# Equality, Diversity \& Inclusion (EDI) Report for the 2023 Academic Promotions Round 

## Summary

This report is an analysis of outcomes of the 2023 Academic Promotions round. The recommendations from the Faculty Promotion Panels were endorsed at the Academic Promotions Group meeting on 10 July 2023 and the receipt of supportive references from external experts for Professorial applicants.

This report is shared with the Head of EDI, who has a role in supporting and advising on recommendations arising from the Academic Promotions Group meeting. The objective is to have consistent representation for race and gender by 2030 across our junior, middle, senior grades: 40:40:40 for BAME representation and 50:50:50 for gender.

222 academic staff applied for promotion in the 2023 round. This represents $24 \%$ of the total eligible population (i.e. Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Readers with at least one year's service). This compares to an application rate of 20\% (174 applicants) in the 2022 round and $22 \%$ in 2021. Further details are in table 1 on page 2.

BAME applicants have a lower application support rate $-74 \%$ of BAME applicants have been supported this year compared to $88 \%$ of white applicants (table 1). The overall BAME promotion rate is slightly lower at $18.6 \%$ (compared to $20.8 \%$ for white staff). This is a similar situation to the 2022 promotion round, although in 2021 the overall BAME promotion rate was slightly higher at $16.7 \%$ (against $15.8 \%$ for white staff).

At Reader level across the university, the overall promotion rate for BAME staff is however higher than for White academic staff at $20.6 \%$ and $16.3 \%$ respectively.

It is also noteworthy that there are greater numbers of BAME academics entering the in-scope eligible population (those with at least one year's service); for example, the BAME in-scope population has increased by $13 \%$ in the last year, whereas the White in-scope population increased by $4 \%$. We should therefore expect to see this feed through into higher promotion numbers in the next few years.

This year, female applicants have a higher application support rate than male applicants (87\% compared to $80 \%$ ). Women also have a higher overall promotion rate (as a percentage of the overall eligible population) at $24.6 \%$ (compared to $15.9 \%$ for men). This reflects the situation that has been seen in the promotion rounds for the previous 3 years 2019-2022. Indeed, the success of women in this promotion round has significantly outstripped the success of men across all faculties and academic levels.

The Appendices contain data by Faculty and role for application rates, applicant success (i.e. Faculty support) and overall promotion rates, similar to the overall data shown in table 1. This detailed analysis is broken down into each role applied for (across Queen Mary as a whole) in tables 2, 3 and 4; then for each Faculty (all roles) in tables 5-7; and finally by role within each Faculty in tables 8-16.

Table 1 - overall promotion EDI data in this round ${ }^{1}$

| Table 1 | (1) Eligible <br> Population | (2) <br> Proportion | (3) No. of <br> Applications | (4) \% of <br> Eligible <br> Population | (5) No. of <br> Supported <br> Applications | (6) \% <br> Support <br> Rate of <br> Applicants | (7) \% Overall <br> Promotion Rate <br> out of Eligible <br> Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 508 | $55 \%$ | 101 | $20 \%$ | 81 | $80 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ |
| Female | 418 | $45 \%$ | 119 | $28 \%$ | 103 | $87 \%$ | $24.6 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 645 | $70 \%$ | 152 | $24 \%$ | 134 | $88 \%$ | $20.8 \%$ |
| BAME | 258 | $28 \%$ | 65 | $25 \%$ | 48 | $74 \%$ | $18.6 \%$ |

1. Eligible population consists of all Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Readers with a year's service.
2. The proportion in column 2 is the percentage of each group out of the total eligible population (total 926), e.g. 55\% of the eligible population are male.
3. Column 3 shows the total number of applications received from each population group.
4. Column 4 represents the figures in column 3 as a percentage of that group's eligible population.
5. Column 5 shows the number of supported applications for promotion (at Faculty level).
6. Column 6 shows supported applications as a percentage of the number of applicants in that group.
7. Column 7 shows the expected overall promotion rates for applicants as a percentage of each eligible population group (assuming all the promotion applications that are currently supported are successful, once the Promotions Group have met and all references have been received).
[^0]Appendix 1 - 2023 promotion success rates across all Faculties by role applied for

| Table 2: Professor applicants | (1) Eligible Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of Applications | (4) \% of Eligible Population | (5) No. of Supported Applications | (6) \% Support <br> Rate of Applicants | (7) \% Overall Promotion Rate out of Eligible Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 124 | 60\% | 23 | 19\% | 17 | 74\% | 13.7\% |
| Female | 84 | 40\% | 32 | 38\% | 27 | 84\% | 32.1\% |
| White | 158 | 76\% | 42 | 27\% | 35 | 83\% | 22.2\% |
| BAME | 44 | 21\% | 12 | 27\% | 8 | 67\% | 18.2\% |


