is not shown. Population counts are included and rounded to 5 populations less than 3 will therefore be shown as 0 .

## Part 1: Staff Data

This section of the report provides staff equality monitoring data with observations in respect of:
A. Staff in Post (including by staff group and seniority)
B. Staff Progression
C. Staff Leavers
D. Recruitment and Selection
E. Pay Gaps

Staff data is profiled by the protected characteristics of age, disability, gender, ethnicity, religion or belief and sexual orientation. Where appropriate, sector average figures are provided, sourced from Advance HE's Equality Plus Higher Education Staff Statistical Report 2022. Comparisons are to staff at all UK Higher Education Institutions.

The University employs a total of 4,415 HESA reportable staff (excluding casual and sessional), compared to 4,156 in the previous year.

## 1a. Staff in Post

Staff in post at Manchester Metropolitan shown as trend data (last three years)

## Age

Chart 1A.1: Staff in post by age group and year


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

Variations within age categories are relatively small, although there has been a 0.7 percentage point (pp) increase in staff in the 56-60 age category, and the proportion of staff aged 25 and under has increased by the same margin.

Compared to the sector, Manchester Met has a slightly lower proportion of staff aged 35 and under ( $27.1 \%$ of all staff compared to $29.7 \%$ in the sector), and a very slightly higher proportion of staff than the sector in every age category up to 60. ${ }^{1}$

## Disability

Chart 1A.3: Staff in post by disability status

[^0]

Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount. Proportion of known data only - we hold disability data for $98.6 \%$ of our staff.
$7.9 \%$ of our staff disclose a disability. This is higher than the sector average of $6.0 \%{ }^{2}$ 8\% of economically active and employed residents in Manchester classed themselves as having a long-term health problem or disability in the 2011 census. ${ }^{3}$

Chart 1A.4: Staff in post by impairment type for all staff disclosing a disability


Population: all disabled staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

[^1]One third of disabled staff have a long-standing illness or health condition (33.1\%). The proportion of disabled staff recording a specific learning disability has increased for the second year running (to $19.8 \%$ from $18.5 \%$ last year), while the proportion of staff reporting a mental health condition has fallen this year (to $15.7 \%$ from $16.3 \%$ last year) following four years of steady increases. Unfortunately, sector comparisons are not available due to differences in reporting categories. ${ }^{4}$

## Sex and Gender

Chart 1A.5: Staff in post by sex


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

A higher proportion of Manchester Met staff are female (55.3\%) than male (44.7\%), this is slightly higher than the proportion of female staff in the sector overall (54.2\%).

Due to current requirements for reporting to HMRC and HESA, data on staff members' sex can only be reported as binary. We acknowledge that this will not represent an accurate record for many trans and non-binary people. For the purposes of this report, data for the sex field will be referred to as sex, which differs from previous reporting where this section was labelled as gender. This aligns with Advance HE's updated guidance on equality data monitoring which better reflects the phrasing of the response options required by HESA.

## Ethnicity

Ethnicity within the HESA staff record is based upon the 2021 census classification system in England and Wales. For this report, where possible we have presented staff ethnicity records in six high-level groups as used by Advance HE, the sector equality body:

- Asian - Asian/Asian British: Bangladeshi, Indian, Pakistani, and any other Asian background
- Black - Black/Black British: African, Caribbean, and any other Black background

[^2]- Chinese ${ }^{5}$
- Mixed - Mixed: White \& Asian, White \& Black Caribbean, White \& Black African, and any other Mixed background
- Other ethnic background - including Arab and any other background
- White -White and Gypsy or traveller

Non-White groups have also been aggregated into a single Black, Asian and minority ethnic group to identify any overarching patterns of inequality. ${ }^{6}$ Data in this section has been further disaggregated by UK and non-UK nationality.

Chart 1A.7: Staff in post by BAME/white identity (all known data)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures
calculated based on headcount. Known data only - we hold ethnicity data for $97.2 \%$ of our staff.

We hold ethnicity data for $97.2 \%$ of our staff. The proportion of all staff (UK and nonUK) who are Black, Asian or minority ethnic has increased for the second year running to $17.5 \%$. The proportion of Black, Asian or minority ethnic staff in the sector overall is $16.3 \%$.

Chart 1A.8: Staff in post by BAME/white identity and UK/Non-UK nationality (all known data)

[^3]

Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.
$14.8 \%$ of our staff are not from the UK ( $n=648$ ).
There have been increases in ethnic diversity for both UK and Non-UK staff in each of the last two years. The proportion of Black, Asian and minority ethnic UK staff has increased from $12.4 \%$ to $12.9 \%$. The proportion of Black, Asian and minority ethnic non-UK staff has increased from $41.3 \%$ to $43.8 \%$. In both cases this is higher than the sector ( $11.4 \%$ UK staff in the sector are Black, Asian and minority ethnic and $33.6 \%$ non-UK staff).

Chart 1A.9: Staff in post by ethnic group and Nationality (all known data)


## Non-UK



Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The increase in UK Black, Asian and minority ethnic staff has been driven by small increases in staff from Black and Asian ethnic backgrounds. The increase in Non-UK BAME staff is driven by an increase in staff from Asian and Other backgrounds.

Sector comparisons for UK staff show that we have slightly larger proportions of staff from Asian and Black ethnic backgrounds (5.3\% Asian compared to 4.8\% in the sector; and $3.9 \%$ Black compared to $2.4 \%$ in the sector).

Sector comparisons for non-UK staff show that we have much higher proportions of Black non-UK staff than the sector overall (14.4\% of our non-UK staff are Black compared to $4.8 \%$ in the sector). ${ }^{7}$

## Religion or Belief

Chart 1A.11: Staff in post by religion or belief (all known data)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount. Known data only: we hold religion or belief data for $85.1 \%$ of our staff.

We have increased the proportion of staff for whom we hold religion or belief data each year, and now have data for $85.1 \%$ of our staff.

The majority of our staff have no religion or belief (48.6\%), and a falling proportion are Christian (38.0\% compared to $39.8 \%$ last year). An increasing proportion of staff are Muslim ( $6.1 \%$ this year compared to $5.2 \%$ last year). A significant proportion of staff ( $4.4 \%, \mathrm{n}=165$ ) describe their religion or belief as Other - any except Islam, Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism or Sikhism.

[^4]A higher proportion of our staff are Christan or Muslim than in the sector overall ( $38.0 \%$ Christian compared to $36.1 \%$ in the sector, and $6.1 \%$ Muslim compared to $3.9 \%$ in the sector). ${ }^{8}$

## Sexual Orientation

Chart 1A.13: Staff in post by sexual orientation (all known data)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount. Known data only, we hold sexual orientation data for $85.3 \%$ of our staff.

The proportion of lesbian, gay or bisexual staff has increased slowly but steadily over the three-year period, and now stands at $8.7 \%$, driven by an increase in the proportion of staff who are Bisexual. Of the staff in institutions that returned sexual orientation data to HESA who declared their sexual orientation, $7.5 \%$ were lesbian, gay, bisexual or other. ${ }^{9}$

[^5]
## Staff in Post at Manchester Metropolitan by Staff Group

This section of the report provides data by staff groups: Academic and Professional Services. In 2022, 39.4\% of our staff are Academic ( $n=1,742$ ) and 60.6\% Professional Services ( $n=2,673$ ).

## Age

Chart 1A.14: Percentage of Academic and Professional Services staff within each age group (2022)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

There are higher proportions of Academic staff in all age groups between 36 and 60, and considerably higher proportions of Professional Services staff aged 35 and under.

## Disability

Chart 1A.15: Academic and Professional Services staff by disability status (2022)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount. Known data only. We hold disability data for $98.6 \%$ of our staff.

A slightly higher proportion of Professional Services staff are disabled (8.4\%) then the proportion of Academic staff who are disabled (7.5\%).

Chart 1A.16: Academic and Professional Services disabled staff by impairment type (2022)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The chart above shows the impairment type breakdown between Academic staff and Professional Services staff. The most notable differences are in specific learning disabilities - with a higher disclosure rate for Academic staff - and long standing illness and health condition - with a higher incidence rate amongst Professional Services staff.

## Sex

Chart 1A.17: Academic and Professional Services staff by sex (2022)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

There are greater proportions of females in both Professional Services and Academic roles, although the gender split is less pronounced amongst Academic staff.

## Ethnicity

Chart 1A.18: Academic and Professional Services staff by BAME/white identity (2022, all known data)
 calculated based on headcount.

There are broadly similar proportions of staff from Black, Asian and minority ethnic groups in Academic and Professional services, albeit the proportion is 0.8pp higher in Professional Services at 17.8\%.

In the sector, 19.0\% Academic staff and 13.2\% Professional Services staff are Black, Asian and minority ethnic.

