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## GENDER AUDIT REPORT 2020-2022

Equity Office, 2023

## Key Area 1A: Governance bodies, key actors and decision making

## Methodology

Data was gathered in June - July 2022 from the University's online Annual Reports, as well as data provided by the Office for Human Resources Management and Development.

## The Senate and the Council

Looking closer at the highest-level governing bodies at UM, i.e., the Council and the Senate, numerical data comparing the year 2020/1 to the year 2021/2, finds that in the Senate, there was a sharp increase in the number of males in the Senate, while the number of females in the Senate decreased (Figure 1.0). Consequently, as shown in Figure 1.1, the percentage of females to males dropped from $29 \%$ in the year 2020/1, to $25 \%$ in the year 2021/2.

In the UM Council, there was also a drop in the proportion of females, from $25 \%$ in academic year 2020/1,1 to $24 \%$ in academic year 20/22, although this drop was not as sharp as the one in the Senate.


Figure 1.0. Gender distribution in the Senate and Council, 2020/1, 2021/2
Source: UM Annual Report 2021


Figure 1.1. Comparing proportion of male/female representation in the Council and Senate 2020/1, 2021/2

Source: Annual Reports 2021, UM website 2022

## Governing/ Decision-making bodies

Governing or decision-making bodies are taken to include the posts shown in Table 1.0 (column A): Institute/Centre Directors, the Academic Registrar, Administrative Directors, Council and Senate members, the Rectorate, the Rector's delegates, Deans and Deputy Deans, Heads of Department and School/Faculty Directors, and Union representatives (UMASA, UHM). Table 1.0 (column A) shows that there is a disparity in the proportion of females at this level, with only $29 \%$ of female participation in 2021/2.

Figure 1.2 further highlights the problematic gaps in female participation. As pointed out earlier on, there is a lack of female participation at Council, Senate and Rectorate level. Additionally, this lack of female participation is also salient among Heads of Department (33\%), Deans (7\%), Administrative Directors (30\%), as well as Directors of Institutes and Centres ( $18 \%$ ). This leaves female participation in the governance of the University of Malta at $29 \%$ (Table 1.0), which contrasts greatly with the majority representation of female students which has consistently amounted to $60 \%$ of the total of student population (Table 3.9). Female leadership is important for female students at the University to develop leadership identity, as well as for male students and male leaders to develop a holistic idea of contemporary leadership, which is already well established in the business world where many students will be working.

It is also important to note, that when adding academic, and especially support staff (where females are the majority), the total population of the University becomes more balanced, and female participation reaches $56 \%$, although it is much lower among academic staff (38\%) (Table 1.0, column B). This reality further recognizes the need for increasing female participation in academic and decision-making positions.

Table 1.0. Gender composition of governing bodies by area, excluding (A)/including(B) academic and support staff, in percentage, 2022
A.

| Position | Male (\%) | Female (\%) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| (Institute/Centre) Director | 82 | 18 |
| Academic Registrar | 100 | 0 |
| Administrative Director | 70 | 30 |
| Deputy Dean | 56 | 44 |
| Dean | 93 | 7 |
| Head of Department | 67 | 33 |
| Council | 76 | 24 |
| Senate | 75 | 25 |
| Pro-Rector | 60 | 40 |
| Rector's Delegates | 79 | 21 |
| Rector | 100 | 0 |
| Union representation | 45 | 54 |
| School Director | 100 | 0 |
| Total | 71 | 29 |

B.

| Position | Male (\%) | Female (\%) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Academic staff | 62 | 38 |
| Support staff | 45 | 54 |
| Institute/Centre) Director | 82 | 18 |
| Academic Registrar | 100 | 0 |
| Administrative Director | 70 | 30 |
| Deputy Dean | 56 | 44 |
| Dean | 93 | 7 |
| Head of Department | 67 | 33 |
| Council | 76 | 24 |
| Senate | 75 | 25 |
| Pro-Rector | 60 | 40 |
| Rector's Delegates | 79 | 21 |
| Rector | 100 | 0 |
| Union representation | 45 | 54 |
| School Director | 100 | 0 |
| Total | 56 | 44 |

## Source: HRMD

Figure 1.2. Gender composition of governing bodies by area, in actual figures, 2021/2


Figure 1.2. Gender composition of governing bodies by area, in actual figures, 2022
Source: Author

## Rector's delegates

There were 3 female Rector's delegates in academic year 2021/2, out of a total of 14, which sets the percentage of female delegates at $21 \%$ of all the Rector's delegates (Table 1.1). Additionally, the Secretary to Council has been a male for a number of years.