| Table 3: Reader applicants | (1) Eligible Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of Applications | (4) \% of Eligible Population | (5) No. of Supported Applications | (6) \% Support <br> Rate of Applicants | (7) \% Overall Promotion Rate out of Eligible Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 240 | 58\% | 47 | 20\% | 34 | 72\% | 14.2\% |
| Female | 177 | 42\% | 42 | 24\% | 37 | 88\% | 20.9\% |
| White | 306 | 73\% | 58 | 19\% | 50 | 86\% | 16.3\% |
| BAME | 102 | 24\% | 30 | 29\% | 21 | 70\% | 20.6\% |


| Table 4: Senior Lecturer applicants | (1) Eligible Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of Applications | (4) \% of Eligible Population | (5) No. of Supported Applications | (6) \% Support <br> Rate of Applicants | (7) \% Overall Promotion Rate out of Eligible Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 144 | 48\% | 31 | 22\% | 30 | 97\% | 20.8\% |
| Female | 157 | 52\% | 45 | 29\% | 39 | 87\% | 24.8\% |
| White | 181 | 60\% | 52 | 29\% | 49 | 94\% | 27.1\% |
| BAME | 112 | 37\% | 23 | 21\% | 19 | 83\% | 15.6\% |

Appendix 2-2023 promotion success rates for all roles by Faculty

| Table 5: HSS <br> applicants | (1) Eligible <br> Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of <br> Applications | (4) \% of Eligible <br> Population | (5) No. of <br> Supported <br> Applications | (6) \% Support <br> Rate of <br> Applicants | (7) \% Overall <br> Promotion Rate <br> out of Eligible <br> Population |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 154 | $47 \%$ | 26 | $17 \%$ | 25 | $96 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ |
| Female | 171 | $53 \%$ | 52 | $30 \%$ | 46 | $88 \%$ | $26.9 \%$ |
| White | 249 | $77 \%$ | 61 | $24 \%$ | 56 | $92 \%$ | $22.5 \%$ |
| BAME | 72 | $22 \%$ | 16 | $22 \%$ | 14 | $88 \%$ | $19.4 \%$ |


| Table 6: S\&E <br> applicants | (1) Eligible <br> Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of <br> Applications | (4) \% of Eligible <br> Population | (5) No. of <br> Supported <br> Applications | (6) \% Support <br> Rate of <br> Applicants | (7) \% Overall <br> Promotion Rate <br> out of Eligible <br> Population |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 205 | $71 \%$ | 37 | $18 \%$ | 28 | $76 \%$ | $13.7 \%$ |
| Female | 84 | $29 \%$ | 17 | $20 \%$ | 14 | $82 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ |
| White | 193 | $67 \%$ | 33 | $17 \%$ | 27 | $82 \%$ | $14.0 \%$ |
| BAME | 83 | $29 \%$ | 20 | $24 \%$ | 14 | $70 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |


|  | Table 7: FMD <br> applicants | (1) Eligible <br> Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of <br> Applications | (4) \% of Eligible <br> Population | (5) No. of <br> Supported <br> Applications | (6) \% Support <br> Rate of <br> Applicants |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 149 | $48 \%$ | 38 | (7) \% Overall <br> Promotion Rate <br> out of Eligible <br> Population |  |  |  |
| Female | 163 | $52 \%$ | 50 | $36 \%$ | 28 | $74 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  | 58 | 43 | $86 \%$ | $26.4 \%$ |  |
| White | 203 | $65 \%$ | 53 | $29 \%$ | 51 | $88 \%$ | $25.1 \%$ |
| BAME | 103 | $33 \%$ | 29 | $28 \%$ | 20 | $69 \%$ | $19.4 \%$ |

Appendix 3-2023 promotion success rates for applications to Professor within each Faculty

| Table 8: HSS Professor applicants | (1) Eligible Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of Applications | (4) \% of Eligible Population | (5) No. of <br> Supported Applications | (6) \% Support Rate of Applicants | (7) \% Overall Promotion Rate out of Eligible Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 38 | 49\% | 4 | 11\% | 3 | 75\% | 7.9\% |
| Female | 39 | 51\% | 14 | 36\% | 10 | 71\% | 25.6\% |
| White | 62 | 81\% | 17 | 27\% | 13 | 76\% | 21.0\% |
| BAME | 14 | 18\% | 1 | 7\% | 0 | - | - |


| Table 9: S\&E Professor applicants | (1) Eligible Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of Applications | (4) \% of Eligible Population | (5) No. of Supported Applications | (6) \% Support Rate of Applicants | (7) \% Overall Promotion Rate out of Eligible Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 55 | 81\% | 10 | 18\% | 7 | 70\% | 12.7\% |
| Female | 13 | 19\% | 4 | 31\% | 4 | 100\% | 30.8\% |
| White | 48 | 71\% | 9 | 19\% | 8 | 89\% | 16.7\% |
| BAME | 17 | 25\% | 4 | 24\% | 2 | 50\% | 11.8\% |


| Table 10: FMD Professor applicants | (1) Eligible Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of Applications | (4) \% of Eligible Population | (5) No. of Supported Applications | (6) \% Support Rate of Applicants | (7) \% Overall Promotion Rate out of Eligible Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 31 | 49\% | 9 | 29\% | 7 | 78\% | 22.6\% |
| Female | 32 | 51\% | 14 | 44\% | 13 | 93\% | 40.6\% |
| White | 48 | 76\% | 16 | 33\% | 14 | 88\% | 25.0\% |
| BAME | 13 | 21\% | 7 | 54\% | 6 | 86\% | 46.2\% |