Chart 1A.19: Academic and Professional Services staff by BAME/white identity and nationality (2022, all known data)



Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The proportion of UK BAME staff is considerably lower in Academic roles than Professional Services roles (10.0\% UK academics are BAME, compared to 14.6\% UK Professional Services staff). The proportion of non-UK BAME staff is broadly similar across Academic and Professional Services roles.

Chart 1A.20: Academic and Professional Services staff by ethnic group (2022, all known data)
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Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

There is a higher proportion of Black staff in professional services roles (6.9\% of Professional Services staff are Black) than in academic roles (3.2\% Academic staff are Black).

Chart 1A.21: Academic and Professional Services staff by ethnic group and nationality (2022, all known data)


## Non-UK



Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

Looking at detailed ethnic groups by UK/Non-UK nationality reveals a very low proportion of Black staff amongst British academics (only 1.6\% of UK academics are Black). There are very high proportions of Black staff in the non-UK professional services staff population ( $21.0 \%$ of non-UK professional services staff are Black).

## Religion or Belief

Chart 1A.22: Academic and Professional Services staff by religion or belief (2022, all known data)


Population: all staff for whom religion or belief is known excluding casual and sessional as at 1st December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount. Known data only: we hold religion or belief data for $85.1 \%$ of our staff.

There is a slight difference between the proportion of Christian Professional Services staff (39.8\%) and Christian Academic staff (35.2\%), but a similar proportion of staff in each staff group are Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Jewish and Sikh.

## Sexual Orientation

Chart 1A.23: Academic and Professional Services staff by sexual orientation (2022, all known data)


Population: all staff for whom sexual orientation is known excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$
December census date. Headcount data. We hold sexual orientation data for $85.3 \%$ of our staff
There are higher proportions of staff identifying as gay or bisexual in Professional Services roles than in Academic roles.

## Staff in Post at Manchester Metropolitan by Contract Level

This section of the report provides data by contract level, shown separately for Academic and Professional services staff.

Academic staff are categorised into four employee subgroups, as follows:

| Employee Subgroup | Roles included | Grades | Number of staff |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Research Staff | Includes Research <br> Assistants, Research <br> Associates and <br> Research Fellows | (Grades 7-9 | $6.5 \%$ of <br> Academic staff <br> $(\mathrm{n}=113)$ |
| Standard Academic | Includes Lecturers <br> and Senior Lecturers | Grades 8-11 | $82.7 \%$ <br> academic staff <br> (n=1440); |
| Professors | Professorial staff with <br> the title 'Professor', <br> except those in head <br> of department or <br> executive roles | Professorial <br> Bands 1-4, <br> above grade 11 | $7.5 \%$ Academic <br> staff (n= 130); |
| Senior Staff | Includes heads of <br> department and <br> executive roles | executive grade <br> banding - <br> above grade <br> 11); | $2.9 \%$ Academic <br> staff (n=50). |

Note: Directorate -Academic (the most senior level) comprises only 10 people and so is excluded from the charts below to protect anonymity.

Professional Services staff are categorised into two employee subgroups:

| Employee Subgroup | Roles included | Grades | Number of staff |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Standard - Support | Multiple (840 <br> different job titles) | Grades 1-11 | $97.3 \%$ of <br> Professional <br> Services staff <br> $(n=2,475)$ |
| Senior Staff - <br> Support | Directors and <br> Assistant <br> Directors | Senior and <br> Executive grade <br> bandings (above <br> Grade 11) | $2.5 \%$ of <br> Professional <br> Services staff <br> $(n=65) ;$ |

Note: Directorate -Support (the most senior level) comprises only 5 people and so is excluded from the charts below to protect anonymity.

## Age

Chart 1A.24: Academic staff by contract level and age group (2022)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at December 2022 census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The largest age category of Standard Academic Staff is 41-45 (17.4\%). The largest age category of Professors is 56-60 (30.0\%), with a significant proportion aged 66 and above ( $9.2 \%$ ). The largest proportion of Senior Academic staff are in the age group 51-55 (30.0\%).

Chart 1A.25: Professional services staff by contract level and age group (2022)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at December 2022 census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

For professional services staff, a high proportion of people in senior roles are aged 51$55(27.0 \%)$. There is quite an even spread in the proportion of people in standard roles, with large proportions in all age groups between 26 and 50.

## Disability

Chart 1A.26: Academic staff by contract level and disability (2022)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at December 2022 census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

Very low proportions of senior academic staff and Professors are disabled (2.0\% senior staff, and 3.3\% of professors).

Chart 1A.27: Professional services staff by contract level and disability disclosure (2022)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at December 2022 census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

As with Academic staff, for Professional Services staff the proportion disclosing a disability is far lower amongst senior staff (3.3\% compared to $8.6 \%$ for standard staff).

## Sex

Chart 1A.28: Academic staff by contract level and sex (2022)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at December 2022 census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

There is a clear pattern of the proportion of male staff increasing as the seniority of the post increases. The proportion of females is high amongst Research Staff ( $57.1 \%$ ) and Standard Academics ( $54.1 \%$ ). There are lower proportions of female staff in senior academic roles (51.0\%, although this has increased from 40.5\% last year), and professor level roles (42.3\%, a slight increase from 39.1\% last year).

Chart 1A.29: Professional Services staff by contract level and sex (2022)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at December 2022 census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

In Professional Services, females form the majority of both Standard and Senior Staff, however the proportion of males increases at Senior level (from $42.7 \%$ of Standard Staff to $49.2 \%$ of Senior Staff).

## Ethnicity

Chart 1A.30: Academic staff by contract level and BAME/white identity (2022)


Population: all academic staff for whom ethnicity data is known excluding casual and sessional as at December 2022 census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.
$17.0 \%$ of all academic staff are Black, Asian or minority ethnic. 10.0\% Senior roles are held by Black, Asian or minority ethnic staff, compared to $17.1 \%$ of Professor level roles (up from 15.6\% last year), 17.2\% Standard Academic and 19.1\% Research staff roles.

Chart 1A.31: UK Academic staff by contract level, BAME/white identity (2022, all known data)



Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at December 2022 census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

Chart 1A. 31 is limited to UK staff only and shows that amongst UK staff there is an under-representation of BAME staff in Senior roles (7.0\% BAME). Data for non-UK staff is not included due to small population sizes of non-UK staff at some contract levels.

Chart 1A.32: Academic staff by contract level and ethnic group (2022, all known data)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at December 2022 census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

At the more granular level of ethnic group, the data show that no Senior Academic roles are held by Black staff.

This data is not broken down by UK/Non-UK nationality as the population sizes would be small and compromise anonymity.

Chart 1A.33: Professional Services staff by contract level and BAME/white identity (2022, all known data)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at December 2022 census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.
$17.8 \%$ of Professional Services staff overall are Black, Asian and minority ethnic. Senior BAME representation in Professional Services is 3.2\%, compared to 18.4\% representation in Standard roles. This data is not broken down by ethnic group or nationality in order to protect anonymity.

## Religion or Belief

Chart 1A.35: Academic staff by contract level and religion or belief (2022, all known data)


Population: all staff for whom religion or belief is known excluding casual and sessional as at 1st December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount. Excludes undefined, Information Refused, and missing data. Data for staff who are Hindu, Sikh, Jewish, Buddhist and Other religion has been grouped within 'Other Religion' in order to protect anonymity.

A particularly high proportion of Senior Academic staff are Christian (57.1\%) and there are no Muslim Senior Academic Staff. Please note that the data only includes staff who have declared their religion or belief: we now hold religion or belief data for $85.1 \%$ of our staff.

Chart 1A.36: Professional Services staff by contract level and religion or belief (2022, all known data)


Population: all staff for whom religion or belief is known excluding casual and sessional as at 1st December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount. Excludes undefined, Information Refused, and missing data. Data for staff who are Hindu, Sikh, Jewish, Buddhist and Other religion has been grouped within 'Other Religion' due to small population sizes.

A 13.1pp higher proportion of Professional Services Senior Staff are Christian (52.5\%) than the proportion of Standard Support staff who are Christian (39.4\%). (41.5\%). There are lower proportions of Muslim staff (1.7\% compared to $5.6 \%$ ) and staff with other religions or beliefs ( $0 \%$ compared to $7.6 \%$ ) in senior roles compared to standard roles.

## Sexual Orientation

Chart 1A.37: Academic staff by contract level and sexual orientation (2022, all known data)


Population: all staff for whom sexual orientation is known excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

There are higher proportions of staff identifying as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other in Research roles ( $8.4 \%$ ) and Standard Academic roles ( $7.3 \%$ ) compared to Senior Staff and Professors ( $4.7 \%$ and $4.9 \%$ respectively). Please note that this data only includes those who have declared their sexual orientation: we now hold this data for $85.3 \%$ of our staff.

Chart 1A.38: Professional Services staff by contract level and sexual orientation (2020/21, all known data)


Population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at December 2022 census date. Figures calculated based on headcount.

