

# Annual diversity report 2018/19

## CONTENTS

The report presents diversity data on the following activity areas:

1. **Governance**
2. **Fellowship**
3. **Grant schemes**
4. **Career development programmes**
5. **Policy**
6. **Corporate affairs and communications**
7. **Human resources**

Each section outlines areas of improvement and concern before breaking down key data.

*This report is presented by Melanie Etherton, Communications Officer, and Nick Hillier, Director of Communications, with data collected by staff across the Academy*

## Notes

### *Data collection*

- This data covers the period from 1 September 2018 to 31 August 2019.
- Data reported was accurate as of 31 August 2019.
- All ethnicity and disability data in this report is based on data explicitly and voluntarily declared by respondents. Our data collection methods are often mandatory, but always contain an option for 'Prefer not to say'. Not all respondents choose to provide their diversity information. Where applicable, individuals who have chosen 'prefer not to say' or not answered a question at all are excluded from this report. This is generally <5% of people asked.
- Gender data is collected via self-reported forms for Fellows, grant applicants and awardees and event attendees. However gender data in this report is often inferred from appearance for committees and senior groups involving external experts. See comment in 'Overview' section on the need to improve gender data collection mechanisms.
- Data collection is judged according to the following criteria:
  - >90% data collection = very good
  - >75% data collection = good
  - <50% data collection = poor

### *Terminology*

- PNS = prefer not to say
- This document uses the acronym AWB to refer to people who identify as being from 'Any white background' when asked about their ethnicity. This document uses the acronym BAME to refer to people who identify as Black, Asian or from a minority ethnic group. Pooled totals for BAME individuals include people who identify as mixed race. We acknowledge the limitations of using this acronym as raised by Advance HE's Race Equality Charter group in their [terminology document](#), in particular around:
  - International work where Black, Asian and other visible minority ethnic groups in the in UK are actually a global majority.
  - Implications of homogeneity for BAME individuals. Where appropriate and where there is sufficient data, this document tries to examine outcomes for specific minority groups in addition to comparing pooled outcomes.

### *Analysis and benchmarking*

- Mean values presented in this document for summary data (e.g. across all policy work, across all media work) are always recalculated from base data and are therefore weighted by number of people in each pooled category, rather than simply averaging the averages.
- Percentages presented in this report are given as whole numbers. Please note due to rounding errors percentages may not sum to 100%. Please refer back to full data tables for non-rounded figures.
- This report is benchmarked where possible against other organisations and sector norms.
- Much of the Academy's work centres on the Fellowship, who form the core basis of the pool of people with which we work for committees, decision-making panels,

events and more. An overview of Fellowship diversity is provided here as context. For more detailed information about the Fellowship please see Section 2.

- Gender: The Fellowship is 79% male and 19% female. 2% of the Fellowship prefer to self-define or prefer not to say.
- Ethnicity: 76% of people in the Fellowship are from any white background. 6% of people in the Fellowship are BAME. 1% of people in the Fellowship prefer not to say. 17% of the Fellowship we do not hold data for.
- Data is flagged in red text and bold in summary tables if:
  1. >50% data not collected in any category
  2. Gender: <35% female or male
  3. Ethnicity is 100% "Any white background" or <2% BAME*NB If already flagged under 1), data is not reflagged under 2) or 3).*

#### *Privacy and data storage*

- All data is collected and stored under our privacy policy which can be found at <https://acmedsci.ac.uk/privacy-policy>

## Overview

---

This is the Academy's fifth annual diversity report presented to Council, and the third to be published externally.

High-quality data collection is vital. Our data collection systems in some areas are now strong, but others – particularly policy work and decision-making panels – are still lacking. Without the right data we cannot understand how best to improve our work.

Areas under direct staff control tend to show higher diversity, such as speakers for career development events, public engagement volunteers, and policy working group and steering group members.

Our data shows that there is still more to do to diversify decision-making committees, such as Council, grants panels and Fellowship selection committees, to include people of colour.

### **Gender**

Almost all the Academy's work has at least 35% female representation apart from the Fellowship, where less than 1 in 5 people are women.

Although our data collection systems allow for gender self-reporting, we need to make this the norm across activities. Much of the gender data in this report is still determined using assumptions based on appearance.

