



UK Research
and Innovation

Diversity results for UKRI funding data

2014-15 to 2018-19



Contents

Executive summary	03
Background	04
Diversity characteristics	06
Diversity analysis	09
Award rates	11
Award value	13
Studentship starts	15
References	16

Executive summary

In June 2020, UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) is publishing data for diversity characteristics of its funding applicants and recipients for the past five years. This publication differs from previous data releases in the following ways:

- For the first time, data have been harmonised across all research councils
- The publication includes new, previously unpublished, data on award values
- The data are being made available in a range of formats to facilitate access and analysis by the community

Key findings include:

- 1** The composition of applicants by gender and ethnicity has changed from 2014–15 to 2018–19. The magnitude of change varies by role. The largest increase has been a 10 percentage points (pp) increase in the proportion of ethnic minority Co-Investigators (CI) in the last five years (from 12% to 22%). The proportion of female applicants has also seen an increase in the last five years, with the largest increase at the CI level (27% to 32%). The composition of applicants by age category and disability status remains relatively unchanged.
- 2** Differences in award rates by gender vary by applicant role. For instance, female Principal Investigators (PI) have lower award rates than male PIs (24% vs. 26% in 2018–19), but that finding is reversed for fellowships. Females have a higher award rate than males as Fellows (24% vs. 16% in 2018–19), which has been the case for four out of the last five years. The results are more mixed for CIs where the award rates for male and female applicants appear to be converging in 2018–19. Looking at award rates by ethnicity, we can see that white PI and CI applicants had higher award rates than their ethnic minority counterparts in the last five years. The difference ranges from +2pp to +9pp for the two roles in the last five years.

- 3** Award values also differ by diversity characteristics. Our analysis indicates that female and ethnic minority awardees tend to apply for and win smaller awards. For example, the median award value for female awardees is approximately 15% less than the median award values of males (£336,000 vs £395,000). Similarly, the median award value for ethnic minority awardees is approximately 8% less than that of white awardees (£353,000 vs. £383,000). This finding highlights a need to understand whether ethnic minority and female applicants tend to apply for smaller awards, or whether there is an influence of other factors such as career stage and discipline, which in turn affect award value.

We advise against using these findings alone to draw conclusions on the relationship between protected characteristics and application and award rates. Further analysis is needed to control for the effects of other background factors. Additionally, there are other factors that affect the interpretation of these data and these are outlined in other sections of the report.

UKRI is committed to expanding its data collection and analysis capabilities and some of its ambitions and priorities for this are also outlined. The next diversity data release is scheduled for early 2021.

Background

Research Councils UK (RCUK) last published detailed research council level funding results by diversity characteristics in April 2018.¹ The creation of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) gave us the opportunity to produce a singular, harmonised dataset and to increase our data capabilities. To that end, UKRI announced in mid-2019 that it would publish detailed funding data by diversity characteristics for the past five years.² This narrative document outlines our approach (including the exclusions that were applied), contains a description of our findings and includes additional details about our ambitions for future work.

What are we presenting?

Using harmonised data for the first time, we have produced results by diversity characteristics for each of the seven research councils:

- Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC)
- Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC)
- Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC)
- Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)
- Medical Research Council (MRC)
- Natural Environment Research Council (NERC)
- Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC)³

The data produced includes:

- 1 Proportion of applicants and awardees for research grants and fellowships
- 2 Award rate⁴ (number of awardees as a proportion of number of applicants)
- 3 Award value for successful applicants for research grants and fellowships (published for the first time)
- 4 Proportion of doctoral studentship starts
- 5 Estimate of UK staff and student populations for each research council based on Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data to understand whether the applicants, awardees and students reflect the underlying population of students and staff.

In this release, we are also providing findings by diversity characteristics for the cross-UKRI Future Leaders Fellowships (FLF).⁵ For the future, we are investigating ways to present diversity results for other cross-council calls such as the Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund and Global Challenge Research Fund.

We have started work on other strands such as intersectionality, detailed ethnicity analysis and regression analysis. We will continue to keep the community updated on our progress. Please do provide feedback on this release and our enhanced efforts with data analysis and visualisation as we would like to improve our reports and make them as useful and accessible as possible. We will use feedback to inform future iterations.

