

Recruitment Data 2011-2012

1. The College monitors progress through recruitment and selection processes at the application, shortlist and final selection stages. Information is recorded through our online recruitment system in a separate database that is not seen by the recruitment panel.
2. Although the introduction and roll out of online recruitment has improved the quantity and quality of data available about applicants, one of the key challenges for the management of diversity remains the collection of accurate and comprehensive equality data at appointment. Information on an individual's social identity is optional and large numbers of applicants do not submit this information.
3. Since 2009-10, the sample of which this analysis is based has been doubled. The roll out of the E-recruitment has now been completed. We should have a 100% of the data inputted by applicants for the academic year 2012-2013. This also means that comparisons with previous year are not always significant as the sample is much bigger at present.
4. Data has been withheld where the numbers of applicants from a particular category are so small as to compromise confidentiality of declarations of sensitive personal information.

Summary:

5. Overall slightly more women applied at Queen Mary in 2011-12. The proportion of male and female applicants who were shortlisted and appointed **is broadly in line** with their representation in the applicants' pool. This is consistent over the past few year. In S&E, female applicants were much more likely to be successful but few of them apply.
6. Overall at QM, **White candidates were more likely to be shortlisted and appointed** 45% of all applicants were BME, but only 30% were appointed, the gap is particularly prominent for Asian and Black applicants.
7. Overall 14.0% of applicants declared having a disability and 18.2% of the successful applicants were disabled, which is **a positive outcome**.
8. Overall, the proportion of applicants by Age group is **broadly in line** with the proportion of people who had a job offered.
9. Applicants from the UK were more likely to be appointed. **Applicants that were from outside the EU were less likely to be successful.**
10. Across QM, applicants who were **Muslim, Hindu or other religion (apart from Christian) were less likely to be shortlisted and appointed** in comparison with Christian and applicants with no religion

Gender

Professional services						
Gender	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
Female	2335	47%	261	51%	56	46%
Male	2518	51%	234	46%	55	45%
Unknown	98	2%	13	3%	11	9%
Total	4951	100%	508	100%	122	100%

Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS)						
Gender	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
Female	1395	50%	70	50%	41	63%
Male	1305	47%	62	44%	22	34%
Unknown	90	3%	9	6%	2	3%
Total	2790	100%	141	100%	65	100%

Science and Engineering (S&E)						
Gender	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
Female	313	26%	44	43%	19	43%
Male	832	70%	54	53%	23	52%
Unknown	46	4%	4	4%	2	5%
Total	1191	100%	102	100%	44	100%

School of Medicine and Dentistry (SMD)						
Gender	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
Female	4270	62%	466	62%	136	60%
Male	2552	37%	275	36%	86	38%
Unknown	66	1%	15	2%	3	2%
Total	6888	100%	756	100%	225	100%

All QM						
Gender	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
Female	8313	53%	841	56%	252	55%
Male	7207	46%	625	41%	186	41%
Unknown	300	2%	41	3%	18	4%
Total	15820	100%	1507	100%	456	100%

Variation 2008-09 to 2011-12

Gender	Applied 08-09	Applied 09-10	Applied 10-11	Applied 11-12
Female	41 %	53 %	48 %	53 %
Male	42 %	39 %	50 %	46 %
Unknown	17 %	8 %	3 %	2 %

Gender	Shortlisted 08-09	Shortlisted 09-10	Shortlisted 10-11	Shortlisted 11-12
Female	48 %	52 %	49 %	56 %
Male	40 %	41 %	48 %	41 %
Unknown	12 %	7 %	3 %	3 %

Gender	Offered 08-09	Offered 09-10	Offered 10-11	Offered 11-12
Female	46 %	50 %	50 %	55 %
Male	41 %	40 %	43 %	41 %
Unknown	13 %	10 %	6 %	4 %

Commentary

Overall slightly more women applied at Queen Mary in 2011-12 (53% female applicants and 46% male applicants). The proportion of male and female applicants who were shortlisted and appointed is broadly in line with their representation in the applicants' pool. This is consistent over the past few year.

In HSS, female applicants were slightly more likely to be successful. In SMD the proportion of applicants and of candidates who were successful by gender are broadly in line.

In S&E, female applicants were much more likely to be successful, 26% of the applicants were female but 43% of those who were successful were female.