### **Ethnicity**

Data collection for ethnicity has improved overall, but there are still major gaps. The areas which have more complete data collection for ethnicity suggest disparities in representation which need to be explored further.

*Benchmarking: The most recent Advance HE data release shows that BAME people make up 13% of the academic workforce in biosciences and clinical medicine.*

BAME people are represented fairly well on international grants panels, as speakers for career development events, as speakers and attendees for corporate affairs events and as staff. Otherwise BAME people are generally under-represented across the Academy's work.

### **Disability**

This is the second year we have collected data for disability. Data collection outside online event booking and the Fellowship needs improving.

### **Other protected characteristics**

We need to improve the security of our data collection and storage mechanisms before expanding data collection for sexuality.

## 1. Governance

---

*The Academy is governed by a Council of 17 Fellows including six Officers whose role is to provide strategic advice to the Academy. Other core committees provide oversight for Finance, Fellowship nominations, and regional work.*

- Data collection for gender is very good. Data collection for ethnicity is good. Data collection for disability is poor. Systems for collecting disability data from governance committees need to improve.
- Only one person of colour sat on any of the Academy's core governance committees in 2018/19.
- There were 97 possible seats on the Academy's core governance bodies over 2018-19, allowing for rotation. Only two of these seats were filled by a person of colour (one person, two years running).
- The Academy has strong female representation across its governance committees with 54% of people across all committees being women.

***Governance breakdown***

	Gender		Ethnicity				Disability	Total people
	% F	% M	% AWB	% BAME	% PNs	% No info		
All Governance committees	54	46	84	0	5	11	64	97
Council 2018	58	42	84	0	5	11	82	19
Council 2019	59	41	82	0	6	12	76	17
Officers 2018	57	43	100	0	0	0	67	7
Officers 2019	33	67	67	0	0	33	67	6
Finance Committee 2018	67	33	67	0	0	33	83	6
Finance Committee 2019	50	50	33	0	0	67	83	6
Fellows Committee 2018	50	50	90	10	0	0	80	10
Fellows Committee 2019	62	38	87	13	0	0	0	8
Regional Champions 2017/18	44	56	100	0	0	0	78	9
Regional Champions 2018/19	44	56	100	0	0	0	0	9

## 2. Fellowship

---

*The Academy of Medical Sciences is a self-governing Fellowship representing UK biomedical and health research. Around 50 people are elected each year, and there are currently 1293 Fellows. Fellowship nominations are made by existing Fellows and judged by peer review and the Sectional Committees.*

- Ethnicity data collection for the Fellowship is good. We hold ethnicity data for 84% of the total Fellowship of 1293 people.
- *Benchmarking: This compares well to other national Academies – currently the Royal Society only holds data for 39% of its Fellowship.*
- Of the four Black Fellows the Academy has ever had, three were elected in 1998 as Founder Fellows. Of the 1129 other people elected through the normal Fellowship election process over the past 20 years, only one person is Black.
- The Fellowship remains less than 0.2% Black.
- *Benchmarking: Advance HE dataset 2017-18. In 2017-18, 0.6% of UK professors were Black. In the fields of science, engineering and technology, there are 40 Black people at professorial level in UK higher education institutions. There are 900 BAME people in total at professorial level in the same fields.*
- Over the four years for there is sufficient data to compare, the election rate for BAME candidates is slightly lower than the election rate for candidates from any white background (11% versus 13%). This difference is not statistically significant.
- The Fellowship in total is 6% BAME.
- *Benchmarking: Advance HE dataset 2017-18. 9.7% of UK Professors in science, technology and engineering are BAME. No further breakdown by field is provided in the publically available Advance HE datasets. In addition, the Medical Schools Council Clinical Academic Survey states “76% of clinical academics identify as White, with 17% of BAME backgrounds and 6.9% not recorded.” – this is for clinical academics across all levels of seniority. They add “When looking at ethnic profile by academic grade, the data demonstrate that, as the level of seniority increases, the proportion of those who identify as White also increases, while the number of those who identify as BAME decreases. This is unchanged since 2005.” No further data on exact BAME proportions among different levels of clinical academics is openly provided.*
- Gender data collection for the Fellowship is very good.
- The Fellowship remains male dominated. Less than 1 in 5 Fellows are female.
- *Benchmarking: This is slightly better than other national academies for which data is available: for the Royal Society In 2018, 9% of Fellows were and 91% were male. For the Learned Society of Wales’ Fellows in science, technology, engineering, mathematics and medicine, 11% were female as of 2017.*
- There has been a reduction in new female candidates for 2018/19 (29%, down from 33% in 2017-18).
- The Fellowship success rate for women, once nominated, remains better than the success rate for men (16% versus 11%).
- Disability data collection for the Fellowship is poor. We have collected but not processed disability data for 74% of the Fellowship. We have collected and processed disability data for 16% of the Fellowship. We need to update our records to enable this data to be used.