Roles

We present results by the role on the funding application: Principal Investigator (PI), Co-Investigator (CI) and Fellows, as appropriate. We also present findings for council funding of doctoral studentships.

Data harmonisation

A standardised set of exclusions were applied to all data. Previously, councils applied bespoke exclusions for council level analysis. The exclusions can be summarised as follows:

- Applications are grouped into financial years based on when the decision was made and not when the application was submitted.
- We exclude non-competitive grants such as those falling under calls with 100% rejection or acceptance rate, EPSRC institute grants and algorithmic or block grants where the grant holders are not researchers. About 5% (approximately 2,920) of grants are excluded because of standardised exclusions. Excluding grants with 100% acceptance rate also has an implication for STFC as many of their grants are made up of multiple projects. Some of their calls will have a 100% success rate even if they are competitive.
- Office rejects, meaning grants that do not make it to the peer review stage, are included.
- Additionally, grants with no lead/sole joint funder are excluded. As a result, 3% (approximately 1,970) of grants have been excluded. Data harmonisation across councils is complex and we are taking steps to improve the methodology to ensure that such grants are included in future works.
- Additionally, fellowships with multiple Fellows and research grants with multiple PIs respectively are excluded from diversity analysis as identifying the original lead investigator is not possible on our funding system. These form approximately 1% of research grants and 2% of fellowships.
- Our analysis is based on applications, not unique applicants. An applicant can put in multiple applications in the same year.

Rounding and suppression

- For funding data, counts and results for groups between 1 and 4 members are suppressed. Other numbers are rounded to the nearest multiple of five.
- Proportions are calculated based on unrounded numbers.
- Award values are rounded to the nearest £1,000.
- For HESA data, we follow HESA's rules of rounding and suppression.⁶

Diversity characteristics

Our funding service currently gathers data on four protected characteristics: age, disability, ethnicity, and gender. Please find the description of how the data are collected and grouped, as well as information about how we aim to improve data collection, in Table 1.

We have started conversations on collecting information on other protected characteristics. We will engage with the community to understand areas of interest and continue engaging with UK data specialists and regulators about ways to collect and present our information.

Table 1: Description of variables and modification

Characteristic	How is it measured in the funding service?	How are we presenting the results?	Ambition
Age	Based on applicant's date of birth at the time of the application.	By age categories: <29 30–39 40–49 50–59 60+ Unknown	
Disability	The following options are presented to applicants: An unseen disability Autistic spectrum disorder Blind/Partially sighted Deaf/Hearing impairment Dyslexia Mental health difficulties Mobility difficulties Multiple disabilities No known disability Not disclosed Other disability Unknown Unspecified	By disability status: Not disabled Disabled Unknown Not disclosed	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Investigate how to increase disclosure rates. 2 We will be launching a workstream to understand the experience of our disability community and how best to collect and interpret our data.
Ethnicity	Office for National Statistics (ONS) harmonised list of ethnicity categories.	By broad ethnic categories: Ethnic minority White Unknown Not disclosed	Present results by detailed ethnicity characteristics. We plan to present these results in Year 1 of our five-year EDI work plan.
Gender	Male Female Unknown Not disclosed	No modification	We are exploring adding additional gender categories.

'Not disclosed' refers to when respondents have consciously chosen to not disclose their personal information and selected the 'not disclosed' option. 'Unknown' is when individuals have not provided their details and therefore the funding service has no usable information.

How are we presenting the diversity analysis?

Based on feedback on the previous publication, which was a PDF file, we are expanding the ways that diversity data are available. This year, we are presenting diversity findings in the following ways:

- 1 Descriptive narrative in this document.
- 2 CSV files available for download.
- 3 Interactive dashboards to enable visualisation.

The narrative in this document is organised thematically. Themes include diversity profiles of applicants and awardees, differences in award rates and variation in award value by diversity characteristics. In addition to high level findings, we highlight key results for councils especially if they deviate from the UKRI average or if there are changes over time. Detailed results by councils are provided in CSV files and in the interactive dashboards.

