Introduction

With faculty, staff and a student body from over 100 countries, London Business School takes pride in its diverse and ever expanding international community. This is our fourth report since the introduction of the Public Sector Equality Duty of the Equality Act (2010) and details equality monitoring information which has helped to shape our diversity objectives.

Earlier this year members of Governing Body signalled their unanimous support to the work which has taken place so far, and endorsed a proactive approach to the equality and diversity agenda. This report outlines the steps London Business School is taking to further and strengthen our diversity.

We are located in a city notable for its welcoming attitude to people of different nationalities, ethnicities, religions, and sexual orientations, and provision of opportunities to the disabled, and men and women of all ages, and our goal is nothing less for London Business School.

I believe the suggestions offered herein embody London Business School’s commitment to a diversity which can only enhance the School’s global competitive advantage and overall world impact.

Professor Jean-Pierre Benoît
Chair
London Business School Diversity Working Group
Background to report

This report is written in accordance with the Public Sector Equality Duty of the Equality Act 2010. It provides information about how the School is complying with the requirements of the Act and furthering equality and diversity issues within its community.

The report provides data on our key constituencies: staff, students, Open Executive Education participants, and faculty and illustrates the School’s progress and achievements since January 2014 in the equality arena. Our aim is to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it; and
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.

Remit of monitoring

The equality monitoring information at appendix 2 includes available statistical data on staff, faculty, students and Open Executive Education participants.

The School presently collects data covering the following protected characteristics:

- age
- disability
- ethnicity
- sex

This data demonstrates the School’s position as at 1 December 2014. In due course the monitoring of equality characteristics is expected to be extended to produce a more detailed analysis of the School’s workforce and student body.

Gaps in information

- The data the School is currently able to make available is more limited than we would wish. However, since last year’s report was produced, new E-recruitment systems have been introduced for both staff and faculty. As both systems are relatively new it has not been possible to produce an accurate reflection of recruitment data for the purposes of this report, but early indications show that there should be ample and useful data available in forthcoming years.

• An integrated central HR solution is also in the early stages of development. This will enable the School to collect more and better data on a range of issues, including data on performance management.

- The School has again reported on available data on Open Executive Education programmes participants. This is an area of the School out of the remit of HESA and as in last year’s report only age and gender information has been collected.

- The School is relatively small, and therefore some information has not been published in this report as it might be possible to identify individuals. The report uses HESA recommendations to avoid disclosure of personal information about any individual and the numbers have therefore been rounded to the nearest multiple of 5. This methodology should be taken into account when examining the statistics provided in Appendix Two.
Equality Objectives

The School originally set 3 major equality objectives which were published in April 2012. These objectives focused on the protected characteristics of (i) gender (ii) disability (iii) age. In October 2013 a further objective on (iv) ethnicity was agreed with the aim of developing a more ethnically diverse workforce and student body.

The objectives will be considered again in early 2015 to review progress and to decide whether it would be appropriate to expand them to include any other of the protected characteristics.

Gender
Our original objective was to increase the number of suitable applications from female candidates with the aim of increasing the proportion of female students on all programmes. This was broadened in 2013 to include female faculty. Recent analysis of rankings has shown:

- That the School is one of the leading business schools amongst our top ranked competitors in the number of female faculty.
- Further progress is required to increase the number of female students in the pipeline in order to match our competitors.

A recommendation made to Management Board means that the number of female applicants for faculty positions should be increased by positive action taken during the selection process.

The Degree Programmes Office (DPO) is committed to reviewing student equality issues and is treating this as a matter of priority. One of the main ways in which the School seeks to attract female students is through scholarships (65% of the School’s scholarships are currently awarded to women) and the DPO is now considering other ways of attracting female candidates.

Disability
The School continues to partner with Disabled Go, an organisation which highlights access issues for the disabled. The Director, Campus Services and Developments has ensured that access for the disabled features as a key aspect in future Estates policy.

The reporting of disability amongst students has significantly increased over the last year due to the efforts of the Degree Programmes Office to ensure collation of data and the dedicated support of the Disability Officer working within the School.

Age
Age-related factors have been considered at meetings of the Diversity Working Group and the School has been able to factor in generational differences in HR planning. There is a strategic aim in relation to staff recruitment to take positive action to attract older applicants. Discussion is taking place with relevant faculty on the value of strengthening our objectives on age in the light of recent research findings, especially in relation to Gen Y’s.