Ethnicity

Professional services					
Ethnicity	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered
White	2201	44%	292	57%	58%
Asian	1309	26%	86	17%	15%
Black	822	17%	76	15%	12%
Chinese & Other	210	4%	15	3%	2%
Mixed	202	4%	17	3%	3%
Unknown	207	4%	22	4%	10%
Total	4951	100%	508	100%	100%

Humanities and Social Sciences					
Ethnicity	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered
White	1959	70%	108	77%	75%
Asian	238	9%	>10	6%	8%
Black	149	5%	>10	2%	0%
Chinese & Other	161	6%	>10	4%	3%
Mixed	106	4%	>10	4%	5%
Unknown	177	6%	11	8%	9%
Total	2790	100%	141	100%	100%

Science and Engineering					
Ethnicity	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered
White	607	51%	67	66%	68%
Asian	290	24%	10	10%	5%
Black	48	4%	>10	4%	7%
Chinese & Other	123	10%	12	12%	9%
Mixed	37	3%	>10	6%	7%
Unknown	86	7%	>10	3%	5%
Total	1191	100%	102	100%	100%

School of Medicine and Dentistry						
Ethnicity	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
White	3253	47%	424	56%	145	64%
Asian	1975	29%	156	21%	45	20%
Black	723	10%	65	9%	10	4%
Chinese & Other	467	7%	54	7%	12	5%
Mixed	228	3%	25	3%	>10	4%
Unknown	242	4%	32	4%	>10	2%
Total	6888	100%	756	100%	225	100%

All QM						
Ethnicity	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
White	8020	51%	891	59%	295	65%
Asian	3812	24%	261	17%	70	15%
Black	1742	11%	148	10%	28	6%
Chinese & Other	961	6%	86	6%	20	4%
Mixed	573	4%	53	4%	18	4%
Unknown	712	4%	68	5%	25	5%
Total	15820	100%	1507	100%	456	100%

Variation 2008-09 to 2011-12

Ethnicity	Applied 09-10	Applied 10-11	Applied 11-12
White	48 %	45 %	51 %
BME	51 %	52 %	45 %
Unknown	1 %	3 %	4 %

Ethnicity	Shortlisted 09-10	Shortlisted 10-11	Shortlisted 11-12
White	61 %	57 %	59 %
BME	39 %	39 %	36 %
Unknown	4 %	4 %	5 %

Ethnicity	Offered 09-10	Offered 10-11	Offered 11-12
White	64 %	62 %	65 %
BME	34 %	32 %	30 %
Unknown	1 %	6 %	5 %

Notes: BME: includes Asian, Black, Chinese and other, Mixed

Data is not available for 2008-09 as unknown and BME were calculated together

Commentary:

Overall at QM, White candidates were more likely to be shortlisted and appointed: white candidates represented 51% of the applicants, 59% of the shortlisted and 65% of the successful applicants. This is a consistent pattern over the past 3 years.

45% of all applicants were BME, but only 30% were appointed, the gap is particularly prominent for Asian and Black applicants.

In HSS 0% of successful were Black, although 5% of the applicants were and in S&E, 24% of the applicants were Asian and 5% of applicants that were successful were Asian.

It is one of QM Equality and Diversity objectives to investigate this gap and possible remedial solutions.

Nationality

Professional services					
Nationality	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered
UK	2998	61%	375	74%	67%
EU	585	12%	39	8%	7%
Non EU	1237	25%	75	15%	16%
Unknown	131	3%	19	4%	10%
Total	4951	100%	508	100%	100%

Humanities and Social Sciences					
Nationality	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered
UK	1165	42%	71	50%	65%
EU	747	27%	37	26%	28%
Non EU	772	28%	24	17%	5%
Unknown	106	4%	9	6%	3%
Total	2790	100%	141	100%	100%

Science and Engineering						
Nationality	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
UK	342	29%	48	47%	20	45%
EU	327	27%	28	27%	11	25%
Non EU	470	39%	22	22%	11	25%
Unknown	52	4%	4	4%	2	5%
Total	1191	100%	102	100%	44	100%

School of Medicine and Dentistry						
Nationality	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
UK	3581	52%	472	62%	151	67%
EU	1267	18%	141	19%	37	16%
Non EU	1960	28%	131	17%	36	16%
Unknown	80	1%	12	2%	1	0%
Total	6888	100%	756	100%	225	100%

All QM						
Nationality	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
UK	8086	51%	966	64%	295	65%
EU	2926	18%	245	16%	75	16%
Non EU	4439	28%	252	17%	69	15%
Unknown	369	2%	44	3%	17	4%
Total	15820	100%	1507	100%	456	100%

Variation 2010-11 to 2011-12

Nationality	Applied 10-11	Applied 11-12
UK	51 %	51 %
EU	16 %	18 %
Non EU	29 %	28 %
Unknown	3 %	2 %

Nationality	Shortlisted 10-11	Shortlisted 11-12
UK	61 %	64 %
EU	17 %	16 %
Non EU	19 %	17 %
Unknown	4 %	3 %

Nationality	Offered 10-11	Offered 11-12
UK	57 %	65 %
EU	22 %	16 %
Non EU	15 %	15 %
Unknown	6 %	4 %

Notes:

EU: excludes UK

Variations are not available for 2008-09 and 2009-10 as data by nationality was not produced.