Table 1.1. Rector's Delegates, 2021/2

- Professor Philip von Brockdorff - Rector's Delegate for Gozo
- Mr James Cilia - Rector's Delegate for the Office for Professional Academic Development (OPAD)
- Dr Maureen Cole - Rector's Delegate for Student Wellness
- Dr Edward Duca - Rector's Delegate for STEM Popularisation
- Ms Carmen Mangion - Rector's Delegate for the Debating Union
- Professor Marvin Formosa - Rector's Delegate for the University of the Third Age (U3A)
- Professor Joseph Grima - Rector's Delegate for Degree Plus
- Professor Keith Sciberras - Rector's Delegate for the Curation of Art Works of the University
- Dr Christian Zammit - Rector's Delegate for International Medical Students Mentoring
- Dr Mario T. Vassallo - Rector's Delegate for the Adjunct Office to the Institute for Public Services (IPS)
- Professor Ing Saviour Zammit - Rector's Delegate for Major Projects
- Professor Godrey Baldacchino - Rector's Delegate for SEA-EU
- Professor Isabel Stabile - Rector's Delegate for Quality Assurance
- Secretary to Council - Mr Simon Sammut

Source: UM Website, 2022.

UM trade union representation is made up of of UHM (Voice of the Workers trade union) representatives, with 40\% female representation, and UMASA (University of Malta Academic Staff Association) with 78\% female representation (Figure 1.3).


Figure 1.3. Union representatives, by gender
Source: UHM \& UMASA representatives at UM

## Key Area 3: Recruitment, Career Progression and Retention

## Students at the University of Malta

## Methodology

Raw data was gathered during July and August 2022, from the Office of the Registrar, on various aspects of the student population (gender, F/I/C/S, course level, mode of attendance etc.) in academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2. The raw data was organized and analysed according to data required for Key area 3 of the Equity Plan. In this report, unless otherwise stated, all data sources were from the Office of the Registrar.

The data excluded data on visiting students. The student data indicates that the majority of students at the University of Malta were female ( $60 \%$ ) in each academic year.

## 1. Student population by gender, $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{I} / \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{S}$ and course level at the University of Malta

## (a) Faculties

Student data was analysed by gender and course level within each Faculty for academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2 (Table 1.0). The total student population in Faculties stood at 10,167 in 2020/21, and 9893 in 2021/22, with female participation at $60 \%$ and $61 \%$ respectively.

The highest Faculty student participation is at the Faculty of Economics, Management and Accountancy (FEMA) - 1458 in 2020/1, 1396 in 2021/2, making up $14 \%$ of the total in both years. Female participation stood at $54 \%$ and $53 \%$ in the two academic years, consecutively. Female doctoral participation in this Faculty is relatively low ( 3 out of 11 students ( $27 \%$ ) in 2020/1, and 4 out of 13 students (31\%) in 2021/2), when compared to their participation at undergraduate (455 (53\%) in 2020/1, 392 (51\%) in 2021/2) and Masters level ( $244(58 \%)$ in 2020/1, 269 (57\%) in 2021/2).

The second largest Faculty in terms of student population is the Faculty of Arts -1237 (12\% of total) in 2020/21, and 1289 ( $13 \%$ of total) in 2021/2. In this Faculty female participation is high, at $66 \%$ and $67 \%$ in 2020/1 and 2021/2 consecutively, with similar proportions at Undergraduate ( 66 to $68 \%$ ) and Masters level ( $64-66 \%$ ), but, similar to FEMA, lowers considerably at doctoral level (44-45\%). The third largest Faculty population is at the Faculty of Social Well Being, with a total of 1134 and 1107 in 2020/1 and 2021/2 consecutively (11\% of total in both years). Although this Faculty has a very high proportion of female students ( $72 \%$ in both years), there is an increased male representation at Diploma level (from 30 students ( $37 \%$ ) in 2020/1 to 52 students ( $51 \%$ ) in 2021/2). The proportion of female students is also maintained across Undergraduate ( $71 \%, 72 \%$ ), Masters ( $75 \%, 77 \%$ ) and doctoral levels ( $68 \%, 75 \%$ ) over both academic years, with an increase of doctoral female students from $33(68 \%)$ in 2020/1 to $44(75 \%)$ in 2021/2. Although this is a positive achievement for female students, the low participation of male students is problematic in the feminisation of the social sector.