***Fellowship breakdown***

	Gender		Ethnicity			
	% F	% M	% AWB	% BAME	% PNS	% No info
Total Fellowship	19	79	76	6	1	16
Fellowship (clinical)	13	86	74	7	1	17
Fellowship (non-clinical)	26	73	78	5	2	15
Sectional Committee members 2019	43	57	87	9	1	3
New candidates 2018/19	29	71	79	13	1	6
Total candidates 2018/19	29	71	85	11	0	4
Shortlisted candidates 2018/19	34	66	83	15	1	1
2019 New Fellows	38	62	92	8	0	0



### 3. Grant schemes

---

*The Academy works in partnership with other research funders to offer grants for biomedical and health researchers, and clinical academics. UK schemes focus mainly on supporting the careers pipeline while international schemes focus mainly on capacity building, networks and collaborations.*

Data collection across grants schemes is very good. The consistency and length of data collection allows for a more detailed analysis. Therefore, unlike others in this report, this chapter is split into different sections for gender, ethnicity and disability. The increased level of analysis is new for the Academy and demonstrates the benefits of our commitment to collecting and reporting on diversity data over the past 5 years. It also means that this section includes emerging reflections on the data which we are committed to presenting in an open and transparent way. We will continue to explore the details and implications of this data over the coming year to ensure we are delivering a commitment to diversity in all its forms. This data is valuable to the community and the Academy is contributing to discussions with other funders for a cross-funder initiative on data tracking. This will provide better benchmarking data for both the Academy and the community.

#### **Data overview**

- Data collection across grants schemes is very good.
- There is one small data gap around panel members from joint grants panels with other National Academies.
- To better understand the challenges of recruiting diverse grants panels we should start to collect data on those invited to sit on panels as well as those who agree to sit on the panel

#### **Gender**

- Across all grants, there are no significant differences in success rates of women and men when applying for funding.
- *Benchmarking: Wellcome's most recent grant funding data report states: "At all career stages, women and men are equally successful when applying for funding."*
- Only two out of ten rounds of applications to international grant schemes were red flagged for less than 30% female applicants, and none were red flagged for less than 30% female awardees.

#### **Ethnicity**

- Across both UK and international grants panels, there are no panel members with ethnicities other than any white background and Asian Indian. Grant applicants in the same period came from over 13 different ethnicities.
- *Context: Academy grants panels are mainly selected from the pool of the Fellowship. The Fellowship is 6% BAME. Others are Fellows of other Academies and some are not Fellows of any of the four academies. As Panels need to reflect the breadth of the research landscape, Panel members are chosen to reflect all*

*diversity, including expertise area, geographical location and their personal characteristics.*

- Ethnicity in Starter Grants for Clinical Lecturers:
  - The frequency of grant rounds for Starter Grants for Clinical Lecturers combined with the length of time data has been collected means this grant scheme has the most data available. It is only possible to do this level of analysis on Starter Grants due the high quality and volume of data collected by the Grants team across multiple years.
  - Taking a broader look across all Starter Grant awards for which we hold ethnicity data, going back five rounds of grants to 2016 (a total of 315 applications).
    - White applicants have a success rate of 45% (102 out of 225)
    - BAME applicants have a success rate of 33% (30 out of 90)
    - *Note: This analysis does not include the four applicants during this period who selected 'Prefer not to say' for their ethnicity.*
    - *Note: Currently there is insufficient data to provide a more detailed breakdown by individual ethnicities within the BAME grouping.*
    - *See footnote below for analysis.<sup>1</sup>*
  - *Benchmarking: BAME people might appear to be overrepresented in applications for this award compared to the overall workforce (see 'Benchmarking' note above) – 28% of applications came from BAME people compared to a workforce of around 13%. However this is likely to be because the Advance HE figures do not provide figures broken down by both seniority and ethnicity in particular fields, due to the high risk of identifying individuals due to very small numbers of BAME people in senior management. It is possible therefore that the pool of BAME applicants for Starter Grants is larger than 13% (larger than the Advance HE data would suggest).*
  - There has been no recorded BAME representation on the Starter Grants for Clinical Lecturers panel for as long as we have recorded data (back to 2017).