Data sources

We use the following three data sources for the diversity analysis of UKRI funding:

- 1 Funding data for research grants and fellowships through returns by individuals to their Joint electronic Submissions (Je-S) account, which the research community use to apply for UKRI funding. The Je-S account holds diversity characteristics.
- 2 Studentship data for student starts by years, which is provided by research organisations through the Je-S Studentships Detail Functionality.
- 3 HESA data to understand the diversity profile of the larger academic and student community for each council. This will enable us to compare the diversity data for funding recipients with the diversity profile of the post graduate research (PGR) population in the UK and that of the academic population who are likely to apply for funding to their respective council.

Further details are provided in Table 2 (page 8).

Guidance on interpreting data

We would like to offer the following notes of caution when interpreting the data.

- We cannot draw conclusions on the effect of personal characteristics on application and award rates, without controlling for the effects of other background factors. We have started regression analysis that allows us to better understand the effect of individual characteristics after controlling for a host of other factors, both on an individual and an organisational level. These include career stage, discipline and the type of university of the applicant.
- The changes in award rate of a single group over time should not be used as evidence to understand progress or decline. Award rates fluctuate annually and can be a function of other factors such as budgetary availability and demand for funding. Monitoring of award rates should be done in the context of other measures such as overall award rate as well as award rate of the counterpart. (For example, changes in the award rate of female PIs should be understood in the context of changes in the award rates of male PIs.)
- While the data have been harmonised, differences in demand and nature of funding mean that award rates should not be compared across councils. For example, many STFC grants are made up of multiple projects. The grant itself is awarded but not all the projects within it will be funded. Consequently, STFC has a higher award rate than other councils. Similarly, ESRC only disburses small amounts of their funding through fellowships. Additionally, eligibility rules vary by calls for councils, which could affect the diversity results.
- The diversity profile of applicants and awardees for each council should not be compared to each other due to differences in baseline populations. We have provided HESA staff and student estimates for each council that can be used to understand the diversity profile of underlying subjects. Please note that the diversity profiles based on cost codes and JACS code are indicative due to limitations described in table 2. We suspect that disability is underreported in our data. About 1% of applicants for research funding disclose that they have a disability. This is lower than the ONS economically active population of 13% and the HESA staff estimate of 4%. Conclusions about disability must be interpreted in the light of underreporting.
- For studentship funding, ethnicity data are not disclosed for almost 30% of awardees. The unknown data limits the conclusions that can be drawn about the ethnicity profile of studentships.
- A standardised set of exclusions was applied to the funding data for EDI analysis and as such does not include all the funding that was disbursed by the councils. The exclusions are described in detail in the earlier section. Consequently, findings in this release may be different from those in the previous release where each council applied its own set of exclusions.

Table 2: Description of data sources and limitations

Data	Time period	Source	Limitations
Research grants and fellowships	2014–15 to 2018–19 Awardees are grouped into financial year based on the date UKRI made a decision on the application, not the date the application was submitted.	Funding Service through returns to individual Je-S accounts	Non-disclosure of data <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Approximately, 8% of respondents do not share their ethnicity. 2 Only 1% of applicants declare a disability, which is lower than the HESA estimate of 4%⁷ of teaching and research population and the ONS estimate of 13% of the working population.⁸
Studentship starts	2014–15 to 2018–19 Student starts are based on the first financial year that the studentship award was active – a time stamp that typically represents a student's intake year.	Individual studentship information submitted by research organisations (RO) to research councils via the cross-council Je-S Studentship Details Functionality. (Funding for studentships is mainly provided to ROs as a block grant, who then select candidates for specific studentship projects or fund an independent project proposal.)	Data on studentship awardees is provided by RO and is not based on self-disclosure. Consequently: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 We do not collect information on applicants for studentships on Je-S. Consequently, we cannot compute the award rate for each diversity characteristics. 2 Ethnicity data is not disclosed or unknown for almost 30% of awardees.
Diversity profile of larger academic community for each council for 2017/18 (Academic population and students)	2017/18, which is the year for which we have the latest available data.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 HESA data based on cost codes for Academic populations. Using the HESA 2017/18 staff return, Staff full-person equivalent, Staff (excluding atypical), Academic employment function, Teaching & research. 2 JACS codes for postgraduate (Masters and Doctoral research) students and Full time equivalent. JACS principal subjects are used. For ethnicity, data are for UK domiciled students. 	Each research council has selected the HESA cost centres and JACS code ⁹ that most closely reflect their remit, and as such there are overlaps and gaps. Additionally, HESA data reflects the diversity population of the UK Higher Education Institutes, whereas some calls do allow for international applicants. Discussion of further limitations of HESA data can be found here: https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1046/ref_2017_02.pdf

Diversity analysis

How does the proportion of applicants and awardees vary by diversity characteristics?