Commentary

51% of all the applicants were UK nationals. 65% of them were successful overall at QM.

Applicants that were from outside the EU were less likely to be successful; this is consistent across all faculties, especially in HSS and professional services and is consistent with last year findings.

Disability

Professional services						
Disability	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
No disability	4201	84.9%	421	82.9%	95	77.9%
Yes, disability	597	12.1%	76	15.0%	26	21.3%
Unknown	153	3.1%	11	2.2%	1	0.8%
Total	4951	100.0%	508	100.0%	122	100.0%

Humanities and Social Sciences					
Disability	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered
No disability	2374	85.1%	109	77.3%	86.2%
Yes, disability	359	12.9%	31	22.0%	12.3%
Unknown	57	2.0%	1	0.7%	1.5%
Total	2790	100.0%	141	100.0%	100.0%

Science and Engineering					
Disability	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered
No disability	6585	95.6%	729	96.4%	95.6%
Yes, disability	125	1.8%	16	2.1%	2.7%
Unknown	178	2.6%	11	1.5%	1.8%
Total	6888	100.0%	756	100.0%	100.0%

School of Medicine and Dentistry				
Disability	Applied		Shortlisted	Offered
No disability	1136	95.4%	98.0%	97.7%
Yes, disability	20	1.7%	2.0%	0.0%
Unknown	35	2.9%	0.0%	2.3%
Total	1191	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

All QM						
Disability	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
No disability	13180	83.3%	1261	83.7%	366	80.3%
Yes, disability	2217	14.0%	223	14.8%	83	18.2%
Unknown	423	2.7%	23	1.5%	7	1.5%
Total	15820	100.0%	1507	100.0%	456	100.0%

Variation 2008-09 to 2011-12

Disability	Applied 08-09	Applied 09-10	Applied 10-11	Applied 11-12
No disability	98.0 %	98.3 %	96.1 %	83.3 %
Yes, disability	2.0 %	1.7 %	2.5 %	14.0 %
Unknown	*	*	1.4 %	2.7 %

Disability	Shortlisted 08-09	Shortlisted 09-10	Shortlisted 10-11	Shortlisted 11-12
No disability	98.0 %	98.4 %	95.7 %	83.7 %
Yes, disability	2.8 %	1.6 %	2.8 %	14.8 %
Unknown	*	*	1.5 %	1.5 %

Disability	Offered 08-09	Offered 09-10	Offered 10-11	Offered 11-12
No disability	98.6 %	100.0 %	93.8 %	80.3 %
Yes, disability	1.4 %	0.0 %	2.2 %	18.2 %
Unknown	*	*	4.0 %	1.5 %

* For 2008-09 and 2009-10 "Not known" is included in "no known disability"

Commentary:

The proportion of disabled applicants was much higher in 2011-12 than in any previous year. This is potential due to the roll out of our e-recruitment system which provides more guarantees in terms of confidentiality. For this reasons, comparisons with previous years are not meaningful.

Overall 14.0% of applicants declared having a disability and 18.2% of the successful applicants were disabled, which is a positive outcome. The majority of them applied in professional services and in HSS. In SMD, only 1.7% of the applicants declared a disability and none were successful.

Age

Professional services						
Age Category	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
18 - 25	1140	23%	86	17%	19	16%
26 - 34	2138	43%	216	43%	49	40%
35 - 50	1214	25%	142	28%	34	28%
51 - 65	297	6%	44	9%	10	8%
66+	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Unknown	161	3%	20	4%	10	8%
Total	4951	100%	508	100%	122	100%

Humanities and Social Sciences					
Age Category	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered
18 - 25	137	5%	0	0%	2%
26 - 34	1469	53%	69	49%	63%
35 - 50	892	32%	49	35%	23%
51 - 65	157	6%	15	11%	9%
66+	0	0%	0	0%	0%
Unknown	135	5%	8	6%	3%
Total	2790	100%	141	100%	100%

Science and Engineering					
Age Category	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered
18 - 25	56	5%	10	10%	14%
26 - 34	625	52%	48	47%	52%
35 - 50	406	34%	37	36%	25%
51 - 65	43	4%	>10	3%	2%
66+	0	0%	0	0%	0%
Unknown	61	5%	>10	4%	7%
Total	1191	100%	102	100%	100%

School of Medicine and Dentistry						
Age Category	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
18 - 25	2014	29%	105	14%	41	18%
26 - 34	3320	48%	391	52%	122	54%
35 - 50	1166	17%	192	25%	40	18%
51 - 65	233	3%	43	6%	16	7%
66+	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Unknown	153	2%	25	3%	6	3%
Total	6888	100%	756	100%	225	100%