---

<sup>1</sup> Analysis:

*A chi squared test between two groups provides a significant result if the  $\chi^2$  value at the end of the test is greater than the  $\chi^2$  value for the corresponding significance level.*

*The  $\chi^2$  value after comparing success rates of white and BAME applicants was  $\chi^2=3.80$ .*

*Significance table:*

<b><i>a (alpha)</i></b>	<b><i><math>\chi^2</math></i></b>
<i>0.025</i>	<i>2.71</i>
<i>0.050</i>	<i>3.84</i>
<i>0.100</i>	<i>5.02</i>

*The difference between white and BAME applicants' success rates is not statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$ . (An interpretation of this significance level is that there is a 95 out of 100 chance that this difference is real, and a 5 in 100 chance this difference is a coincidence.)*

*The difference between white and BAME applicants' success rates is significant at  $\alpha=0.10$ . (An interpretation of this significance level is that there is a 9 in 10 chance that this difference is real, and a 1 in 10 chance this difference is a coincidence.)*

*Comment: See [Tarran \(2019\): The S Word... and what to do about it?](#) for more information of the current ongoing discussion among statisticians on interpretation of significance levels.*

- *Benchmarking: Wellcome's most recent grant funding data report states: "For the past three years, 15% of applicants applying from UK organisations classified themselves as BAME. The award rates for these applicants has been lower than average. Wellcome's [Diversity and Inclusion](#) team is looking at the reasons for this trend."*
- *Benchmarking: From the Medical Schools Council Clinical Academic Survey: "76% of clinical academics identify as White, with 17% of BAME backgrounds and 6.9% not recorded. When looking at ethnic profile by academic grade, the data demonstrate that, as the level of seniority increases, the proportion of those who identify as White also increases, while the number of those who identify as BME decreases. This is unchanged since 2005."*
- *Benchmarking: International grants are very hard to benchmark in term of ethnicity, as applicants are sometimes restricted to a particular country (e.g. China) or particular set of countries (e.g. countries eligible for overseas development aid). While it is therefore hard to make judgements in terms of what is an 'appropriate' ratio of ethnicities among applicants and awardees, there is an even stronger prerogative to ensure that international grants panels are ethnically diverse and also contain a range of nationalities, to support fair comparison of the diverse range of applications they are likely to receive.*

### **Disability**

- Across all grants for which we hold disability data (dating back to 2017), the success rate for applicants who declare a disability is 16% (7 out of 37), and the success rate for applicants who declare they do not have a disability is 31% (416 out of 1761). This difference is not statistically significantly different<sup>2</sup>. It is not possible to tell whether the difference in success rates is an artefact of small numbers of disabled applicants or a real reflection of their likelihood of success. This should continue to be monitored.
- *Note: Panels are blind to disability data.*
- *Benchmarking: The most recent Advance HE data release shows that 4.3% of academic staff at UK higher education institutions declare some form of disability, falling to 2.7% if only including science, engineering and technology staff at professorial level. Among biomedical and health disciplines this is generally even lower, at 3.2% of staff in clinical medicine, 2.5% of staff in veterinary science, 3.1% of staff in biosciences, 2.7% in clinical dentistry. While this proportion is low, it should act as reminder that we do serve a diverse population of researchers including people with disabilities, and will continue to do so in the future.*
- *Benchmarking: Wellcome's most recent grant funding data report states: "For the past three years, 2% of UK-based Science applicants overall classified themselves as disabled. The award rates for disabled and non-disabled applicants are similar."*

---

<sup>2</sup>  $\chi^2=1.42$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $\alpha=0.05$