The fourth largest student population is at the Faculty of Health Sciences, with a total of 1176 ( $12 \%$ of total) in $2020 / 1$ and 1054 ( $11 \%$ of total)) in 2021/2. Female proportions here, for both academic years, reach $74 \%$ and $75 \%$ at undergraduate level, $73 \%$ and $69 \%$ at Masters level, and $60 \%$ and $62 \%$ at doctoral level in 2020/1 and 2021/2 consecutively. The data analysis indicates a narrower gap, therefore, in female participation at doctoral level when compared to other levels, than in other Faculties.

The Faculty of Medicine and Surgery has the fifth largest student population with 1099 (11\% of total) in 2020/1 and 1123 ( $11 \%$ of total) students in 2021/2. The discrepancy between female proportions at various levels here is low, with female proportions at undergraduate level ( $63 \%$ in 2020/1, $66 \%$ in 2021/2), and Masters level ( $59 \%$ in 2021, $62 \%$ in 2022), comparing closely to those at the doctorate level ( $60 \%$ in $2020 / 1,56 \%$ in 2021/2). It is important, however, to consider here the large number of female students at the professional doctorate level, which are pharmaceutical students, which increased substantially between the two academic years (15 out of 21 students ( $71 \%$ ) in 2020/1, 21 out of 26 students (81\%) in 2021/2).

The sixth largest Faculty population is at the Faculty of Laws, with a total of 982 and 948 students ( $10 \%$ of total population in Faculties for both years) in 2020/1 and 2021/2 consecutively. There is a high proportion of total female students in this Faculty ( $64 \%$ in 2020/1, $67 \%$ in 2021/2), which varies between undergraduate ( $75 \%$ in 2020/1, $53 \%$ in 2021/2), and Masters levels ( $63 \%$ in 2020/1, $71 \%$ in 2021/2), to the doctoral level, where the proportion drops considerably (3 out of 9 ( $33 \%$ ) in 2020/1, 2 out of $8(25 \%)$ in 2021/2).

The Faculty of Education has the seventh largest student population in Faculties, with 906 ( $9 \%$ of total) and 792 ( $8 \%$ of total) students in 2020/1 and 2021/2 consecutively. Female proportions here are the highest among Faculties, with a proportion of $82 \%$ in 2020/1 and $80 \%$ in 2021/2. Among course levels, the proportion of female students is highest at the Undergraduate ( $90 \%, 91 \%$ ) and doctoral ( $79 \%, 89 \%$ ) levels, and slightly lower at Masters level (76\%). While considering the growth of female doctoral studies from 79\% in 2020/1 to $89 \%$ in 2021/2, similar to the situation of the Faculty of Social Well Being, the low participation of male students is problematic in the feminisation of the education sector. The representation of both genders in the formative years of children and adolescents is crucial, for changing attitudes and prejudices associated with traditional gender norms, and for inspiring an equitable, diverse and inclusive environment for learning and development.

In the $8^{\text {th }}$ place is the Faculty of Information and Communication Technology (FICT), with a total of 469 ( $6 \%$ of total) and 453 ( $5 \%$ of total) students in 2020/1 and 2021/2 consecutively. Female proportions here are extremely low, with an average of $20.5 \%$ across all course levels. These proportions do indicate that, although ICT is transforming human societies and every aspect of people's lives, there is a lack of representation of women in this sector, with a resulting masculinisation of the sector. The large gap resulting from the lack of participation of women in ICT also contributes to a slower progress of the sector in Malta.

The Faculty for the Built Environment, in the $9^{\text {th }}$ place, has a total of 454 students ( $4 \%$ of total) in 2020/1, and 465 students ( $5 \%$ of total) in 2021/2. Female proportions here were $42 \%$ in 2020/1 and $41 \%$ in 2021/2, with similar proportions at Undergraduate ( $37 \%, 40 \%$ ) and Masters (44\%, 37\%) levels, for academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2. At the doctoral level, female participation was high ( $60 \%$ ) in 2020/1, with 9 females out of 15 students, decreasing in 2021/2 to $47 \%$, with 7 females out of 15 students.