Ethnicity
The School has made progress in developing more effective recruitment monitoring systems and work continues on raising the profile of ethnic minority groups within the School. In addition, faculty recruitment has specifically addressed this issue by recommending positive action towards ethnic minority candidates in the shortlisting process.
The School’s Diversity Working Group drives the continuing development and recognition of diversity within the School. It was established by the Dean and reports to Management Board, which is accountable for diversity strategy and any resulting activities. The Group’s Chair, Professor Jean-Pierre Benoît, leads the Group in the development and implementation of our diversity initiatives.

The group comprises a member from each department as well as a student representative and a staff representative.

Key actions of DWG in 2014 included:

(i) The Chair of the Diversity Working Group conducted a campaign across the School community to raise the profile of equality and diversity issues. This included a presentation to the School’s Governing Body in July 2014; to Faculty Board, Management Board and the School Meeting. This has already led to a number of recommendations being adopted by Management Board for staff and faculty.

(ii) A new dedicated web page has been developed as part of the wider School website. It provides:
- Key contacts within the School for equality and diversity issues.
- Information on equality issues for staff, students and faculty.
- Useful links such as Disabled Go.
- Details of some of our current initiatives including (a) the Women in Business Conference (b) the Eurout Conference (c) our regular student celebration of diversity – Tattoo.

(iii) Regular news items on equality issues have been reported on the School’s Intranet. Most recently we reported that in December 2014 two female business executives were awarded £30,000 scholarships for London Business School’s Senior Executive Programme. This was the conclusion of an initiative with the 30% Club, aimed at encouraging women in leadership positions.

2. Training

(i) The School’s vision and values are embedded within the community and promoted to new staff, students and faculty at induction. One of our beliefs is ‘we draw strength and ideas from our cultural diversity’.

(ii) Faculty engagement with the School’s Vision and Values has been an area of focus this year.

(iii) Diversity has been embedded within the School’s Essentials of People Management Programme.

(iv) A new course on Intercultural Awareness is being developed to be introduced across the School in 2015.
3. School Plan and Strategy  
(i) The School’s Corporate Plan is updated annually. Diversity issues are an integral part of the plan for HR, the Research and Faculty Office and Degree Programmes Office. 

(ii) In July 2014 the School’s Governing Body emphasised the importance of diversity issues. The School’s Management Board subsequently had a further discussion and agreed a number of specific actions as follows: 

For staff:  
• a review of selection to ensure that there is no diversity bias in the current process.  
• consideration of positive action to attract older candidates.  
• a study of the number of returners from maternity leave with a view to increase retention in this area.

For faculty:  
• In recruiting faculty at the shortlisting stage at least 25-35% of candidates should be women and at least one should be drawn from an Ethnic Minority.

(iii) In relation to students, the School’s MBA programme announced in October 2011 that it was aiming for at least 30 per cent of its MBA intake programme to be women. This has remained a goal of the School. The target was in line with that of the 30 Percent Club, a group of chairs in business voluntarily committed to getting more women on to UK corporate boards. This year the School celebrated the fact that the number of women in the class increased to 34%.

This success has been achieved through a variety of means:  
• The strategic use of scholarships, such as the London Business School Women’s Scholarship to the Forte Foundation Fellowships and the Celia Atkin Avent Scholarship.  
• Gender balance on admission interviews.  
• Personalised outreach for female candidates.

There is further work to do to maintain and increase student female participation across the School. This has been a focus of research undertaken by a newly established DPO group on Equality and Diversity. The group’s findings have been presented to DWG and their work to increase the number of female students across all programmes continues.
4. Groups/clubs
Student clubs provide a vital network of support to our diverse community. Amongst these are:

(i) Out in Business, the Gay and Lesbian Network at London Business School, with over 200 members. In November 2014 London Business School hosted the fourth EurOUT conference for LGBT students, staff and alumni from top business schools across Europe. It featured key speakers from major international companies including a former CEO of a major oil company, a Managing Partner from a multinational professional services firm and current CEO of an international bank.