**Grant schemes breakdown**

	Gender			Ethnicity				Disability			
	% F	% M	% No info	% AWB	% BAME	% PNS	% No info	% Yes	% No	% P N S	% No info
All grants awarded	44	55	1	59	37	1	3	1	94	1	4
All grants applied	40	59	1	47	49	2	3	3	92	2	3
All grants panels	36	50	14	55	8	3	35	0	46	6	48
UK grants awarded	41	59	0	85	15	0	0	3	97	0	0
UK grants applied	44	56	0	78	21	1	0	4	95	1	0
UK grant panels	31	47	22	62	7	3	28	0	45	10	45
International grants awarded	46	52	2	43	50	1	5	1	92	2	5
International grants applied	39	60	1	39	56	2	4	2	96	2	0
International grant panels	43	57	0	41	9	2	48	0	48	0	52

**Grant schemes extended breakdown**

	Gender (%)			Ethnicity (%)				Disability (%)				Total people
	F	M	No info	AWB	BAME	PNS	No info	Y	No	PN S	No info	
<i>UK grants</i>												
Starter grants round 20 applicants	42	58	0	73	27	0	0	5	95	0	0	60
Starter grants round 20 awards	53	47	0	79	21	0	0	5	95	0	0	19
Starter grants round 21 applicants	35	65	0	67	31	2	0	2	98	0	0	54
Starter grants round 21 awards	23	77	0	73	27	0	0	0	100	0	0	22
Springboard Round 4 applicants	50	49	1	84	14	2	0	5	93	2	0	102
Springboard Round 4 awards	44	56	0	94	6	0	0	3	97	0	0	34
AMS Professors round 1 applicants	43	57	0	100	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	7
AMS Professors round 1 awards	50	50	0	100	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	4
Grant panel - Starter grants	22	78	0	89	0	0	11	0	100	0	0	9
Grant panel - Springboard	58	42	0	100	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	9
Springboard Round 4 HEI champions	25	39	35	49	10	6	35	0	27	0	73	51
Grant panel - INSPIRE	30	60	10	40	10	0	50	0	10	90	0	10
Grant panel - AMS Professorships	50	50	0	100	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	4
<i>International grants</i>												
NAF Newton advanced fund Round 9 (China) (Panel Dec 2018) applicants	67	33	0	/	/	/	100	/	/	/	100	3
NAF Newton advanced fund Round 9 (China) (Panel Dec 2018) awards	50	50	0	/	/	/	100	/	/	/	100	2
NAF Newton advanced fund Round 10 (Brazil) (Panel Jul 2018) applicants	25	75	0	42	58	0	0	0	100	0	0	12
NAF Newton advanced fund Round 10 (Brazil) (Panel Jul 2018) awards	33	67	0	33	67	0	0	0	100	0	0	3
NIF Newton international fund	45	55	0	/	/	/	100	/	/	/	100	33

Round 5 (Panel July 2018) applicants												
NIF Newton international fund Round 5 (Panel July 2018) awards	56	44	0	0	33	0	67	0	33	0	67	9
NIF Newton international fund Round 6 (Panel July 2019) applicants	44	56	0	11	89	0	0	0	100	0	0	18
NIF Newton international fund Round 6 (Panel July 2019) awards	63	38	0	25	63	0	13	0	88	0	13	8
UK-India AMR Visiting Professorships round 1 (Panel April 2019) applicants	25	75	0	75	25	0	0	0	63	38	0	8
UK-India AMR Visiting Professorships round 1 (Panel April 2019) awards	40	60	0	100	0	0	0	0	80	20	0	5
Turnberg Round 11 applicants	50	50	0	41	52	7	0	0	98	2	0	58
Turnberg Round 11 awards	52	48	0	48	48	4	0	0	96	4	0	27
GCRF Networking Round 3 applicants - UK partners	42	56	2	59	40	1	0	5	92	3	0	213
GCRF Networking Round 3 applicants - international partners	39	61	0	21	78	1	0	1	97	2	0	213
GCRF Networking Round 3 awardees - UK partners	43	52	5	67	33	0	0	5	95	0	0	21
GCRF Networking Round 3 awardees - international partners	43	57	0	24	76	0	0	0	100	0	0	21
GCRF Networking Round 4 applicants - UK partners	34	63	3	61	38	2	0	3	95	2	0	152
GCRF Networking Round 4 applicants - international partners	36	64	0	21	77	2	0	1	99	1	0	152