Figure 1 (page 10) shows that the proportion of applicants from a demographic group differs by role.

Age

With a UKRI average of about 37%, the 40–49 age group form the largest share of PI and CI applicants and awardees for all councils, and this share is close to or marginally exceeds the HESA estimate of 40–49 age group for each council. The 30–39 and 50–59 age groups are the next largest group of applicants and recipients for UKRI funding, which is the case for most councils.

For Fellows, the 30–39 age group forms the largest share of both applicants and awardees for most of the councils (approximately 65% in 2018–19). For STFC and MRC, the 30–39 age group form more than 80% of fellowship awardees. Several fellowship calls are aimed at early career researchers who have not yet taken up their first academic post.¹⁰

Ethnicity

The proportion of ethnic minority applicants and awardees varies by year, role and council.

The share of ethnic minority applicants and funding recipients has increased in the last five years. The largest increase in the share of ethnic minority applicants has been for CIs (from 12% to 22%). In 2018–19, the share of ethnic minorities as applicants and awardees has been highest as CIs (22% and 30%), compared to as Fellows (16% and 25%) and PIs (13% and 12%).

The 10pp increase in the share of ethnic minority CI applicants is not reflected in every council. For example, while MRC has seen its share of ethnic minority CIs double from 15% to 30%, other councils such as EPSRC have seen a smaller increase of 4pp (from 13% to 17%) in the same five-year period. This period also masks annual fluctuations for councils.

As outlined earlier, we use HESA cost centres to understand the diversity profile of the academic populations within each council's remit. We find that the share of ethnic minority applicants as CIs and Fellows reflects or is close to the ethnic minority share of the overall academic population of the underlying subjects for all councils. The ethnic minority HESA share is reflected for PI applicants for most councils.

Gender

In 2018–19, the share of applicants at UKRI level that select female as their gender is highest as Fellows (36%), followed by CIs (32%) and PIs (28%).

The proportion of applicants identifying as females has increased in 2018–19, relative to 2014–15 for all three roles, with the largest increase for CIs (+5pp). The proportion of CIs identifying as female exceed the female HESA staff proportion for some of the councils.

For most councils, the proportion of female PI awardees and applicants is less than the female share of the HESA staff population. One exception is AHRC, where the proportion of female PIs is 46% in 2018–19 and exceeds the HESA estimate of females in its subject remit (41%).

For most councils, the proportion of female Fellow applicants exceed the female staff share of the HESA population. Many fellowships target early career researchers, where it is estimated that the percentage of females is higher than at later career stages.¹¹

Disability


Only about 1% of applicants for all roles declare that they have a disability, which is below the HESA estimate of 4% for staff with a disclosed disability. About 6% of applicants choose to not disclose their disability status.

The number of PI and Fellow awardees disclosing a disability is too low for statistical analysis at council level.

The proportion of CI applicants who declare a disability is below the HESA population estimate for every council.

As mentioned in the introductory section, there is likely underreporting of disability and we have started looking into why this may be the case.

Figure 1: Proportion of applications by diversity characteristics and role (2018–19)



Note: Numbers may not add up to 100% due to 'unknown' and 'not disclosed' not being shown.

Award rates

How do award rates vary by diversity characteristics?

There are differences in award rates by characteristics. What we find is that the differences also vary by role. Figure 2 (page 12) shows that differences in award rate by gender and ethnicity vary by role.

Award rates vary annually, so fluctuations of a single group should not be used to draw conclusions about improvements. We need to look at overall award rate or the award rate of the counterpart group for context.