A slightly higher proportion of Senior Professional Services staff are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other than the proportion LGBO in Standard Professional Services staff.

## 1b. Staff Progression

This section presents progression data for the 2021/22 academic year, with a comparison to the 2020/21 academic year. Progression is defined as an increase in grade during the period between $1^{\text {st }}$ August and $31^{\text {st }}$ July. 419 staff in total progressed in this way during the 2021/22 academic year, a progression rate of $9.7 \%$ (compared to 207 staff in 2020/21, when the progression rate was $5.1 \%$ ).

The charts below show the number of staff who progressed each academic year who share each protected characteristic as a proportion of total staff in post who share that protected characteristic. The figures on the axis show the total number of staff in post, and the percentages on the bars show the proportion who progressed. This allows us to monitor any differences in progression rates for staff who share particular protected characteristics.

## Age

Chart 1B.1: Age profile progression rate (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at 1st December census date. Promotions population: all promotions between 1st August and 31st July. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The progression rate is much higher for staff in age brackets under 36, and particularly high for staff aged 25 and under (21.5\%). Note that the progression rate is higher in 2021/22 for all age categories.

## Disability

Chart 1B.2: Disability status progression rate (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at 1st December census date. Promotions population: all promotions between 1st August and 31st July. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The progression rate for disabled staff is $8.4 \%$, slightly lower than the progression rate for staff with no known disability ( $9.6 \%$ ). The 1.2 percentage point progression gap this year is a marked improvement on last year when the difference in progression rates for disabled and non-disabled staff was 3.7pp.

## Gender

Chart 1B.3: Gender progression rate (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at 1st December census date. Promotions population: all promotions between 1st August and 31st July. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The progression rate for female staff is $10.1 \%$, compared to $8.8 \%$ for male staff. The progression gap for male staff is therefore 1.3 pp (compared to 0.5 pp last year).

## Ethnicity

Chart 1B.4: Progression rate by BAME/white identity (2020/21 and 2021/22)


This year, as last year, the progression rate for Black, Asian and minority ethnic staff is higher than the progression rate for White staff. $10.0 \%$ of BAME staff progressed in 2021/22 compared to $9.4 \%$ of White staff.

Chart 1B.5: Progression rate by BAME/white identity and nationality (2020/21 and 2021/22)



Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at 1st December census date. Promotions population: all promotions between 1st August and 31st July. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The progression rate for UK BAME staff is higher than for UK White staff (10.5\% compared to $9.0 \%$ ). The reverse is true for non-UK staff where White staff have a higher proportion rate than BAME staff ( $13.3 \%$ compared to $9.4 \%$ ). These trends are the same as last year.

Chart 1B.6: Progression rate by ethnic group (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at 1st December census date. Promotions population: all promotions between 1st August and 31st July. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The progression rates are highest for Mixed (18.0\%), Asian (12.1\%), White (9.4\%) and Other ( $9.9 \%$ ) staff. Black staff had considerably lower progression rates than others in
both 2021/22 (5.6\% of Black staff progressed) and 2020/21 (2.4\% of Black staff progressed).

Please note that due to the small population of non-UK promotions this data cannot be meaningfully split by both ethnic group and nationality.

## Religion or Belief

Chart 1B.7: Religion or belief progression rate (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at 1st December census date. Promotions population: all promotions between 1st August and 31st July. Figures calculated based on headcount. Known data only. Data for staff who are Hindu, Sikh, Jewish, Buddhist and Other religion has been grouped within 'Other Religion' due to small population sizes.

Christian staff and those with a religion or belief other than Christianity or Islam have had slightly lower progression rates than average in both 2020/21 and 2021/22.

## Sexual Orientation

Chart 1B.8: Sexual orientation progression rate (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at 1st December census date. Promotions population: all promotions between 1st August and 31st July. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The progression rate for staff whose sexual orientation is Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other is 4.0pp higher than for heterosexual staff.

## 1c. Staff Leavers

This section presents leavers data for the 2021/22 academic year. This population includes anyone who left the university between 1st August and 31st July (not including fixed term positions). 471 people left permanent positions within the university in the 2021/22 academic year, at a rate of $12.0 \%$. In 2020/21, 356 people left permanent positions, a leaving rate of $9.8 \%$.

The charts below show the proportion of all permanent staff who share each protected characteristic who left in each academic year. The figures on the axis show the total number of staff in post, and the percentages on the bars show the proportion who left. This allows us to monitor whether staff sharing particular protected characteristics are leaving at particularly high (or low) rates.

## Age

Chart 1C.1: Rate of leaving permanent positions by age (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Leavers population: all leavers excluding casual and sessional between August 2021 and July 2022. Figures calculated based on headcount.

Staff in age brackets under 30 leave permanent positions at around twice the average rate ( $12.0 \%$ ) in 2021/22. The leaving rate is particularly low for staff aged between 41 and 55 , and then much higher in age groups over 66. Last year (2020/21) the staff in all age groups over 56 left at a much greater rate than this year.

## Disability

Chart 1C.2: Rate of leaving permanent positions by disability status (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Leavers population: all leavers excluding casual and sessional between August 2021 and July 2022. Figures calculated based on headcount.

Disabled staff left permanent positions in 2021/22 at a slightly higher rate than staff with no known disability ( $13.3 \%$ compared to $11.9 \%$ ). This is in contrast to last year when the leaving rates were almost exactly the same for disabled and non-disabled staff.

## Sex

Chart 1C.3: Rate of leaving permanent positions by sex (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Leavers population: all leavers excluding casual and sessional between August 2021 and July 2022. Figures calculated based on headcount.

Unlike last year, this year a slightly lower proportion of women left their roles (11.9\%) than men (12.1\%).

## Ethnicity

Chart 1C.4: Rate of leaving permanent positions by BAME/ white identity (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Leavers population: all leavers excluding casual and sessional between August 2021 and July 2022. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The leaving rate for permanent Black, Asian and Minority ethnic staff is 1 pp lower than for White staff. A similar pattern was seen in 2020/21.

Chart 1C.5: Rate of leaving permanent positions by BAME/ white identity and nationality (2020/21 and 2021/22)


## Non-UK



Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date.
Leavers population: all leavers excluding casual and sessional between August 2021 and July 2022.
Figures calculated based on headcount.
The leaving rate for permanent Black, Asian and minority ethnic UK staff (14.8\%) is higher than the leaving rate for permanent White UK staff (12.5\%), however there was very little difference for UK staff based on ethnicity last year.

For non-UK staff, in both of the last two years Black, Asian and minority ethnic staff have been much less likely to leave permanent roles (5.5\% leaving rate in 2021/22 for BAME staff compared to $11.4 \%$ for White staff).

Chart 1C.6: Rate of leaving permanent positions by ethnic group (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Leavers population: all leavers excluding casual and sessional between August 2021 and July 2022. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The proportion of staff from Mixed ethnic groups who left in 2021/22 was very high ( $25.7 \%$ ). The proportion of Chinese and staff from Other ethnic backgrounds who left was very low in both 2021/22 and 2020/21.

## Religion or Belief

Chart 1C.8: Rate of leaving permanent positions by religion or belief (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Leavers population: all leavers excluding casual and sessional between August 2021 and July 2022. Figures calculated based on headcount.

The proportion of Muslim staff who leave was lower than average in both 2021/22 (when 8.0\% of Muslim staff left compared to an average of 12.0\%) and in 2020/21 (when 4.4\% Muslim staff left compared to an average leaving rate of 9.8\%.

## Sexual Orientation

Chart 1C.9: Rate of leaving permanent positions by sexual orientation (2020/21 and 2021/22)


Workforce population: all staff excluding casual and sessional as at $1^{\text {st }}$ December census date. Leavers population: all leavers excluding casual and sessional between August 2021 and July 2022. Figures calculated based on headcount.

This year the leaving rate was considerably higher for staff whose sexual orientation is Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other (17.8\%, compared to $12.0 \%$ for heterosexual staff). This contrasts with last year when the leaving rate was the same for LGBO and heterosexual staff.

## 1d. Recruitment and Selection

The following datasets reflect the previous 12 months of staff recruitment activity, split by protected characteristics. Numbers and percentages of applications, shortlisted candidates, offers, and hires are provided. In addition, the relative rate of candidates being shortlisted and hired are calculated. A relative value close to 1 indicates no significant difference in the relative rates for each group.

## Disability

Chart 1D.1 Applications, shortlist, offers and hires by disability (2021/22)

```
Applications \bullet Shortlisted \bulletOffered \bullet Hired
```



A higher proportion of people shortlisted and hired in 2021/22 were disabled compared to the proportion of applications who were disabled.