GCRF Networking Round 4 awardees - UK partners	43	48	10	76	19	5	0	0	95	5	0	21
GCRF Networking Round 4 awardees - international partners	38	62	0	14	86	0	0	0	100	0	0	21
Grant panel - Turnberg	50	50	0	83	0	0	17	0	100	0	0	6
Grant panel - Newton NIF	63	38	0	25	0	0	75	/	/	/	100	8
Grant panel - Newton NAF	40	60	0	40	0	0	60	/	/	/	100	5
Grant panel - UK-India AMR Visiting Professorships	38	63	0	63	25	0	13	0	88	0	13	8
Grant panel - GCRF networking	37	63	0	26	11	5	58	0	47	0	53	19

## 4. Career development programmes

---

- *Benchmarking: The most recent Advance HE data release shows that UK higher education institutions overall are gender balanced in fields relating to the Academy's work. 51% of the approximately 42,265 UK Academic staff in biosciences, clinical dentistry, clinical medicine and veterinary science are female. However across all science, technology and engineering academic staff, the proportion of women falls to 21% at professorial level.*
- *Benchmarking: The most recent Advance HE data release shows that BAME people make up 11.3% of UK academic science, engineering and technology staff. Across specifically biosciences and clinical medicine, there were 3120 BAME UK academic staff, or around 13% of the total workforce in these areas.*
- *Benchmarking: The most recent Advance HE data release shows that 4.3% of academic staff at UK higher education institutions declare some form of disability, falling to 2.7% if only including science, technology and engineering staff at professorial level. Among biomedical and health disciplines this is similarly low, at 3.2% of staff in clinical medicine, 2.5% of staff in veterinary science, 3.1% of staff in biosciences, and 2.7% in clinical dentistry. While this proportion is low, it should act as reminder that we do serve a diverse population of researchers including people with disabilities, and will continue to do so in the future.*
- Data collection across career development programmes is generally good.
- The Careers programme has 14% BAME speakers for its events.
- Across the careers committees, competition judges, event speakers and participants in this programme this year, 10% were from BAME backgrounds. However breaking this figure down shows that none of these people were Black.
- For the first time this year we know transgender people are interacting with the Academy through our careers events, as indicated through online booking systems. Due to very low numbers this data is not broken down, however should act as reminder across the Academy of the importance of psychological safety and ensuring our work is inclusive to all.
- For the second year running, only four out of 25 areas are flagged as falling below the Academy's 35% red flag for female representation across all the Academy careers programmes: a substantial achievement given the size and scale of the programmes.



**Career development programmes breakdown**

	Gender			Ethnicity				Disability			
	% F	% M	% No info	% AWB	% BAME	% PNS	% No info	% Yes	% No	% P N S	% No info
All careers judges/committees	47	49	4	67	4	0	29	0	16	0	84
All careers events (speakers)	43	50	7	54	14	0	32	0	58	0	42
All careers programme participants (SUSTAIN + FLIER)	Totals not provided: SUSTAIN is female only			85	12	2	0	7	93	0	0
Mentors	26	71	2	77	6	1	15	1	14	0	85
Mentees	36	46	18	9	3	0	88	0	1	0	99
Mentoring skills workshops (attendees)	64	34	2	66	30	4	0	6	92	2	0
Career development events (attendees)	59	37	4	52	40	8	0	3	92	5	0
Career development events (speakers)	45	41	14	45	5	0	50	0	18	0	82
CATAC (abstract submitted)	46	50	4	66	28	6	0	0	96	4	0
CATAC (oral comp)	50	50	0	83	17	0	0	0	100	0	0
CATAC (posters)	38	59	3	59	35	6	0	0	96	4	0
Winter Meeting (Research in 3)	44	56	0	56	44	0	0	0	100	0	0
Winter Meeting (oral competition)	50	50	0	50	25	0	25	0	75	0	25
Winter Meeting 2018 (posters)	47	53	0	53	21	5	21	5	74	0	21
Winter Meeting 2018 (all attendees)	49	51	0	40	22	2	36	4	64	0	31
SUSTAIN applicants - round 3	100	0	0	82	18	0	0	4	94	1	0
SUSTAIN participants - round 3	100	0	0	83	17	0	0	8	92	0	0
SUSTAIN event speakers	25	38	38	25	0	0	75	0	13	0	88
FLIER applicants - round 1	43	57	0	88	10	2	0	2	98	0	0
FLIER participants - round 1	47	53	0	88	6	6	0	6	94	0	0
FLIER event speakers	22	67	11	33	0	0	67	0	0	0	100