With the Faculty of Science in the $10^{\text {th }}$ place, student populations were 372 in 2020/1, and 396 in 2021/2 (4\% of total in both academic years). Female participation is slightly low, but more consistent across levels. The proportion of female students is at $49 \%$ at undergraduate level (both academic years), 46-47\% at Masters level, and 44-45\% at doctoral level. Reasons may be complex, multifaceted, or even random, but there may also be systematic, behavioural and inspirational reasons that can help us understand further the nature of barriers for women, and to bring about important changes in the way we provide for them.

The Faculty of Engineering occupies the $11^{\text {th }}$ place in total student population, with 352 in 2020/1, and 341 in 2021/2 ( $3 \%$ of total population in Faculties in both years). Female undergraduate students ( $23 \%$ and $25 \%$ of students, in $2020 / 1$ and 2021/2 respectively), while at Masters level the proportion was $21 \%$ and $24 \%$ consecutively, in the same academic years. In contrast to trends in other Faculties, female doctoral participation at the Faculty of Engineering was relatively higher than at other levels, at 37\% in 2020/1, and 32\% in 2021/2. It would be interesting to explore the reasons for the reasons for this difference.

In the $12^{\text {th }}$ place is the Faculty of Media and Knowledge Sciences (293 and 277 students in 2020/1 and 2021/2 respectively), with female student proportions of $59 \%$ and $61 \%$ in respective academic years. Female proportions at Undergraduate ( $60 \%$, $69 \%$ ) and Masters ( $58 \%, 57 \%$ ) levels, compare with the proportions at doctoral level ( $56 \%, 62 \%$ ) for academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2 respectively. The Faculty of Theology, in $13^{\text {th }}$ place, has a student population of 136 for both academic years, with a female proportion of $49 \%$, mostly distributed in certificate ( $71 \%, 83 \%$ ) and Masters ( $61 \%, 62 \%$ ), but lower at Undergraduate level ( $36 \%$ in both academic years). Doctoral female students make up $10 \%$ and $14 \%$ of doctoral students in 2020/1 and 2021/2, respectively.

The student population at the Faculty of Dental Surgery stood at 99 and 116, in the respective academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2. Male participation here is extremely low (2 out of 17 students in 2020/1, 5 out of 31 students in 2021/2). In contrast, female participation here is high at all levels, and increases at the doctoral level ( $60 \%$ in 2020/1, $80 \%$ in 2021/2).

As indicated in Table 1.1, female participation at Diploma, Undergraduate and Masters level is around $60 \%$, but falls to $47 \%$ in 2020/1, and $48 \%$ in 2021/2, at doctoral level.

Table 1.0. Student population by gender, Faculty and course level 2020/21 and 2021/22


|  | others | 2 | 3 | 40 | 3 | 8 | 27 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Faculty of Health Sciences | Certificates <br> Degrees <br> Diplomas <br> Doctoral Degrees <br> Masters <br> Others <br> Postgraduate <br> Certificates <br> Postgraduate <br> Diplomas | 11 | 2 | 85 | 11 | 1 | 92 |
|  |  | 573 | 204 | 74 | 523 | 172 | 75 |
|  |  | 68 | 29 | 70 | 47 | 18 | 72 |
|  |  | 15 | 10 | 60 | 15 | 9 | 62 |
|  |  | 151 | 55 | 73 | 144 | 64 | 69 |
|  |  | 24 | 5 | 83 | 27 | 8 | 77 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 16 | 12 | 57 | 10 | 0 | 100 |
|  |  | 1 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 0 | 100 |
| Faculty of Information and Communication Technology | Degrees <br> Doctoral Degrees | 59 | 242 | 20 | 56 | 225 | 20 |
|  |  | 5 | 26 | 16 | 6 | 27 | 18 |
|  | Masters | 31 | 106 | 23 | 34 | 105 | 24 |
| Faculty of Laws | Degrees <br> Diplomas <br> Doctoral Degrees <br> Masters <br> Others | 451 | 250 | 64 | 471 | 232 | 67 |
|  |  | 18 | 6 | 75 | 10 | 9 | 53 |
|  |  | 3 | 6 | 33 | 2 | 6 | 25 |
|  |  | 148 | 85 | 63 | 153 | 63 | 71 |
|  |  | 10 | 5 | 67 | 1 | 1 | 50 |
| Faculty of Media and Knowledge Sciences | Degrees <br> Diplomas <br> Doctoral Degrees <br> Masters <br> Others | 135 | 91 | 60 | 140 | 62 | 69 |
|  |  | 2 | 2 | 50 | 1 | 2 | 33 |
|  |  | 9 | 7 | 56 | 10 | 6 | 62 |
|  |  | 25 | 18 | 58 | 30 | 23 | 57 |
|  |  | 2 | 2 | 50 | 1 | 2 | 33 |
| Faculty of Medicine and Surgery | Degrees <br> Doctoral Degrees <br> Masters <br> Professional Doctorate | 97 | 58 | 63 | 106 | 54 | 66 |
|  |  | 28 | 19 | 60 | 29 | 23 | 56 |
|  |  | 513 | 363 | 59 | 547 | 338 | 62 |
|  |  | 15 | 6 | 71 | 21 | 5 | 81 |
| Faculty of Science | Degrees | 140 | 147 | 49 | 150 | 158 | 49 |
|  | Doctoral Degrees | 15 | 18 | 45 | 14 | 18 | 44 |
|  | Masters | 24 | 27 | 47 | 25 | 29 | 46 |
|  | Others | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Faculty of Theology | Certificates | 12 | 5 | 71 | 5 | 1 | 83 |
|  | Degrees | 10 | 18 | 36 | 10 | 18 | 36 |
|  | Diplomas | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 54 |
|  | Doctoral Degrees | 2 | 18 | 10 | 3 | 19 | 14 |
|  | Masters | 43 | 28 | 61 | 43 | 26 | 62 |