(ii) The Women in Business Club strives to celebrate and advance women’s leadership in business. As one of the most active and largest clubs on campus, the club enjoys a unique position to bring excellent networking, skills development and recruitment opportunities for our female students. Over the past year, the Women in Business Club organised:

- summer recruitment events
- mock interviews
- career panels
- a mentorship programme

The Club’s flagship event, the Women in Business Conference, takes place each Spring. Speakers and participants in 2014 included major figures in industry, media and politics.

(iii) A number of student clubs encourage participation from regions across the globe. These include the Africa, the Asia, India, and Latin America Clubs. The clubs seek to embrace the diversity that London Business School has to offer and are committed to harnessing the spirit and strength of diverse communities worldwide. They have provided vital resources to their membership over the last year, and brought new experiences and learning opportunities to the School.
5. Procurement
(i) Comprehensive and thorough diversity procurement policies which are in line with good practice are now in place at the School and a guidance document has been published for all new tender exercises.

6. Student, faculty and staff support
The School has various networks of support, some of which are mentioned above, as well as:

(i) Counselling services for faculty and staff (provided through a new external Employee Assistance Programme, Optum).

(ii) Trained, confidential advisers for any instances of perceived bullying and harassment.

(iii) A disability adviser who provides help and advice from the provision of mentors to specialist IT support for students.

(iv) A counselling service which is available to all students.

(v) The School has incorporated religious festivals into its overall committee calendar to raise awareness and ensure that committee dates are not planned at these times wherever possible.
The data at appendix 2 reflects the information available for students, staff, faculty and Open Executive Education participants at the School in December 2014. It therefore illustrates any changes or developments during the year, since the publication of the last Annual Report in January 2014.

Advice from HESA has also led to a rounding of numbers to the nearest 5 throughout the report and this should be taken into account when analysing the data. This is of particular significance when reviewing faculty data owing to the small number of faculty at the School.

The School remains a diverse place at which to work and study. The School is proud of its international rating both in terms of students and faculty. Ethnicity data within this report indicates:

- Those from an Asian or British Asian Indian ethnic background make up the largest proportion of Black and Minority Ethnic students and faculty.
- Amongst staff the highest proportion of those from BME backgrounds are Asian or British Asian Indian and Black or Black British African.
- Black or Black British Caribbean groups and Asian or British Asian Bangladeshi appear significantly lower in number throughout the School.
- In general, there appear to be more from a white background in the faculty and staff population than the student body which is around 42% BME.

Overall, the gender breakdown is as follows:

- Amongst students it is approximately 28% female to 72% male.
- The proportion of female to male staff remains high (70% female to 30% male) – the School has one of the highest proportion of women compared to other London based HEIs.
- The number of female faculty remain around a quarter.

The development of positive action in the recruitment of faculty is welcomed as are further initiatives to attract more female students across all programmes.

In terms of disability:

- The reporting on disability amongst students has significantly increased but the number of those who have a disability remains only around 1%.
- Amongst the staff community 3.2% have declared a disability, which is more aligned with averages across the sector.

Whilst reporting is high amongst faculty, the number of faculty who have declared a disability once rounded remains at zero.

With regard to age:

- Amongst the student population the SLOAN and Executive MBA students make up the bulk of those over forty.
- The faculty profile remains more varied across age groups with the exception of those under thirty.
- The staff profile is of a largely younger make-up (much higher than the London HEI benchmark).
Appendix 1: Diversity objectives

Gender

1. To increase the number of suitable applications from female candidates with the aim of increasing the proportion of female faculty and students on all programmes for instance by:
   • Implementing systems to effectively monitor applications from female candidates
   • Regularly reviewing the gender profile for faculty and students
   • Raising the profile of women at the School to encourage more applications from female candidates
   • Encouraging programmes and Subject Areas to review recruitment practices where the number of suitable female applicants is lower than might be expected
   • Increasing the number of applications from women for faculty positions and in the degree programme pipeline

Disability

2. To build an understanding of disability within the School and to identify areas for development for instance through:
   • Joining such initiatives as Disabled Go to raise awareness of access issues at the School
   • Implementing systems to effectively monitor applications from disabled candidates
   • Regularly reviewing the profile of the School in terms of disability to better understand why the proportion of disabled students and faculty is low