Age

For PIs, the award rate amongst age categories lies between 25% and 27% in 2018–19. The range of award rate varies across councils. For the most part, older age groups have higher award rates, relative to the <29 age category. In some councils, the <29 age group have the highest award rate as PIs. The number of applicants is small in the group.

For CIs, award rate for all age groups tend to be within a narrow range. For example, the award rate in 2018–19 for CIs by age groups is in the range of 22% to 29% in 2018–19.

In case of fellowships, the 30–39 age group and 40–49 age group have the highest award rate.

Ethnicity

Looking at UKRI as a whole, white PIs have consistently higher award rates than ethnic minority PIs. This is reflected for most councils. Some trends that deviate from the average are:

- Ethnic minority PIs have had higher success than white PIs in three of the last five years at AHRC.
- For MRC and NERC, white PIs have consistently higher award rates than their ethnic minority counterparts. The gap is widening with the award rates for ethnic minority applicants declining at higher rates than award rates for white applicants. For MRC, the decline in the award rate correlates with an increase in the number of ethnic minority applicants in the last three years, while the number of awards to ethnic minority applicants remained constant. (We are investigating this trend.)

White CIs have consistently higher award rates than ethnic minority CIs for UKRI. There is however greater fluctuation in the relative award rates when we look at individual councils.

Ethnic minority fellowship applicants had a higher award rate than white applicants in 2018–19 (21% vs. 19%), reversing the trend of previous years. This varies by councils. In several councils, the number of ethnic minority Fellows is too low to enable discussion. One exception is MRC, where the award rate for ethnic minority fellowship applicants is close to or higher than award rates of white fellowship applicants in three out of the last five years.

Gender

In the last five years, PI applicants who select male as their gender had higher award rates than those who select female as their gender. The difference hovers around 2 to 3 pp. The average conceals inter-council variation, where in some years, award rates are statistically similar for male and female PIs.¹²

Male applicants have higher award rates than female applicants as CIs in all years excluding 2018–19, when the two groups had the same award rates. Some exceptions are:

- Applicants identifying as female have higher award rates than applicants identifying as male in all years at AHRC. In 2018–19, the difference was 3pp (31% vs. 28%).
- At EPSRC, male applicants have historically had higher award rates than female applicants, the difference ranging from +3pp to +7pp. The award rates were similar for the first time in 2018–19, with females having +1pp higher award rate than men (29% vs 28%).
- Female CIs have had higher award rates than male CIs at NERC in the last four years.
- Female applicants have higher award rates than male applicants as Fellows in the last four years. This is reflected for most councils as well. Council level numbers for fellowships are however too low to draw meaningful comparisons.

Disability

In the last five years, PI applicants with a declared disability have lower award rates than those who said they do not have a disability. In 2018–19, the difference was 4pp (22% vs. 26%). The numbers are too low at the council level to enable a statistically meaningful discussion.

For fellowships, applicants disclosing a disability have a higher award rate in all years but 2018–19, than those who say they do not have a disability. The numbers of awardees are however too small to draw any generalisable conclusions.

In the last couple of years, the award rate of CIs who declare a disability is equal to those who do not declare a disability. This conceals inter-council variations.

Figure 2: Differences in award rate by role for gender and ethnicity (2018-19)

The bars represent the difference between the award rate of females and ethnic minority applicants and their counterparts respectively. Bars to the right of the axis mean that the award rate of the ethnic minority/female applicants is greater than that of white/male applicants

Ethnicity

(Ethnic minority–White)

CI

-4 pp

Fellow

3 pp

PI

-9 pp

Gender

(Female–Male)

CI

0 pp

Fellow

8 pp

PI

-2 pp

Difference in award rate
(Ethnic minority–White) / (Female–Male)

Note: Differences are based on unrounded numbers.

Award value

How do award values differ by diversity characteristics?

In this report, we present both mean and median award values.¹³ As shown in figure 3 (page 14), mean award values are generally higher than the median award value, indicating that there are a few large awards that tend to increase the average. (Note that award values for fellowships and research grants can range from £400 to £38 million depending on factors such as discipline and career stage.)

The discrepancy between mean and median award value highlights the need to investigate the distribution of high value awards by diversity characteristics. While the distribution of large grant awards by diversity characteristics for UKRI was presented in the S&T Committee response, similar work for each council has also started.