Table 1.1. Student population by gender and course level at Faculties, 2020/1 2021/2

|  | 2020/1 |  |  |  | 2021/2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level | F | $\mathbf{M}$ | Total | $\mathbf{F} \%$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{M}$ | Total | F\% |
| Dip | 264 | 194 | 458 | $58 \%$ | 228 | 208 | 436 | $52 \%$ |
| UG | 3263 | 2177 | 5440 | $60 \%$ | 3114 | 2017 | 5131 | $61 \%$ |
| Masters | 2142 | 1342 | 3484 | $61 \%$ | 2214 | 1315 | 3529 | $63 \%$ |
| Doctorate | 163 | 182 | 345 | $47 \%$ | 173 | 184 | 357 | $48 \%$ |

## (b) Institutes

Table 1.2 shows the data analysis of the student population within Institutes. The total female participation is $52 \%$ for both academic years $2020 / 1$ and 2021/2. The highest student participation was at the Institute for Tourism, Travel and Culture ( 133 out of 667 (20\%) in 2020/1, 150 out of $653(23 \%)$ in 2021/2), where female participation was exceptionally high ( 100 out of 133 students ( $75 \%$ ) in 2020/1, 110 out of 150 students ( $73 \%$ ) in 2021/2).

The second largest student Institute population is within the Institute of European Studies ( 122 out of $667(18 \%)$ in 2020/1, 112 out of $653(17 \%)$ in 2021/2). Female participation here was at $51 \%$ and $54 \%$ consecutively over the two academic years. A closer look at gender differences at course level shows that female student participation is higher than male participation at undergraduate level ( $59 \%$ in 2020/1 and $61 \%$ in 2021/2), but lower at Masters level ( $31 \%$ in 2020/1, $46 \%$ in 2021/2), which differs from the general trend where female student participation at Masters level is maintained at $60 \%$. The student population at the Institute for Physical Education and Sport is the third highest, with 122 and 109 students in academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2 consecutively. Female participation here was low when compared to the Institutes with large student populations, at $40 \%$ in 2020/1 and $38 \%$ in 2021/2.

The fourth largest student Institute population is at the Institute of Earth Systems (109 in $2020 / 1,85$ in 2021/2), with a female participation of $47 \%$ in 2020/1 and $48 \%$ in 2021/2.
Analysis at course level within this Institute, in Table 1.1, shows that female participation decreased between levels, with $53-56 \%$ at undergraduate level, $32-40 \%$ at Masters level, and $33 \%$ at doctoral level. The decreasing numbers may be due to several reasons, including gender barriers and also the pursuing of Masters and doctoral degrees abroad.