CATAC (steering committee)	40	60	0	60	10	0	30	0	10	0	90
CATAC 2018 (judges)	40	47	13	73	0	0	27	0	27	0	73
Winter Meeting 2018 (judges)	67	33	0	78	0	0	22	0	0	0	100
Mentoring advisory group 2019	44	56	0	56	11	0	33	0	22	0	78
Leadership task force	50	50	0	63	0	0	38	0	13	0	88

## 5. Policy

---

- There are data gaps across the Academy's policy work, and we will be focussing on improving our processes to ensure regular and consistent collection in our policy work to significantly improve the data for next year's data analysis.
- There are challenges in ensuring appropriate collection across all of the different activities that the policy team do, and we are looking at how to integrate and standardise this collection.
- There is no ethnicity or disability data for more than 70% of people on the Academy's UK focussed policy decision-making committees. This remains unchanged since last year. We are looking at new processes to improve this significantly for next year.
- Although there is gender data across the Academy's policy work, there is no formal diversity data collected for ethnicity and disability across almost all policy event attendees and speakers.
- Diversity analysis of the Academy's policy work is therefore limited.
- However, there is good data collection and good BAME representation in the Academy's internationally focussed policy decision-making committees (34% BAME, including 14% Black).
- Diversity data collection for gender is very good.
- The proportions of male and female speakers and attendees across all policy work are gender balanced (speakers: 55% male, 45% female; attendees: 48% male, 52% female). The Academy's policy work has a high number red flags for gender when assessed in terms of individual events, which is due to three reasons: some events involve inviting participants who hold certain senior roles and there is no room for the Academy to address diversity considerations; very low numbers (e.g. a single speaker at an event), and lastly with partnership working our partners do not always provide gender balanced representatives. Nevertheless, it is good to see that when viewed in collective terms, the Academy's policy work is broadly gender balanced.

**Policy breakdown**

	Gender		Ethnicity				Disability			
	% F	% M	% AWB	% BAME	% PNS	% No info	% Yes	% No	% P N S	% No info
All policy events (attendees)	52	48	12	8	1	79	0	18	1	82
All policy events (speakers)	45	55	4	1	0	95	/	/	/	100
All UK Working/Oversight/Steering Groups	59	41	24	5	0	71	/	/	/	100
All International Working/Oversight/Steering Groups	44	56	62	38	0	0	/	/	/	100
All FORUM events (attendees)	46	54	8	1	0	91	/	/	/	100
All FORUM events (speakers)	35	65	12	3	0	86	/	/	/	100
All MSP events (attendees)	52	48	/	/	/	100	/	/	/	100
All MSP events (speakers)	51	49	/	/	/	100	/	/	/	100
All international policy events (attendees)	58	42	23	19	3	55	1	43	1	55
All international policy events (speakers)	50	50	0	1	0	99	/	/	/	100

## 6. Corporate Affairs and communications

---

- Data collection for gender in this area is good. Data collection for ethnicity varies greatly within this area. Data collection for disability is poor. Formal ethnicity and disability data collection for media work needs to improve.
- Attendees across all corporate events are roughly gender balanced (42% female, 45% male, 2% PNS and 10% data not collected).
- Last year, the Academy's events with Regional Champions had six red flags for lack of women speakers or attendees, but this year there were only two red flags at the old level of 30% female representation. However when considered with the new level of 35% female representation, five areas are flagged.
- 15% of speakers at corporate events during this time period were BAME. None were Black.
- The Academy's media work is female-focused: the Academy's media office actively identifies women for reactive comments when not putting the President forward and most proactive media work prioritises the pitching of women experts.