All QM						
Age Category	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
18 - 25	3347	21%	201	13%	67	15%
26 - 34	7552	48%	724	48%	235	52%
35 - 50	3678	23%	420	28%	100	22%
51 - 65	730	5%	105	7%	33	7%
66+	>10	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Unknown	510	3%	57	4%	21	5%
Total	15820	100%	1507	100%	456	100%

Variation 2010-11 to 2011-12

Age category	Applied 10-11	Applied 11-12
18 - 25	27 %	21 %
26 - 34	43 %	48 %
35 - 50	19 %	23 %
51 - 65	4 %	5 %
66+	0 %	0 %
Unknown	7 %	3 %

Age category	Shortlisted 10-11	Shortlisted 11-12
18 - 25	14 %	13 %
26 - 34	46 %	48 %
35 - 50	26 %	28 %
51 - 65	7 %	7 %
66+	0 %	0 %
Unknown	8 %	4 %

Age category	Offered 10-11	Offered 11-12
18 - 25	15 %	15 %
26 - 34	45 %	52 %
35 - 50	25 %	22 %
51 - 65	5 %	7 %
66+	0 %	0 %
Unknown	10 %	5 %

Notes: Variations are not available for 2008-09 and 2009-10 due to a change in methodology for the categorisation of age group

Commentary:

Overall, the proportion of applicants by Age group is broadly in line with the proportion of people who had a job offered. Applicants 18-25 were slightly less likely to be successful. This is broadly the case across QM.

Religion and Belief

Professional services					
Religion	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered
Christian	1646	33%	141	28%	25%
Muslim	960	19%	55	11%	10%
Hindu	269	5%	18	4%	3%
Other	305	6%	27	5%	7%
No Religion	1310	26%	192	38%	39%
Not Known	461	9%	75	15%	16%
Total	4951	100%	508	100%	100%

Humanities and Social Sciences				
Religion	Applied		Shortlisted	Offered
Christian	860	31%	34%	26%
Muslim	128	5%	4%	3%
Hindu	71	3%	0%	0%
Other	181	6%	6%	3%
No Religion	1173	42%	39%	49%
Not Known	377	14%	18%	18%
Total	2790	100%	100%	100%

Science and Engineering				
Religion	Applied		Shortlisted	Offered
Christian	300	25%	33%	32%
Muslim	142	12%	8%	5%
Hindu	127	11%	2%	0%
Other	65	6%	4%	0%
No Religion	428	36%	44%	50%
Not Known	129	11%	9%	14%
Total	1191	100%	100%	100%

School of Medicine and Dentistry						
Religion	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
Christian	2234	32%	243	32%	72	32%
Muslim	1038	15%	68	9%	24	11%
Hindu	769	11%	61	8%	13	6%
Other	421	6%	42	5%	11	4%
No Religion	1857	27%	249	33%	87	39%
Not Known	569	8%	93	12%	18	8%
Total	6888	100%	756	100%	225	100%

All QM						
Religion	Applied		Shortlisted		Offered	
Christian	5040	32%	466	31%	133	29%
Muslim	2268	14%	136	9%	40	9%
Hindu	1236	8%	81	5%	17	4%
Other	972	7%	81	6%	21	4%
No Religion	4768	30%	541	36%	189	41%
Not Known	1536	10%	202	13%	56	12%
Total	15820	100%	1507	100%	456	100%

Variation 2010-11 to 2011-12

Religion	Applied 08-09	Applied 09-10	Applied 10-11	Applied 11-12
Christian	25 %	30 %	32 %	32 %
Muslim	11 %	14 %	16 %	14 %
Other	13 %	14 %	17 %	15 %
No Religion	26 %	26 %	26 %	30 %
Not Known	24 %	16 %	10 %	10 %

Religion	Shortlisted 08-09	Shortlisted 09-10	Shortlisted 10-11	Shortlisted 11-12
Christian	28 %	32 %	35 %	31 %
Muslim	8 %	10 %	13 %	9 %
Other	10 %	9 %	16 %	11 %
No Religion	34 %	33 %	29 %	36 %
Not Known	19 %	16 %	16 %	13 %

Religion	Offered 08-09	Offered 09-10	Offered 10-11	Offered 11-12
Christian	25 %	29 %	32 %	29 %
Muslim	7 %	7 %	7 %	9 %
Other	6 %	5 %	11 %	8 %
No Religion	38 %	38 %	35 %	41 %
Not Known	24 %	21 %	15 %	12 %

Commentary:

Across QM, applicants who were Muslim, Hindu or other religion (apart from Christian) were less likely to be shortlisted and appointed in comparison with Christian and applicants with no religion