Table 1D. 1 Applications, shortlist, offers and hires, with shortlisting and offer rates by disability (2021/22)

|  | Number of applications | Number on shortlist | Shortlist <br> rate (\% <br> of apps) | Number offered | Offer rate (\% of shortlist) | Number hired | Hire rate (\% of shortlist) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Known Disability | 21833 | 3433 | 15.7\% | 1678 | 48.9\% | 1024 | 29.8\% |
| Disabled | 1478 | 315 | 21.3\% | 133 | 42.2\% | 93 | 29.5\% |
| \% Disabled | 6.3\% | 8.4\% |  | 7.3\% |  | 8.3\% |  |

Table 1D. 2 Relative shortlisting and offer rates for disabled candidates (2021/22)

| Relative rate of a disabled applicant being shortlisted | 1.4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Relative rate of a disabled shortlisted candidate being hired | 0.99 |

This data shows the relative rates of disabled candidates being shortlisted and hired.

- The relative rate of being shortlisted is calculated by dividing the proportion of disabled applications who are shortlisted by the proportion of non-disabled applications who are shortlisted.
- The relative rate of being hired is calculated by dividing the proportion of the disabled shortlist who are hired by the proportion of the non-disabled shortlist who are hired.

The figures can be read as a ratio or percentage. With a relative rate of being shortlisted of 1.4, for every 10 non-disabled candidates who are shortlisted, 14 disabled candidates are shortlisted. With a relative rate of being hired of 0.99, For every 100 non-disabled candidates who are hired, 99 disabled candidates are hired.

Disabled candidates are relatively more likely to be shortlisted than non-disabled candidates. The hiring rate for shortlisted disabled candidates being hired is very similar to the hiring rate for shortlisted non-disabled candidates.

## Gender

Chart 1D. 2 Applications, shortlist, offers and hires by gender (2021/22)

- Applications • Shortlisted $\bullet$ Offered • Hired


The proportion of male candidates decreases (and the proportion of female candidates increases) throughout each step of the recruitment process. A higher proportion of female candidates are shortlisted, offered a role, and hired than the proportion of female applications.

Table 1D. 3 Applications, shortlist, offers and hires with shortlisting and offer rates by gender (2021/22)

|  | Number of <br> applications | Number on <br> shortlist | Shortlist <br> rate (\% of <br> apps) | Number <br> offered | Offer rate <br> (\% of <br> shortlist) | Number <br> hired | Hire rate <br> (\% of <br> shortlist) |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 11619 | 1989 | $17.1 \%$ | 1031 | $51.8 \%$ | 647 | $32.5 \%$ |
| Male | 10975 | 1653 | $15.1 \%$ | 726 | $43.9 \%$ | 448 | $27.1 \%$ |

Table 1D. 4 Relative shortlisting and recruitment rates for women candidates (2021/22)

| Relative rate of a female applicant being shortlisted | 1.14 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Relative rate of a female shortlisted candidate being hired | 1.2 |

The relative rate of a woman being shortlisted is 1.14 , and the relative rate of a woman being hired is 1.2 , showing an increased likelihood of women being both shortlisted and hired.

## Ethnicity

Chart 1D. 3 Applications, shortlists, offers and hires by BAME/white identity (2021/22)

- Applications • Shortlisted $\bullet$ Offered • Hired


There is a marked decrease in the proportion of Black, Asian and minority ethnic candidates at each stage of the recruitment process. $43.8 \%$ applications are BAME, compared to just $31.6 \%$ of those shortlisted, $25.1 \%$ of those offered a role, and $24.5 \%$ of those hired.

The proportion of BAME applications has increased considerably this year to 43.8\% of applications compared to $35.6 \%$ of applications last year. There has been a smaller increase in the proportion of shortlisted candidates who are BAME, from 28.5\% last year to $31.6 \%$ this year. The proportion of BAME offer holders has also increased from 21.6\% last year to 25.1\% this year.

Table 1D.5 Applications, shortlists, offers and hires, with shortlisting and offer rates by BAME/White identity (2021/22)

|  | Number of <br> applications | Number <br> on <br> shortlist | Shortlist <br> rate (\% of <br> apps) | Number <br> offered | Offer rate <br> (\% of <br> shortlist) | Number <br> hired | Hire rate <br> (\% of <br> shortlist) |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BAME | 9840 | 1151 | $11.7 \%$ | 440 | $38.2 \%$ | 267 | $23.2 \%$ |
| White | 12651 | 2487 | $19.7 \%$ | 1316 | $52.9 \%$ | 824 | $33.1 \%$ |
| \% BAME | $43.8 \%$ | $31.6 \%$ |  | $25.1 \%$ |  | $24.5 \%$ |  |

Table 1D. 6 Relative shortlisting and recruitment rates for BAME candidates (2021/22)

| Relative rate of BAME applicant being shortlisted | $\mathbf{0 . 6 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Relative rate of BAME shortlisted candidate being hired | $\mathbf{0 . 7 0}$ |

Data on ethnicity shows that BAME applications are less likely ( 0.6 as likely) to be shortlisted than White applications, and that shortlisted BAME candidates are less likely ( 0.70 as likely) to be hired than shortlisted White candidates.

The relative rate of a BAME candidate being shortlisted has fallen since last year (from 0.71 to 0.6 ), while the rate at which shortlisted candidates are hired is similar to last year (0.71).

## Sexual Orientation

Chart 1D. 4 Applications, shortlist, offers and hires by sexual orientation group (2021/22)

- Applications $\bullet$ Shortlisted $\bullet$ Offered • Hired


There are similar proportions of people who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other at application, shortlist and who are eventually hired.

Table 1D.7 Applications, shortlist, offers and hires with shortlisting and offer rates by sexual orientation group (2021/22)

|  | Number of <br> applications | Number on <br> shortlist | Shortlist <br> rate (\% of <br> apps) | Number <br> offered | Offer rate <br> (\% of <br> shortlist) | Number <br> hired | Hire rate (\% <br> shortlist) |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Heterosexual | 17998 | 2900 | $16.1 \%$ | 1429 | $49.3 \%$ | 871 | $30.0 \%$ |
| LGBO | 2952 | 504 | $17.1 \%$ | 205 | $40.7 \%$ | 143 | $28.4 \%$ |
| \% LGBO | $14.1 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ |  | $12.5 \%$ |  | $14.1 \%$ |  |

Table 1D. 8 Relative shortlisting and recruitment rates for LGBO candidates (2021/22)

| Relative rate of LGBO applicant being shortlisted | 1.06 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Relative rate of LGBO shortlisted candidate being hired | $\mathbf{0 . 9 4}$ |

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other applications are very slightly more likely to be shortlisted than heterosexual applications, and very slightly less likely to be hired; but the differences are minimal.

## 1e. Pay Gaps Reporting

The University has a statutory obligation to report its gender pay gap based on a snapshot of workforce data taken on $31^{\text {st }}$ March each year. We have chosen to go beyond our statutory obligation to calculate and report our ethnicity, disability and (for the first time this year) sexual orientation pay gaps.

Pay gaps show the percentage difference between the average pay for all employees who do and don't share a particular protected characteristic (for example, the average pay for all male and all female employees), no matter what their role is. The tables below show the mean and median calculations for Manchester Metropolitan's pay gaps as at $31^{\text {st }}$ March 2022, with a comparison to last year and to the sector figures where available. Sector figures show all UK Higher Education Institutions and are taken from Advance HE's Equality in Higher Education Staff Statistical Report 2022.

## Gender

A Gender Pay Gap is the percentage difference between the average pay of all male employees and all female employees, no matter what their role is.

Table 1E. 1 Mean and Median Gender Pay Gaps with sector comparison

|  | 2021 | 2022 | Sector <br> $(2021)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean Gender Pay Gap | $6.4 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ |
| Median Gender Pay Gap | $2.6 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ | $8.5 \%$ |

The mean Gender pay gap in 2022 is $5.2 \%$ and the median is $4.5 \%$. In 2021 the mean was $6.4 \%$ and the median $3.2 \%$. The Higher Education Sector mean in 2021 was $14.8 \%$ and the median $8.5 \%$. Our gender pay gap is therefore considerably smaller than the sector and has reduced since last year.

Table 1E. 2 Proportion of staff who are male and female by Pay Quartile

|  | Female | Male |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Quartile 1 - lowest pay | $57.5 \%$ | $42.5 \%$ |
| Quartile 2 | $56.5 \%$ | $43.5 \%$ |
| Quartile 3 | $53.3 \%$ | $46.7 \%$ |
| Quartile 4 - highest pay | $50.3 \%$ | $49.7 \%$ |

Table 1E. 2 shows the proportion of male and female staff in four pay quartiles ordered from the lowest pay cohort (Quartile 1) to the highest pay cohort (Quartile 4). The bands have been established by ranking all employees by hourly pay, staring from the lowest to the highest paid and dividing into quartiles. The pay gap is strongly impacted by the fact that the university has more women than men in lower paid roles.