**Breakdown**

	Gender		Ethnicity				Disability			
	% F	% M	% AWB	% BAME	% PNS	% No info	% Yes	% No	% PN S	% No info
All corporate event speakers and core representatives	65	35	58	15	1	26	3	68	1	28
All corporate event attendees	42	45	72	16	7	5	3	81	7	9
All media work	66	34	19	5	0	76	0	0	0	100
New Fellows admission day 2019 (speakers)	50	50	75	25	0	0	0	100	0	0
Regional champions events 2018/19 (speakers) - Scotland event	67	33	83	17	0	0	0	33	0	67
Regional champions events 2018/19 (attendees) - Scotland event	64	36	68	22	10	0	1	88	10	0
Regional champions events 2018/19 (speakers) - South East lecture	0	100	/	/	/	100	0	0	0	100
Regional champions events 2018/19 (attendees) - South East lecture	21	79	94	3	3	0	3	94	3	0
Regional champions events 2018/19 (speakers) - Wales	86	14	57	29	0	14	0	43	0	57
Regional champions events 2018/19 (attendees) - Wales	65	35	66	30	5	0	2	84	14	0
Regional champions events 2018/19 (speakers) - North East celebration	38	63	88	13	0	0	0	88	0	13
Regional champions events 2018/19 (attendees) - North East celebration	50	50	77	15	8	0	3	85	11	0
Annual General Meeting (2018/19) (attendees)	31	69	83	9	7	0	6	94	0	0
Lectures - Shanks (total speakers to date)	33	67	/	/	/	100	/	/	/	100
The Departure Lounge guides (applications)	95	5	81	18	1	0	6	93	1	0
The Departure Lounge guides (accepted)	94	6	79	18	3	0	3	94	3	0
The Departure Lounge Dead Beats event (speakers)	38	63	38	13	0	50	13	38	0	50
The Departure Lounge Dead Beats event (attendees)	0	0	28	8	8	56	/	/	/	100
MedSciLife profiles	57	43	71	29	0	0	/	/	/	100
Media - Media training/media messaging	73	27	73	14	0	14	/	/	/	100
Media - press briefing panellists	25	75	50	13	0	38	/	/	/	100
Media - ITV showcase	100	0	62	31	0	8	/	/	/	100
Media - major spokespeople put forward (proactive)	70	30	0	0	0	100	/	/	/	100
Media - major spokespeople put forward (reactive)	74	26	0	0	0	100	/	/	/	100
Media - major spokespeople quoted (anywhere, proactive)	62	38	0	0	0	100	/	/	/	100
Media - major spokespeople quoted (anywhere, reactive)	24	76	0	0	0	100	/	/	/	100
Media - added to SMC database	100	0	100	0	0	0	/	/	/	100

## 7. Human resources

---

- *Benchmarking: The Academy's HR transparency compares well to comparator organisations – no other national Academies currently publish staff diversity data although the Royal Society is planning to do so in 2020.*
- For the first time in three years, there was not a disparity in applicant success rate for jobs at the Academy by ethnicity which is promising.
- Staff are 16% BAME.
- *Benchmarking: Trust for London demographic data. The UK population is around 10% BAME. The population of London is around 40% BAME.*
- Women represent just under two thirds of Academy staff.
- The Academy gets more job applications from women than from men.
- There is no significant difference in success rates for job by gender over the past three years.
- This was the first year we have collected data on sexual orientation and gender identity among staff. 10% of staff are LGBTQ+. (*Note: LGBTQ stands for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer. The + is often added at the end to encompass people who identify as Asexual, Intersex or who are questioning their sexuality.*) 4% of staff preferred not to say.
- Diversity data for interns across all areas is not currently collected in a systematic way and this needs to improve.

**Human resources breakdown:**

	Gender		Ethnicity				Total people
	% F	% M	% AWB	% BAME	% PNS	% No info	
Permanent staff (total)	63	18	67	16	0	18	51
Recruitment - applications	67	31	66	29	5	0	178
Recruitment - shortlisted	68	27	73	25	2	0	60
Recruitment - appointed	85	15	69	31	0	0	13
Interns - applications	63	37	/	/	/	100	27
Interns - shortlisted	65	35	/	/	/	100	20
Interns - appointed	50	50	/	/	/	100	12

**Permanent staff only: gender identity and sexual orientation:**

Gender identity same as birth? (%)			What best describes your sexual orientation? (%)			
Yes	No	No info	LGBTQ+	Hetero	PNS	No info
82%	0%	18%	9%	69%	4%	18%