Age

3. To build understanding of generational differences and to identify areas for development in order to attract and retain an age-diverse workforce for instance through:
   • Analysing the results of the School Survey 2013 and future surveys from an age perspective (in addition to ethnicity and gender) to see whether there are any insights emerging that can be used as future objectives
   • Ensuring professional development opportunities are made available to all age groups
   • Continuing to develop flexible working policies as a means of attracting and retaining employees from different generations
   • Consider formalising and reinstating the staff mentoring scheme, taking account, where possible, of opportunities for different generations to mentor each other

Ethnicity

4. To develop a more ethnically diverse workforce and student body and encourage further participation of ethnic minorities throughout the School community, for example by:
   • Implementing systems to effectively monitor recruitment applications from ethnic minority candidates
   • Regularly reviewing the ethnic profile of faculty, staff and students
   • Raising the profile of ethnic minority groups within the School to encourage more applications from ethnic minority candidates
   • Encouraging departments and subject areas to review recruitment practices where the number of suitable applicants from certain ethnic minority groups is lower than might be expected
### Appendix 2: Diversity data 2014

#### Student profile

##### Students by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20–25</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–30</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–35</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–40</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–45</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–50</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Student disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declared disabled</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known to be disabled</td>
<td>94.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student age by programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>EMBA</th>
<th>EMBAG</th>
<th>EMBAGA</th>
<th>MBA</th>
<th>MiFFT</th>
<th>MiFPT</th>
<th>MiM</th>
<th>SLN</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20–25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–30</td>
<td>10.58%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>64.63%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–35</td>
<td>43.27%</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>30.49%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.71%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–40</td>
<td>29.81%</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>24.14%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–45</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–50</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Executive Education participant profile

Age – all participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 and under</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–35</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–40</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–45</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–50</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–55</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56–60</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61–65</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender – all participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Staff age by level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20–25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56–60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61–65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff age by division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>RFO</th>
<th>Advancement</th>
<th>Central Administration</th>
<th>DPO &amp; Career Services</th>
<th>Executive Education</th>
<th>Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20–25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56–60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61–65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff age
part time staff

Staff disability

Staff ethnicity

Staff ethnicity
part time staff

20-25  9.1%
26-30  0%
31-35  27.3%
36-40  27.3%
41-45  18.2%
46-50  9.1%
51-55  9.1%
55+    0%
Not known to be disabled  96.8%
Declared disabled  3.2%

BME  26.4%
White  73.6%

Asian or British Asian -
Indian  5.0%
Asian or British Asian -
Pakistani  1.7%
Black or Black British -
African  5.0%
Chinese  1.7%
Mixed - White & Black
Caribbean  3.3%
Other Asian Background  2.5%
Other Black Background  0.8%
Other Ethnic Background  2.5%
Other Mixed Background  0.8%
White  76.7%

BME  28.6%
White  71.4%
Staff gender by level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff gender by division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>RPO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Advancement</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Central Administration</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DPO &amp; Career Services</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Executive Education</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty age

Faculty age by level

| Age range | Assistant | | | Associate | | | Professor | | |
|-----------|-----------|---|---|-----------|---|---|-----------|---|
| 30 and under | 5 | 12.5% | | | 0 | 0% | | 0 | 0% |
| 31–35 | 25 | 62.5% | | | 0 | 0% | | 0 | 0% |
| 36–40 | 10 | 25.0% | | 10 | 66.6% | | 0 | 0% |
| 41–45 | 0 | 0% | 5 | 33.3% | | 10 | 25.0% |
| 46–50 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 10 | 25.0% |
| 51–55 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 12.5% |
| 56–60 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 12.5% |
| 61–65 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 12.5% |
| 66 and over | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 12.5% |

Faculty disability

Not known to be disabled 100.0%
Faculty ethnicity:
- BME: 23.81%
- White: 76.19%
- Asian or British Asian - Indian: 10.0%
- Chinese: 5.0%
- Other Asian Background: 5.0%
- White: 80.0%

Faculty gender:
- Female: 24.0%
- Male: 76.0%

Faculty gender by level:
- Male assistant: 23.8%
- Female assistant: 19.0%
- Male associate: 14.1%
- Female associate: 4.76%
- Male professor: 33.3%
- Female professor: 4.76%

Faculty gender by level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>