Age

The median award values vary by age categories.

Median award value is higher for older age categories, with the largest award values for the 50–59 and 60+ age category for PIs. Even as the total number of awardees are relatively fewer for the 60+ age group, the median award size is the largest. If we look at mean award values for PIs, the 60+ age category has a much higher average award value than the group with the next largest average award value (50–59), which implies that a few small awards are being awarded to applicants in the 60+ age category. This pattern conceals inter-council variation.

For fellowships, median award value is highest for the 50–59 age group, even as the number of awardees in the group tends to be small. This is reflected for most councils. Note that numbers are too small at the council level to enable a meaningful discussion.

Gender

PI awardees identifying as female apply for and win smaller amounts than male awardees. The relative award values by gender vary by council. Some exceptions to the average are:

- Award value for female awardees was equal to or greater than that for male awardees in BBSRC (£453,000 vs. £423,000 in 2018–19).
- Except for 2018–19, median award value for female and male awardees were similar for AHRC. This, however, changed in 2018–19 where the award value for males is more than double that of females (£188,000 vs. £80,000). Award values for female Fellows is less than that for male Fellows. This is the case for most councils. Note that at the council level, female Fellows have median award values greater than that of male Fellows in some years.

Ethnicity

White PI awardees win higher award amounts than their ethnic minority counterparts in the last five financial years. Disaggregating award values by councils reveal exceptions.¹⁴

The relative award value varies by ethnicity for PIs at AHRC, with average award values higher for ethnic minority awardees than for white awardees. In 2018–19, the median award value for ethnic minority awardees was more than double the median for white PIs (£196,000 vs. £82,000). If we however look at mean award values, we find that the award values for white PIs was more than double that of ethnic minority PIs (£509,000 vs. £232,000).

Award amounts for ethnic minority and white Fellows are close in value in the last three years (2016–17 to 2018–19). For the most part, the number of ethnic minority Fellows at council level are too small to enable a meaningful discussion. One departure from the average is that in 2018–19, the median award value for white Fellows at MRC was more than double that for ethnic minority Fellows (£707,000 vs £280,000).¹⁵ This was a departure from the preceding three years where the median award values were similar for the two groups. We are conducting intersectional analysis which will look at award values by age and ethnicity.

Disability


In 2018–19, the median award value was higher for PIs who say that they do not have a disability compared to those with a declared disability. That holds for all years but 2017–18. The low numbers of PIs with disclosed disabilities make discussion at council level not insightful.

The small number of Fellows who disclose a disability means we cannot draw statistically valid conclusions on funding by disability.

Figure 3: Differences in median and mean award values

Average amount awarded by ethnicity and gender for research grants in UKRI (2018–19).

Numbers on the top of the bar refer to the average award value and counts of the specified group.



Studentship starts

How do studentships funded by UKRI councils differ by diversity characteristics?

Age

The <29 age group forms the largest share of studentship funding for all councils. The proportion of awardees in the <29 age group is greater than the HESA share of the <29 age group for all councils. Awardees are also from 30–39 age group and 40–49 age group. Their share is less than the HESA estimate of the PGR population. The share of recipients in the <29 age groups has remained steady over the last five years (approximately 82%).

This pattern holds for most councils, even as the precise distribution varies. Interestingly, at 16% and 19% respectively, the share of the 30–39 age group as the recipient of doctoral studentships at AHRC and ESRC is higher than that of other councils.

Ethnicity

The proportion of those with unknown ethnicity and active non-disclosures is very high in all years (adding up to 29% in 2018–19) for studentship awardees (Figure 4). At approximately 9% in 2018–19, the proportion of ethnic minority studentships has remained relatively steady over the last five years. It is also less than the HESA estimate of the ethnic minority proportion of the PGR population (17%).¹⁶

For councils, the proportion of ethnic minority studentship awardees is less than the PGR population estimate. Considering the relatively large amount of unknown ethnicity data, the comparisons with the HESA estimates should be interpreted with caution.

Gender

Approximately 40% of recipients of UKRI studentships in the last five years were female, which is less than the HESA estimate of females in the PGR population (49%). The share of female recipients has increased by 2pp since 2014–15.