Table 1E. 3 Mean and Median Gender Bonus Gaps

|  | 2021 | 2022 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Mean Average Bonus Gap | $17 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Median Average Bonus Gap | $16 \%$ | $17 \%$ |


| Proportion Receiving Bonus - Male | $1.0 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Proportion Receiving Bonus - Female | $0.9 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |

In March 2022 the University offered a very limited bonus scheme to staff working above grade 11. $1.9 \%$ of male staff received a bonus, and $1.3 \%$ of female staff. The mean bonus gap for women was $25 \%$, much higher than the pay gap and higher than last year. The median average bonus gap was slightly lower at $17 \%$.

## Disability

A Disability Pay Gap is the percentage difference between the average pay of employees with no known disability and disabled employees, no matter what their role is.

Table 1E. 4 Mean and Median Disability Pay Gaps with sector comparison

|  | 2021 | 2022 | Sector <br> $(2021)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean Disability Pay Gap | $7.5 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ |
| Median Disability Pay Gap | $0.3 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ |

The mean Disability Pay Gap in 1011 is $7.7 \%$ and the median is $5.4 \%$. The mean gap has increased slightly since last year, and the median gap has increased significantly from $0.3 \%$ in 2021 to $5.4 \%$ in 2022. Both the mean and median gaps are slightly below the sector average.
Table 1E. 5 Proportion of staff who are disabled, not disabled, and not declared by Pay Quartile

|  | Disabled | Non-disabled | Unknown |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Quartile 1 - lowest pay | $8.9 \%$ | $87.1 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ |
| Quartile 2 | $8.4 \%$ | $89.8 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Quartile 3 | $7.3 \%$ | $90.6 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Quartile 4 - highest pay | $7.6 \%$ | $89.4 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |

Table 1E. 5 shows the proportion of disabled employees, employees with no known disability and employees who did not provide information in four pay quartiles ordered from the lowest pay cohort (Quartile 1) to the highest pay cohort (Quartile 4). The bands have been established by ranking all employees by hourly pay, staring from the lowest to the highest paid and dividing into quartiles. There are higher proportions of disabled people in the first and second cohorts.

## Ethnicity

An Ethnicity Pay Gap is the percentage difference between the average pay of all white employees and all Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) employees, no matter what their role is.

Table 1E. 6 Mean and Median Ethnicity Pay Gaps with sector comparison

|  | 2021 | 2022 | Sector <br> $(2021)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean Ethnicity Pay Gap | $10.9 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |


| Median Ethnicity Pay Gap | $5.7 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

The mean ethnicity pay gap in 2022 is $11.3 \%$ and the median is $5.8 \%$. Both gaps have increased slightly from 2021, when the mean was $10.9 \%$ and the median $5.7 \%$. Our ethnicity pay gaps, both mean and median, are significantly higher than the sector gaps.

Table 1E. 7 Proportion of staff who are Black, Asian and minority ethnic and White by Pay Quartile

|  | BAME | White |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Quartile 1 - lowest pay | $23.4 \%$ | $76.6 \%$ |
| Quartile 2 | $15.5 \%$ | $84.5 \%$ |
| Quartile 3 | $13.9 \%$ | $86.1 \%$ |
| Quartile 4 - highest pay | $13.5 \%$ | $86.5 \%$ |

Table 1E. 7 shows the proportion of white and BAME employees in four pay quartiles ordered from the lowest pay cohort (Quartile 1) to the highest pay cohort (Quartile 4). The bands have been established by ranking all employees by hourly pay, staring from the lowest to the highest paid and dividing into quartiles. The Ethnicity Pay Gap is strongly impacted by the high proportion of staff in Quartile 1 (the lowest paid roles) who are BAME compared to the proportion in Quartiles 2, 3 and 4. The Ethnicity Pay Gap increased despite the proportion of BAME staff in Quartile 4 (the highest paid roles) increasing significantly in 2022 to $13.5 \%$ from $7.3 \%$ the previous year.

## Sexual Orientation

A Sexual Orientation Pay Gap is the percentage difference between the average pay of heterosexual employees and employees who describe their sexual orientation as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other (LGBO). As this is the first year these figures have been provided, comparisons will be made available next year; however, this data is not available for the sector.

Table 1E. 8 Mean and Median Sexual Orientation Pay Gaps

|  | 2022 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mean Sexual Orientation Pay Gap | $5.1 \%$ |
| Median Sexual Orientation Pay Gap | $6.7 \%$ |

The mean Sexual Orientation Pay Gap in 2022 is $5.1 \%$ and the median gap is $6.7 \%$.
Table 1E. 9 Proportion of staff who are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other and heterosexual by Pay Quartile

|  | LGBO | Heterosex <br> ual | Information <br> not <br> provided |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Quartile 1 - lowest pay | $9.1 \%$ | $73.3 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ |
| Quartile 2 | $8.1 \%$ | $80.5 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ |
| Quartile 3 | $7.0 \%$ | $80.2 \%$ | $12.8 \%$ |
| Quartile 4 - highest pay | $5.4 \%$ | $74.1 \%$ | $20.5 \%$ |

Table 1E. 9 shows the proportion of LGBO employees, heterosexual employees, and employees who did not provide the information in four pay quartiles ordered from the lowest pay cohort (Quartile 1) to the highest pay cohort (Quartile 4). The bands have been established by ranking all employees by hourly pay, staring from the lowest to the highest paid and dividing into quartiles. The pay gap is impacted by the fact that there is a decreasing proportion of LGBO staff from the lowest to the highest pay Quartiles. A high proportion of staff in the Quartile 4 (the highest pay quartile) chose not to provide information about their sexual orientation.

## Part 2: Student Data

This section of the report provides student equality monitoring data with observations in respect of:

1. Student enrolments
2. Progression from level 4 to level 5
3. Student satisfaction
4. Degree awards
5. Graduate employment

Student data is profiled by the protected characteristics of age, disability, gender, ethnicity, religion or belief and sexual orientation wherever possible. Where appropriate, sector average figures are provided, sourced from Advance HE's 'Equality in higher education - students statistical report 2022'. Sector comparisons refer to the 20/21 academic year, which is the most recent data available.

## 2a. Student enrolments at Manchester Metropolitan shown as trend data (last three years)

The population used for the student enrolment data in this report is the standard registration population reported to HESA. Registrations are counted once for each 'year of programme of study'. Students who leave within two weeks of their start date, or anniversary of their start date, and are on a course of more than two weeks duration, are not included in the standard registration population. Students who have suspended study (e.g. dormant students), incoming visiting and exchange students from overseas, writing-up students and students on sabbatical are also excluded from this population.

In the academic year 2021/22 there were 36,965 active students enrolled at Manchester Metropolitan (compared to 35,910 the previous year).

## Age

Chart 2A.1: Student enrolment by age group on entry


Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled students; standard registration population. Percentages calculated on headcount. To match Advance HE reporting, student age data refers to students' age on the start date of their studies.

The majority of our students start their studies when aged 21 or under.
There have been some very slight changes in the age on entry profile of our students since 19/20, with a small increase in the proportion of students in age groups over 26, and a slight decrease in the proportion of students aged 22-25. This is in part due to the increase in degree apprenticeship enrolments - a large proportion of whom are over 26.

Our student profile is younger than the sector, where 49.0\% of students are aged 21 and under when they start their studies ${ }^{10}$.

## Disability

Chart 2A.2: Student enrolment by disability status


Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled students; standard registration population. Percentages calculated on headcount.

In 2021/22 the proportion and number of students disclosing a disability increased to $15.5 \%$ of all enrolments. This is the highest level seen in the three year reporting period (and the highest level we have ever recorded at Manchester Met).

The proportion of students who are disabled in the sector overall has increased every year since 2003/04, and in 2020/21,15.2\% students were disabled. ${ }^{11}$

Chart 2A.3: Disabled students by impairment type

[^6]

Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled students who disclosed a disability, excluding dormant. Percentages calculated on headcount.

This is the first year in which mental health conditions are the most common impairment type. 34.1\% of disabled students (1,955 students) report a mental health condition, slightly higher than the $33.6 \%$ of disabled students (1,925 students) who report a specific learning difficulty.

Sector data is only available for 2020/21, when $29.4 \%$ disabled students reported a mental health condition (a 0.8 percentage point increase on the previous year), and $32.6 \%$ disabled students had a specific learning difficulty. ${ }^{12}$

## Sex

Chart 2A.4: Student enrolment by sex

[^7]

Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled students; standard registration population. Percentages calculated on headcount.

Across the sector, $57.0 \%$ of students are female, $42.8 \%$ are male ( $0.2 \%$ Other) ${ }^{13}$ and There is, therefore, a small variation between the University and sector averages, as we have a slightly higher proportion of students who are female.

Data on students' sex is returned to HESA with the possible options of 'Female', 'Male' and 'Other'. For the purposes of this report, data for the sex field will be referred to as sex, which differs from reporting up to 19/20 where this section was labelled as gender. This aligns with Advance HE's updated guidance on equality data monitoring which better reflects the phrasing of the response options required by HESA.