The fifth largest Institute student population is at the Edward Debono Institute, with a total of 42 and 48 students in 2020/1 and 2021/2 respectively Female proportions are high, with $61 \%$ and $71 \%$ in 2020/1 and 2021/2 respectively. Following the gender trends at course level, as found in other Institutes, female participation is high at Diploma ( $83 \%$ ) and Masters ( $72 \%$ in 2020/1, $60 \%$ in 2021/2) level, but lowers at doctorate level ( $50 \%$ in 2020/1, $40 \%$ in 2021/2).

The relationship between course level and gender at Institutes, as shown in Table 1.3, indicates that female participation lowers considerable at doctoral level. An average of 55 of female representation at Undergraduate and Masters level decreases to an average of 36 at doctoral level. This is a difference of 20 percentage points. In other words, within Institutes, women make up a little more than half the students at Undergraduate and Masters level, but only a little more than a third at Doctorate levels.

Table 1.2. Student population by gender, Institute and course level 2020/1 and 2021/2

|  |  | 2020/1 |  |  | 2021/2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Institute | Level | F | M | F (\%) | F | M | F (\%) |
| Institute for Climate <br>  <br> Sustainable <br> Development | Doctoral Degrees | 3 | 1 | 75 | 2 | 1 | 67 |
|  | Masters | 2 | 1 | 67 | 4 | 3 | 57 |
|  | TOTAL | 5 | 2 | 71 | 6 | 4 | 60 |
| Edward Debono Institute | Diplomas | 5 | 1 | 83 | 5 | 1 | 83 |
|  | Doctoral Degrees | 2 | 2 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 40 |
|  | Masters | 23 | 9 | 72 | 21 | 14 | 60 |
|  | TOTAL | 30 | 12 | 71 | 28 | 18 | 61 |
| Institute of European Studies | Degrees | 50 | 34 | 59 | 42 | 27 | 61 |
|  | Doctoral Degrees | 1 | 2 | 33 | 1 | 3 | 25 |
|  | Masters | 11 | 24 | 31 | 18 | 21 | 46 |
|  | TOTAL | 62 | 60 | 51 | 61 | 51 | 54 |
| Institute for Physical Education \& Sport | Certificates | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 18 |
|  | Degrees | 32 | 45 | 42 | 34 | 53 | 39 |
|  | Masters | 5 | 6 | 45 | 5 | 6 | 45 |
|  | Others | 12 | 18 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 49 | 73 | 40 | 41 | 68 | 38 |
| Institute for Sustainable Energy | Doctoral Degrees | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 4 | 8 | 33 | 4 | 6 | 40 |
|  | TOTAL | 4 | 12 | 25 | 4 | 10 | 29 |
| Institute for Tourism, Travel \& Culture | Degrees | 46 | 15 | 75 | 41 | 17 | 71 |
|  | Doctoral Degrees | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 54 | 16 | 77 | 69 | 21 | 77 |
|  | TOTAL | 100 | 33 | 75 | 110 | 40 | 73 |
| Institute of <br> Aerospace Technologies | Doctoral Degrees | 1 | 4 | 20 | 1 | 3 | 25 |
|  | Masters | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 50 |
|  | Diplomas | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1 | 6 | 14 | 2 | 5 | 29 |
| Institute of Digital Games | Doctoral Degrees | 2 | 5 | 29 | 2 | 8 | 20 |
|  | Masters | 11 | 14 | 44 | 10 | 18 | 36 |
|  | TOTAL | 13 | 19 | 41 | 12 | 26 | 32 |
| Institute of Earth Systems | Degrees | 34 | 30 | 53 | 32 | 25 | 56 |
|  | Diplomas | 2 | 5 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  | Doctoral Degrees | 1 | 2 | 33 | 1 | 2 | 33 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Masters | 14 | 21 | 40 | 8 | 17 | 32 |
|  | TOTAL | 51 | 58 | 47 | 41 | 44 | 48 |
|  | Degrees | 2 | 4 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Institute of | Doctoral Degrees | 2 | 3 | 67 | 3 | 2 | 60 |
|  | Masters | 2 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 1 | 83 |
|  | Others | 1 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 7 | 7 | 50 | 8 | 5 | 61 |
|  | Doctoral Degrees | 1 | 3 | 25 | 1 | 3 | 25 |
|  | Masters | 5 | 5 | 50 | 2 | 4 | 33 |
|  | TOTAL | 6 | 8 |  | 3 | 7 |  |
| Institute of Public Administration \& Management | Diplomas | 1 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Institute of Space | Doctoral Degrees | 3 | 6 | 33 | 4 | 5 | 44 |
| Sciences \& | Masters | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Astronomy | TOTAL | 4 | 8 | 33 | 4 | 6 | 40 |
|  | Doctoral Degrees | 2 | 2 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 50 |
| International | Masters | 3 | 3 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 50 |
|  | Others | 1 | 1 | 50 | 3 | 10 | 23 |
|  | TOTAL | 6 | 6 | 50 | 8 | 15 | 35 |
|  | Doctoral Degrees | 1 | 2 | 33 | 6 | 4 | 60 |
| Island \& Small States | Masters | 1 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 6 | 40 |
|  | TOTAL | 2 | 8 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 50 |
| Mediterranean | Masters | 13 | 11 | 54 | 7 | 6 | 54 |
| Academy of | Others | 1 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diplomatic Studies | TOTAL | 14 | 11 | 56 | 7 | 6 | 54 |
|  | Doctoral Degrees | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 100 |
| Mediterranean | Masters | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 33 |
|  | TOTAL | 349 | 318 | 52 | 343 | 310 | 52 |