The proportion of female recipients varies by council, but largely reflect the estimate of the PGR female population. One result that differs is that the share of female awardees for NERC at 47% in 2018–19 exceeded the share of the female PGR population of 36%.


Disability

7% of studentship awardees in 2018–19 had a disability, which is less than the 9% of PGR population that said that they had a disability. The share of studentship awardees with a declared disability has increased by 2pp since 2014–15.

The proportion of studentship awardees who declare a disability is less than the HESA PGR population with disabilities for almost all councils. The proportion of awardees with declared disabilities increased for AHRC and ESRC. The proportion of studentship awardees with declared disabilities has increased from 6% in 2014–15 to 11% in 2018–19 for ESRC and it now exceeds the share of students with declared disabilities in the corresponding PGR community (10%).

We do not hold information on the disability status of approximately 1% of doctoral studentship awardees.

Figure 4: Ethnicity composition by student starts (2018–19)



References

- 1** RCUK was the predecessor organisation of UKRI.
<https://www.ukri.org/files/rcuk-diversity-headline-narratives-april2017-pdf>
- 2** This dataset was used to inform UKRI's responses in November 2019 to the pre-inquiry questions contained in a letter from Sir Norman Lamb to Sir Mark Walport as part of the then Science and Technology Parliamentary Select Committee inquiry into funding and equality, diversity and inclusion and accessibility. UKRI used these data to identify key differences by diversity characteristics for application rates, award rates and values, but at an aggregate level, rather than by council.
<https://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-committees/science-technology/Correspondence/191030-UKRI%20to%20Chair%20re%20Impact%20of%20funding%20on%20equality%20diversity%20inclusion%20and%20accessibility.pdf>.
- 3** Two of UKRI's constituent bodies – Research England and Innovate UK – predominantly fund organisations (universities and businesses, respectively) rather than individuals, which is why they are excluded from our analysis. Diversity data for universities is collected, analysed and published by HESA. Our approach going forward is to strengthen and align data collection across all UKRI bodies.
<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/23-01-2020/sb256-higher-education-staff-statistics>
- 4** Success rates have been renamed award rates.
- 5** We do not discuss the results in this narrative. As FLF in its early stages, the number of awardees is small, which limits the discussion of result. The findings are made available for download.
- 6** <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/about/regulation/data-protection/rounding-and-suppression-anonymise-statistics>
- 7** <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/staff/table-5>
- 8** <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/datasets/labourmarketstatusofdisabledpeoplea08>
- 9** JACS (the Joint Academic Coding System) is a system used by HESA to classify academic subjects. We list JACS and cost codes used for student and academic population within the CSV files we are publishing.
<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/support/documentation/jacs>
- 10** The 31–35 and 36–40 age groups collectively form the largest age group of academic staff starters in 2018/19, totaling 43% of starters. The calculation is based on table 23-Academic staff starters and leavers published by HESA. Calculation is for academic employment function- 'both teaching and research', mode of employment- 'all' and for total inflow to UK HE academic staff population.
<https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/staff/table-23>
- 11** <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/26-02-2015/age-and-gender-of-staff>
- 12** For example, female and male PI applicants for EPSRC have had statistically similar award rates in the last five years. We see this with other councils as well, where female PIs have similar or higher award rates relative to male PIs in some of the years.
- 13** Award amounts have inflation indexation removed to enable comparison with application amounts. All award amounts are rounded to the nearest £1,000.
- 14** Note that the number of ethnic minority awardees tends to be small relative to white awardees. For example, in 2018–19, there were a total of 210 ethnic minority awardees and 2,050 white awardees.
- 15** Note that MRC fellowship award values range in scale according to career stage from £150,000 to £2 million. Several high value awards were applied for by and went to white applicants during 2018–19, potentially impacting ethnicity findings for that year. We are investigating this through more detailed analysis.
- 16** <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/students/whos-in-he>
The figures in parentheses are for 2017/18.



**UK Research
and Innovation**

Accessibility

To request copies of this report in large print or in a different format, please contact the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion team at UKRI:

01793 444000
equality@ukri.org

UK Research and Innovation
Polaris House
Swindon
SN2 1FL