## Gender Identity

Chart 2A.5a: Gender Identity data collection rates


Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled students; standard registration population. Percentages calculated on headcount. Please note that

Chart 2A.5b: Student enrolment by gender identity (where data is held, excluding information refused or not collected)


[^8]Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled students; standard registration population. Percentages calculated on headcount.

Separately, we record and report our students' gender identity. Advance HE refer to this as Trans status. Students are asked to indicate, according to their own selfassessment, if their gender identity is the same as the gender they were originally assigned at birth.

In 2021/22 the amount of data we hold on our students' gender identity greatly increased - we now hold data for $94.3 \%$ of our students (or $95.9 \%$ including those who chose not to reveal this information). In previous years we only held this data for around $65 \%$ of our students.
$0.6 \%$ of our enrolled students (around 215 students) say that their gender identity is not the same as the gender originally assigned to them at birth. Sector comparison data is increasing in reliability - student disclosure rates in institutions who returned this data to HESA was at $84.1 \%$ in 2020/21, and $0.8 \%$ of these students said that their gender identity differed from that assigned to them at birth.

## Ethnicity

The following tables present ethnicity data by UK/non-UK domicile. Ethnicity within the HESA student record is based upon the 2021 census classification system in England and Wales. For the purposes of this report, we have aggregated detailed ethnicity records into five high-level groups as used in the census classification system:

- Asian - Asian/Asian British: Bangladeshi, Indian, Pakistani, Chinese, and any other Asian background
- Black - Black/Black British: African, Caribbean, and any other Black background
- Mixed - Mixed: White \& Asian, White \& Black Caribbean, White \& Black African, and any other Mixed background
- Other ethnic background - including Arab and any other background
- White -White and Gypsy or traveller

Chart 2A.6: Student enrolment by ethnic group and UK/Non-UK domicile ${ }^{14}$

[^9]

Non-UK


Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled students; standard registration population. Percentages calculated on headcount.

Chart 2A.7: Student enrolment by ethnicity (UK students only, 2021/22)


Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled students with UK Domicile; standard registration population. Percentages calculated on headcount.

Charts 2A. 5 and 2A. 6 show the breakdown of students based on ethnicity.
The UK domiciled student population at Manchester Met is becoming more and more ethnically diverse. There has been a year-on-year reduction in the proportion of White students at Manchester Met over the three year reporting period, and an increase in students from Black, Asian, Mixed and Other ethnic backgrounds. The proportion of Black UK domiciled students has increased in particular, from 5.9\% in 2019/20 to 6.8\% in 2021/22.

Manchester Metropolitan has a higher proportion of students from Black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds in total (35.5\%) than HEls in the UK overall (25.9\%) and HEls in England (29.5\%). The proportion of our students from Asian backgrounds is particularly high at $19.0 \%$ compared to $11.1 \%$ in HEIs in the UK overall ( $12.7 \%$ in HEls in England). However, we have a lower proportion of Black students (6.8\%) than institutions in the UK overall (7.7\%) and English institutions in particular (9.0\%). ${ }^{15}$

Chart 2A. 6 shows the ethnicity of our students according to their own self-assessment.

## Religion or Belief

Chart 2A.8: Student enrolment by religion or belief group

[^10]

Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled students; standard registration population. Known data only. Percentages calculated on headcount. We hold religion or belief data for $94.2 \%$ of our students.

Almost half of students declare no religion (46.5\%), 27.2\% are Christian and 20.3\% are Muslim. Although only small proportions of students are from other religious backgrounds, this does represent some sizable populations. There are over 100 Jewish students, around 200 Buddhist and Sikh students, almost 600 Hindu students and over 600 spiritual students.

In the sector overall 44.7\% students have no religion, 29.3\% are Christian, and 9.7\% are Muslim. We therefore have a much higher proportion of Muslim students than the sector overall. ${ }^{16}$

## Sexual Orientation

Chart 2A.9: Student enrolment by sexual orientation

[^11]

Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled students; standard registration population. Known data only. Percentages calculated on headcount. We hold data on sexual orientation for data for 90.9\% of our students.

We have a slightly lower proportion of students identifying as Bisexual, Gay man, Gay woman/lesbian or Other (9.4\%) than in the sector overall (10.6\%) ${ }^{17}$.

[^12]
## 2b. Student Progression

One of the University's Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) is to improve student progression, as measured by the percentage of Level 4 students who re-enrol onto their next level of study the following year. As part of the Road to 2030, a new set of institutional KPIs was established to monitor the progress of our strategy to 2026 and the progression KPI has been maintained from the previous set of institutional KPIs. The institutional target for 2026 is $90 \%$ progression.

In 2021/22 the overall progression rate was $82.0 \%$, lower than the previous year. The progression rate peaked in 2019/20, in part due to changes to assessment methods introduced due to the pandemic lockdowns, so the charts below show the previous four years' data in order to view trend data either side of this anomalous year.

## Student Progression by Age

Chart 2B.1: Student progression by age group


Population: all full time, first degree, level 4, students. Progression rate is the proportion of all full time, first degree, level 4 students who go on to re-enrol at level 5 the following year. To match Advance HE reporting, student age data refers to students' age on the start date of their studies.

In each of the previous three years the progression rate was lower for students aged 22-25, and this year the gap has got more pronounced with a progression rate of only $75.9 \%$ for this age group. Older students (those aged 26-35 and 36 and over) have consistently higher progression rates.

## Student Progression by Disability

Chart 2B.2: Student progression by disability group


Population: all full time, first degree, level 4, students. Progression rate is the proportion of all full time, first degree, level 4 students who go on to re-enrol at level 5 the following year.

In contrast to previous years, this year the progression rate for students with Mental health conditions, and Other disabilities (all excluding mental health condition and specific learning difficulty) are much lower than for students with no known disability. In all previous years, the gaps have been negligible or students with disabilities have had higher progression rates than those with no known disability.

## Student Progression by Sex

Chart 2B.3: Student progression by sex


Population: all full time, first degree, level 4, students. Progression rate is the proportion of all full time, first degree, level 4 students who go on to re-enrol at level 5 the following year.

Progression rates are consistently higher for female students, but the gap has reduced this year to 3.4 pp from 5.0pp last year.

## Student Progression by Ethnicity

Chart 2B.4: Student progression by BAME/White identity


Population: all full time, first degree, level 4, students. Progression rate is the proportion of all full time, first degree, level 4 students who go on to re-enrol at level 5 the following year.

Chart 2B.5: Student progression by BAME/White identity and nationality - UK/Non-UK


Population: all full time, first degree, level 4, students. Progression rate is the proportion of all full time, first degree, level 4 students who go on to re-enrol at level 5 the following year.

The progression rate for Black, Asian and Minority ethnic students this year was very slightly higher than the progression rate for White students, and in the previous three years' there has been very minimal difference based on ethnicity. In previous years (between $15 / 16$ and 18/19), there were small but persistent progression gaps between White and BAME students of around 2-4 percentage points, so the removal of these gaps represents real progress.

Chart 2B.6: Student progression by Ethnic group


Population: all full time, first degree, level 4, students. Progression rate is the proportion of all full time, first degree, level 4 students who go on to re-enrol at level 5 the following year.

Chart 2B.7: Student progression by Ethnic group and nationality - UK/Non-UK



Population: all full time, first degree, level 4, students. Progression rate is the proportion of all full time, first degree, level 4 students who go on to re-enrol at level 5 the following year.

Looking at progression rates by ethnic group and nationality reveals lower progression rates in each of the previous three years for Black Non-UK students, and a slightly lower progression rate this year for Black UK students (80.0\% compared to 81.9\% for White students and 82.2\% for Asian students).

## Student Progression by Sexual Orientation

Chart 2B.8: Student progression by sexual orientation (LGBO: students who identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual or other)


Population: all full time, first degree, level 4, students. Progression rate is the proportion of all full time, first degree, level 4 students who go on to re-enrol at level 5 the following year. Note: Other religion includes those who identify as Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Sikh, Spiritual or Any other religion or belief. The number of respondents within each of these religious groups is too small to meaningfully report separately.

There is a small persistent gap in progression rates for students who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other - this year the progression rate for LGBO students was 3.4 pp lower than the progression rate for heterosexual students.

## Student Progression by Religion or Belief

Chart 2B.9: Student progression by Religion or Belief


Population: all full time, first degree, level 4, students. Progression rate is the proportion of all full time, first degree, level 4 students who go on to re-enrol at level 5 the following year. Note: Other religion includes those who identify as Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Sikh, Spiritual or Any other religion or belief. The number of respondents within each of these religious groups is too small to meaningfully report separately.

For the last two years there has been a slightly lower progression rate for students from Other religions (Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Sikh, Spiritual or Any other religion or belief) compared to students who are Christian, Muslim or have no religion.