Table 1.3. Student population by gender and course level at Institutes, 2020/1, 2021/2

|  | 2020/1 |  |  |  | 2021/2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level | F | $\mathbf{M}$ | Total | $\mathbf{F} \%$ | $\mathbf{F}$ | $\mathbf{M}$ | Total | F\% |
| Dip | 7 | 6 | 13 | $54 \%$ | 5 | 2 | 7 | $71 \%$ |
| UG | 164 | 128 | 292 | $56 \%$ | 149 | 123 | 272 | $55 \%$ |
| Masters | 148 | 130 | 278 | $53 \%$ | 161 | 130 | 291 | $55 \%$ |
| Doctorate | 19 | 39 | 58 | $33 \%$ | 26 | 42 | 68 | $38 \%$ |

## (c) Centres and Schools

Table 1.4 illustrates the proportions of female and male students, within the different schools and centres, at each course level. The total number of students at Centres and Schools is 727 and 713 , for academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2 respectively. The proportion of female students for both academic years is at $58-59 \%$, close to the total percentage of female students at the University.

The largest student population here is at the Centre for the Liberal Arts and Sciences (303 in $2020 / 1,304$ in 2021/2), with a female proportion of $63 \%$ is 2020/1, and $56 \%$ in 2021/2. The second largest student population is at the Centre for Labour Studies, with a total of 148 and 98 students, in academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2 respectively. The analysis shows that most of these students are studying at Undergraduate level ( 132 in 2020/1 and 82 in 2021/2) where the proportion of female students is $42 \%$ and $46 \%$ in 2020/1 and 2021/2 respectively. Following closely, the School of Performing Arts has 99 students in 2020/1 and 123 students in 2021/2, where the proportion of women was $67 \%$ in both academic years. The Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Educational Research has 77 and 80 students in 2020/1 and 2021/2 respectively, with the largest majority studying at Masters level, and with 7475\% female participation. The International School for Foundation Studies, then, has 62 students in 2020/1, and 57 students in 2021/2, with a proportion of $62 \%$ female students in 2020/1, and 57\% in 2021/2.

The next largest School/Centre population is at the Centre for Distributed Ledger Technologies, with 29 and 38 students in 2020/1 and 2021/2 respectively, all studying at Masters level. Female proportions here are at $24 \%$ and $16 \%$ for the respective academic years. At the Centre for English Language Proficiency, there are 14 students in 2020/1, and 12 students in 2021/2, with a majority female population both at Masters (7 out of 10 or $70 \%$ in 2020/1, 4 out of 7 or $47 \%$ in 2021/2) and at doctoral level ( 9 over the two years or $100 \%$, since there were no male doctoral students).

The Centre for Environmental Education and Research has a student population of 12 and 9 , for the respective academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2, with a majority female population at Masters ( 9 out of 11 or $82 \%$ in 2020/1, 6 out of 8 or $75 \%$ in 2021/2) and doctoral level ( 2 over the two years or $100 \%$, since there were no male doctoral students). The Centre for the Study and Practice of Conflict Resolution has 2 students in 2020/1 (100\% female) and 17 students in 2021/2 (11 or 65\% female). Meanwhile the Centre for Molecular Medicine and Biobanking has 9 students in both academic years, 5 or $56 \%$ of which are female in both years. The student population in other Schools and Centres is quite low, and therefore the relationship between gender, course subject and course level is harder to analyse.