Appendix 4-2023 promotion success rates for applications to Reader within each Faculty
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Table 11: HSS } \\ \begin{array}{l}\text { Reader } \\ \text { applicants }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { (1) Eligible } \\ \text { Population }\end{array} & \text { (2) Proportion } & \begin{array}{c}\text { (3) No. of } \\ \text { Applications }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { (4) \% of Eligible } \\ \text { Population }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { (5) No. of } \\ \text { Supported } \\ \text { Applications }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { (6) \% Support } \\ \text { Rate of } \\ \text { Applicants }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Male } & 71 & 51 \% & 11 & 15 \% & 11 & 100 \% \\ \text { Promotion Rate } \\ \text { out of Eligible } \\ \text { Population }\end{array}\right\}$

| Table 12: S\&E Reader applicants | (1) Eligible Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of Applications | (4) \% of Eligible Population | (5) No. of Supported Applications | (6) \% Support Rate of Applicants | (7) \% Overall Promotion Rate out of Eligible Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 89 | 74\% | 15 | 17\% | 9 | 60\% | 10.1\% |
| Female | 32 | 26\% | 7 | 22\% | 4 | 57\% | 12.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 87 | 72\% | 12 | 14\% | 7 | 58\% | 8.0\% |
| BAME | 28 | 23\% | 10 | 36\% | 6 | 60\% | 21.4\% |


| Table 13: FMD Reader applicants | (1) Eligible Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of Applications | (4) \% of Eligible Population | (5) No. of Supported Applications | (6) \% Support <br> Rate of Applicants | (7) \% Overall Promotion Rate out of Eligible Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 80 | 51\% | 21 | 26\% | 14 | 67\% | 17.5\% |
| Female | 77 | 49\% | 18 | 23\% | 16 | 89\% | 20.8\% |
| White | 107 | 68\% | 26 | 24\% | 23 | 88\% | 21.5\% |
| BAME | 48 | 31\% | 12 | 25\% | 7 | 58\% | 14.6\% |

Appendix 5-2023 promotion success rates for applications to Senior Lecturer within each Faculty

| Table 14: HSS <br> Senior Lecturer applicants | (1) Eligible Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of Applications | (4) \% of Eligible Population | (5) No. of <br> Supported Applications | (6) \% Support <br> Rate of Applicants | (7) \% Overall Promotion Rate out of Eligible Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 45 | 41\% | 11 | 24\% | 11 | 100\% | 24.4\% |
| Female | 64 | 59\% | 21 | 33\% | 19 | 90\% | 29.7\% |
| White | 75 | 69\% | 24 | 32\% | 23 | 96\% | 30.7\% |
| BAME | 32 | 29\% | 7 | 22\% | 6 | 86\% | 18.8\% |


| Table 15: S\&E Senior Lecturer applicants | (1) Eligible Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of Applications | (4) \% of Eligible Population | (5) No. of Supported Applications | (6) \% Support Rate of Applicants | (7) \% Overall Promotion Rate out of Eligible Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 61 | 61\% | 12 | 20\% | 12 | 100\% | 19.7\% |
| Female | 39 | 39\% | 6 | 15\% | 6 | 100\% | 15.4\% |
| White | 58 | 58\% | 12 | 21\% | 12 | 100\% | 20.7\% |
| BAME | 38 | 38\% | 6 | 16\% | 6 | 100\% | 15.8\% |


| Table 16: FMD Senior Lecturer applicants | (1) Eligible Population | (2) Proportion | (3) No. of Applications | (4) \% of Eligible Population | (5) No. of Supported Applications | (6) \% Support Rate of Applicants | (7) \% Overall Promotion Rate out of Eligible Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 38 | 41\% | 8 | 21\% | 7 | 87\% | 18.4\% |
| Female | 54 | 59\% | 18 | 33\% | 14 | 78\% | 25.9\% |
| White | 48 | 52\% | 16 | 33\% | 14 | 87\% | 29.2\% |
| BAME | 42 | 46\% | 10 | 24\% | 7 | 70\% | 16.7\% |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Data assumes all Faculty recommendations are endorsed by the Academic Promotions Group in July 2023.