## 2c. Student Satisfaction

The Office for Students runs an annual National Student Survey (NSS) to gather final year undergraduate students' opinions on the quality of their courses, and the results are made available to providers split by some protected characteristics. The charts below show the proportion of students who agree or strongly agree with the statement "Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of my course".

In 2022 our students' overall satisfaction increased 8.3 pp to $78.1 \%$, above the sector average of $76.3 \%$, representing our best ever position relative to the sector. Last years' survey in 2021 showed a particular fall in students' satisfaction, here at Manchester Met and in the sector overall. The survey in 2020 was completed in February reflecting students' experience prior to the disruption caused by the pandemic.

Chart 2C.1: Overall satisfaction by age group (\% satisfied)


Note: Young students are those who were aged 21 or under when they started their degree course, mature students are those who were over 21 when they started their degree course

Young students remain slightly less satisfied than Mature students, as in 2021 and in contrast to the 2020 survey reflecting students' experiences before the pandemic.

## Disability

Chart 2C.2: Overall satisfaction by disability

```
A specific learning disability (e.g. dyslexia, dyspraxia, ADHD)
No known disability
Other disability (Excluding Dyslexia, dyspraxia, ADHD)
```



100

In 2021, there was a steep drop in satisfaction for all students, but particularly for those with specific learning disabilities. In 2022, students with specific learning difficulties have seen a return to much higher levels of satisfaction. However, students with other disabilities (excluding Dysxlexia, dyspraxia and ADHD) are considerably less satisfied than other students and have not returned to pre-pandemic levels of satisfaction.

## Sex

Chart 2C.3: Overall satisfaction by sex


In 2022 the satisfaction rate for male and female students is almost exactly the same.

## Ethnicity

Chart 2C.4: Overall satisfaction by ethic group (five way split)


Note: The NSS changed to a five way breakdown of ethnicity reporting in 2021. In 2020 Other and Mixed ethnicities were combined as 'Other' in NSS reporting,

In 2020, students from Asian, Black, White and Other ethnic groups all had very similar rates of satisfaction of around $83 \%$. In 2021, students from Black and Other ethnic groups had slightly higher satisfaction than Asian, White and Mixed ethnicity students. In 2022, satisfaction has increased for students in Asian, Mixed, Other and White ethnicities, but has not increased to the same extent for Black students who were the least satisfied group in 2022.

## 2d. Student Good Honours

The tables in this section show the percentage of first-degree qualifiers who achieved Good Honours (a first class or 2:1 degree) by equality characteristic. Where appropriate the awarding gap is provided, along with sector benchmarks. This year our good honours rate fell by 4.4 pp to $78.1 \%$, representing a correction to two years' higher rates caused in part by changes to assessment practices implemented due to the pandemic.

## Student Good Honours by Age

Chart 2D.1: Student good honours by age group


Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22. To match Advance HE reporting, student age data refers to students' age on the start date of their studies.

Table 2D.1: Student good honours by age group (Advance HE comparable age groups) with sector comparison

| Age Group | $\mathbf{1 9 / 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 / 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 / 2 2}$ | Sector <br> benchmark <br> (20/21 data) | Difference to <br> sector (20/21) |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 1 \&}$ under | $82.5 \%$ | $82.1 \%$ | $77.7 \%$ | $87.0 \%$ | -4.9 pp |
| $\mathbf{2 2}$ to $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $84.2 \%$ | $84.3 \%$ | $77.3 \%$ | $83.5 \%$ | +0.8 pp |
| $\mathbf{2 6}$ to $\mathbf{3 5}$ | $90.4 \%$ | $86.2 \%$ | $85.3 \%$ | $76.8 \%$ | +9.4 pp |
| $\mathbf{3 6 +}$ | $83.0 \%$ | $82.9 \%$ | $85.1 \%$ | $73.4 \%$ | +9.5 pp |
| Total | $82.9 \%$ | $82.5 \%$ | $78.2 \%$ | $83.5 \%$ | -1.0 pp |

Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22. Sector comparison is 2020/21.

The proportion of students aged 26-35 on entry awarded good honours has been consistently high over the previous three years, and this year the good honours rate is high for those aged 36 and over too. Sector patterns are quite different, with older students having much lower good honours rates than younger students.

## Student Good Honours by Disability

Chart 2D.2: Student good honours by disability group


Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22

Table 2D.2: Student good honours by disability group

|  | $\mathbf{1 9 / 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 / 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 / 2 2}$ | Sector <br> benchmark <br> (20/21 data) | Difference <br> to sector <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 / 2 1 )}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabled | $80.8 \%$ | $82.9 \%$ | $78.3 \%$ | $81.8 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| No disability | $83.3 \%$ | $82.4 \%$ | $78.2 \%$ | $83.0 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ |
| Total | $82.9 \%$ | $82.5 \%$ | $78.2 \%$ | $82.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Awarding gap- difference <br> disability to no disability | -2.5 pp | 0.5 pp | 0.1 pp | -0.9 pp |  |

Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22. Sector comparison is 2020/21.

There is no difference in the proportion of disabled and non-disabled students awarded good honours at Manchester Met, for the second year running. In the sector overall, disabled students have a 0.9pp award gap.

Chart 2D.3: Student good honours by impairment type


Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22.

Table 2D.3: Student good honours by impairment type with sector comparison

|  |  |  | Sector <br> benchmark <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 / 2 1}$ data) | Difference <br> to sector <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 / 2 1 )}$ | Difference <br> to no <br> disability |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mental health condition | $80.2 \%$ | $82.9 \%$ | $81.6 \%$ | $83.2 \%$ | -0.3 pp | $3.4 \%$ |
| Specific learning difficulty | $81.0 \%$ | $84.6 \%$ | $77.6 \%$ | $81.1 \%$ | +3.5 pp | $-0.6 \%$ |
| All other disabilities* | $81.3 \%$ | $80.9 \%$ | $75.3 \%$ | $81.3 \%$ | -0.4 pp | $-2.9 \%$ |
| No known disability | $83.3 \%$ | $82.4 \%$ | $78.2 \%$ | $82.7 \%$ | -0.3 pp | - |
| Total | $82.9 \%$ | $82.5 \%$ | $78.2 \%$ | $82.5 \%$ |  | - |

Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22. * Combined due to small population sizes.

Students with mental health conditions had higher good honours rates this year than those with no known disabilities; there was a 7.0pp drop in the good honours rate for students with specific learning difficulties.

## Student Good Honours by Sex

Chart 2D.4: Student good honours by sex


Table 2D.4: Student good honours by sex with sector comparison

|  | 19/20 | $\mathbf{2 0 / 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 / 2 2}$ | Sector <br> benchmark <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 / 2 1 )}$ | Difference <br> to sector <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 / 2 1 )}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | $80.7 \%$ | $79.0 \%$ | $74.7 \%$ | $80.1 \%$ | $-1.1 \%$ |
| Female | $84.4 \%$ | $85.0 \%$ | $80.7 \%$ | $83.7 \%$ | $+1.3 \%$ |
| Total | $82.9 \%$ | $82.5 \%$ | $78.2 \%$ | $82.2 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ |
| Awarding gap - difference | $-3.7 \%$ | $-6.0 \%$ | $-6.0 \%$ | $-3.6 \%$ |  |

[^13]The awarding data demonstrates $80.7 \%$ of females achieve good honours compared to $74.7 \%$ of males. The award gap is therefore 6.0 pp for male students, exactly equal to last years.

## Student Good Honours by Ethnicity

Chart 2D.6: Student good honours by BAME/White identity and UK/Non-UK domicile


Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22

Table 2D.6: Student good honours by ethnic group (2-way) with sector comparison, UK domiciled students only to allow comparison with sector data

|  | 19/20 | 20/21 | 21/22 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sector } \\ \text { benchmark } \\ (20 / 21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Difference to sector (20/21) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 87.4\% | 87.5\% | 83.5\% | 85.7\% | +1.9pp |
| Black, Asian \& minority ethnic | 75.4\% | 72.5\% | 67.8\% | 76.7\% | -4.2pp |
| Awarding gap - difference BAME to White | -12.0\% | -15.0\% | -15.7\% | -9.0\% | +6.0pp |

Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22. Sector comparison is 2020/21.

The data shows a higher rate of good degree awarding among White graduates compared to BAME graduates ( $83.5 \%$ and $67.8 \%$ respectively). The resultant ethnicity awarding gap is 15.9 pp (an increase from 15.0pp in the previous year). The sector wide awarding gap was 9.0 pp in 20/21. The gap remains larger for UK students (15.7pp) than for non-UK students (7.3pp).

Chart 2D.7: Student good honours by Ethnic group and domicile - UK/Non-UK


## Non-UK



Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22. Sector comparison is 2020/21.

Table 2D.7: Student good honours by ethnic group- UK students only to compare with available sector data.

|  | $\mathbf{1 9 / 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 / 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 / 2 2}$ | Sector <br> benchmark <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 / 2 1 )}$ | Difference <br> to sector <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 1 2 1 )}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | $87.4 \%$ | $87.5 \%$ | $83.5 \%$ | $85.7 \%$ | +1.8 pp |
| Asian | $74.5 \%$ | $71.5 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ | $79.6 \%$ | -8.1 pp |
| Difference to White if Asian | $-12.9 \%$ | $-15.9 \%$ | $-16.8 \%$ | $-6.1 \%$ | -9.8 pp |
| Black | $71.4 \%$ | $68.9 \%$ | $62.4 \%$ | $67.2 \%$ | 1.7pp |


| Difference to White if Black | $-16.0 \%$ | $-18.6 \%$ | $-21.1 \%$ | $-18.5 \%$ | -0.1 pp |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Other | $83.6 \%$ | $70.0 \%$ | $71.1 \%$ | $77.1 \%$ | -7.1 pp |
| Difference to White if | $-3.8 \%$ | $-17.5 \%$ | $-12.4 \%$ | $-8.6 \%$ | -8.9 pp |
| Other/Mixed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed | $80.1 \%$ | $80.9 \%$ | $77.9 \%$ | $83.3 \%$ | -2.4 pp |
| Difference to White if Mixed | $-7.3 \%$ | $-6.6 \%$ | $-5.6 \%$ | $-2.4 \%$ | -4.2 pp |

Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22. Sector comparison is 2020/21.

Following a reduction in the award gap for Black and Asian students in 2019/20, gaps for Black and Asian students have both increased again for the second year running. Sector data is only available for 20/21 graduates, and comparing our graduates in the same year shows that our award gaps for Asian, Other and Mixed students were larger than the sector overall, and our award gap for Black students was similar to the sector.

## Student Good Honours by Sexual Orientation

Chart 2D.8: Student good honours by sexual orientation


Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22.

Table 2D.8: Student good honours by sexual orientation with sector comparison

|  | $\mathbf{1 9 / 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 / 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 / 2 2}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Heterosexual | $84.1 \%$ | $82.4 \%$ | $78.0 \%$ |
| LGBO | $83.2 \%$ | $85.2 \%$ | $78.9 \%$ |
| Total | $82.9 \%$ | $82.5 \%$ | $78.2 \%$ |
| Awarding gap - difference | $-0.9 p p$ | $+2.8 p p$ | +0.9 pp |

Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22. Sector comparison is 2020/21.

There is no consistent gap in the good honours rate for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other students and the good honours rate for heterosexual students. Please note that this data is not available for the sector.

## Student Good Honours by Religion or Belief

Chart 2D.9: Student good honours by religion or belief


Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22.

Table 2D.9: Student good honours by religion or belief with sector comparison

|  | $\mathbf{1 9 / 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 / 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 / 2 2}$ | Sector <br> benchmark <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 / 2 1 )}$ | Difference to <br> sector <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 / 2 1 )}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Christian | $82.5 \%$ | $83.8 \%$ | $80.0 \%$ | $81.7 \%$ | +1.1 pp |
| Muslim | $73.9 \%$ | $69.1 \%$ | $66.5 \%$ | $74.2 \%$ | -5.1 pp |
| No religion | $86.9 \%$ | $87.1 \%$ | $82.8 \%$ | $85.3 \%$ | +2.8 pp |
| Other religion | $80.5 \%$ | $82.2 \%$ | $78.9 \%$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Total | $82.9 \%$ | $82.5 \%$ | $78.2 \%$ | $82.9 \%$ | -0.4 pp |

Population: all HESA reportable internally enrolled first-degree students awarded a qualification between 2019/20 and 2021/22. Sector comparison is 2020/21.

The proportion of Muslim graduates awarded good honours has decreased year on year since 2019/20, and now stands at $66.5 \%$. This is considerable lower than the good honours rate for students who are Christian, have no religion, or are from any other religion (combined), and is lower than the good honours rate for Muslim students in the sector overall.

## 2e. Graduate Outcomes

The Graduate Outcomes survey, run by HESA, is the sector standard tool used to understand graduate activity after leaving university. Graduates are surveyed 15 months after graduation, so this year we received the responses from those who graduates in 2019/20.

The charts below show the proportion of UK, full-time, first degree survey respondents who went on to positive graduate destinations - defined as entering professional, managerial and technical occupations, or entering HE or professional further study (following the Guardian University Guide definition).

The proportion of all UK, full-time, first degree survey respondents at Manchester Metropolitan in positive graduate destinations by this measure was $72.0 \%$ for 2019/20 graduates (compared to $68.6 \%$ for 18/19 graduates).

## Age

Chart 2E.1: Proportion of respondents in positive graduate destinations by age group on entry to university


Population: proportion of all eligible UK, full time, first degree, graduate outcomes survey respondents in positive graduate destinations (following Guardian University Guide methodology). To match Advance HE reporting, student age data refers to students' age on the start date of their studies.

There is a marked difference in the proportion of respondents in positive graduate destinations by age group. For the last two years around $85 \%$ graduates who were aged 25 or over when they started their degree were in positive destinations, compared to around $70 \%$ of graduates who were aged under 25 when they started their degree. The majority of our first degree graduates were aged under 21 when they started their degree, and there has been a 4.8pp increase in the proportion of these young students in positive destinations since last year.

## Disability

Chart 2E.2: Proportion of respondents in positive graduate destinations by disability


Population: proportion of all eligible UK, full time, first degree, graduate outcomes survey respondents in positive graduate destinations (following Guardian University Guide methodology)

Chart 2E.3: Proportion of respondents in positive graduate destinations by impairment type (grouped)


Population: proportion of all eligible UK, full time, first degree, graduate outcomes survey respondents in positive graduate destinations (following Guardian University Guide methodology)

For the last two years a slightly smaller proportion of disabled respondents were in graduate destinations compared to respondents with no known disability. Respondents with specific learning difficulties had a very similar graduate destination rate to those with no known disability; a slightly smaller proportion of respondents with mental health conditions were in graduate destinations, but the graduate destinations rate for students with any other disability was particularly low this year, at 64.9\%.

## Gender

Chart 2E.4: Proportion of respondents in positive graduate destinations by gender


Population: proportion of all eligible UK, full time, first degree, graduate outcomes survey respondents in positive graduate destinations (following Guardian University Guide methodology)

A lower proportion of female respondents are in positive graduate destinations, but the gap between males and females has reduced very slightly from 1.7 pp last year to 1.4pp this year.

## Ethnicity

Chart 2E.5: Proportion of respondents in positive graduate destinations by ethnic group


Population: proportion of all eligible UK, full time, first degree, graduate outcomes survey respondents in positive graduate destinations (following Guardian University Guide methodology)

There has been a lot of variability in the proportion of students in graduate destinations by ethnic group over the three -year reporting period.

- Students from Other and White ethnic backgrounds have consistently had the highest graduate prospects rates.
- The graduate prospects rate for respondents from Mixed ethnic backgrounds has been volatile - while a relatively low proportion of 18/19 respondents were in graduate destinations, the graduate prospects rate was above average for 19/20 respondents.
- There has been similar volatility in the graduate prospects rate for Black respondents, from $58.3 \%$ of $17 / 18$ respondents in graduate destinations, to $71.0 \%$ of $18 / 19$ respondents, and $67.9 \% 19 / 20$ respondents.
- The graduate outcomes rate for Asian students, however, has been consistently low in each of the three reported years. Only 65.1\% Asian respondents who graduated in 19/20 were in graduate destinations (compared to the $72.0 \%$ overall average).


## Sexual Orientation

Chart 2E.6: Proportion of respondents in positive graduate destinations by sexual orientation (LGBO: students who identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual or other)


Population: proportion of all eligible UK, full time, first degree, graduate outcomes survey respondents in positive graduate destinations (following Guardian University Guide methodology)

There was no difference in the proportion of heterosexual and LGBO respondents in positive graduate destinations among 17/18 graduates. However, in the following two years there has been a considerable gap for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Other respondents: with a 5.8 pp lower graduate destinations rate for 18/19 respondents and a 4.6pp lower rate for 19/20 graduates.

## Religion or Belief

Chart 2E.7: Proportion of respondents in positive graduate destinations by ethnic group


Population: proportion of all eligible UK, full time, first degree, graduate outcomes survey respondents in positive graduate destinations (following Guardian University Guide methodology). Note: Other religion includes those who identify as Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Sikh, Spiritual or Any other religion or belief. The number of respondents within each of these religious groups is too small to meaningfully report separately.

The graduate destinations rate for respondents who identify as Christian, having no religion or belief, or any other religion are broadly similar for 2019/20 graduates (although Christians had slightly higher graduate destination rates among 17/18 and 18/19 graduates). Muslim
respondents, however, have had a consistently lower graduate destination rate in each of the three reported years.
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