Similar to the analysis of Faculties and Institutes, Table 1.5 is used to illustrate the relationship between gender and course level at Schools and Centres. Although there are few Diploma students (11to12), the largest majority of these students are female (83 to $100 \%$ ). Meanwhile, contrary to the trend in Faculties and Institutes, the proportion of female students at Undergraduate (50\% in 2020/1, 57\% in 2021/2) and Masters (58\% in both academic years) level, increases at doctoral level ( $71 \%$ in 2020/1, $78 \%$ in 2021/2).

Table 1.4. Student population by gender, School/Centre and course level for 2020/21 and 2021/22

|  |  | 2020/1 |  |  | 2021/2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School/Centre | Course Level | F | M | F (\%) | F | M | F (\%) |
| IFS | Others | 20 | 12 | 62 | 28 | 21 | 57 |
| PFA | Degrees | 36 | 14 | 72 | 35 | 11 | 76 |
|  | Doctoral Degrees | 2 | 1 | 67 | 4 | 1 | 80 |
|  | Masters | 7 | 6 | 54 | 13 | 7 | 65 |
|  | Others | 1 | 0 | 100 | 3 | 0 | 100 |
|  | TOTAL | 66 | 33 | 67 | 83 | 40 | 67 |
| ELP | Doctoral Degrees | 4 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 0 | 100 |
|  | Masters | 7 | 3 | 70 | 4 | 3 | 57 |
|  | TOTAL | 11 | 3 | 79 | 9 | 3 | 75 |
| EBI | Masters | 9 | 16 | 36 | 5 | 7 | 42 |
| EER | Doctoral Degrees | 1 | 0 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 100 |
|  | Masters | 9 | 2 | 82 | 6 | 2 | 75 |
|  | TOTAL | 10 | 2 | 83 | 7 | 2 | 78 |
| CLS | Degrees | 55 | 77 | 42 | 38 | 44 | 46 |
|  | Diplomas | 11 | 0 | 100 | 10 | 2 | 83 |
|  | Masters | 4 | 1 | 80 | 4 | 0 | 100 |
|  | TOTAL | 70 | 78 | 47 | 52 | 46 | 53 |
| MMB | Doctoral Degrees | 1 | 0 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 100 |
|  | Masters | 4 | 4 | 50 | 4 | 4 | 50 |
|  | TOTAL | 5 | 4 | 56 | 5 | 4 | 56 |
| LAS | Others | 191 | 112 | 63 | 170 | 134 | 56 |
| SCR | Doctoral Degrees | 1 | 0 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 100 |
|  | Masters | 1 | 0 | 100 | 10 | 6 | 62 |
|  | TOTAL | 2 | 0 | 100 | 11 | 6 | 69 |
| TCM | Masters | 2 | 4 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CBC | Doctoral Degrees | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| DLT | Masters | 7 | 22 | 24 | 6 | 32 | 16 |
| EMC | Doctoral Degrees | 1 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 1 | 50 |
|  | Masters | 57 | 18 | 76 | 58 | 20 | 74 |
|  | TOTAL | 58 | 19 | 75 | 59 | 21 | 74 |
| RSE | Doctoral Degrees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 100 |
|  | Masters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 86 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 87 |
|  | TOTAL | 431 | 296 | 59 | 414 | 299 | 58 |

Table 1.5. Student population by gender and course level at School/Centre for 2020/1, 2021/2

|  | $2020 / 1$ |  |  |  | $2021 / 2$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level | F | M | Total | F \% | F | M | Total | F\% |
| Dip | 11 | 0 | 11 | $100 \%$ | 10 | 2 | 12 | $83 \%$ |
| UG | 91 | 91 | 182 | $50 \%$ | 73 | 55 | 128 | $57 \%$ |
| Masters | 107 | 77 | 184 | $58 \%$ | 116 | 83 | 199 | $58 \%$ |
| Doctorate | 10 | 4 | 14 | $71 \%$ | 14 | 4 | 18 | $78 \%$ |
| IFS | 20 | 12 | 32 | $62 \%$ | 28 | 21 | 49 | $57 \%$ |

## 2. Student population by gender, subject and course level at the Junior College

The data source for the analysis on Junior College students was the Junior College Student Services Office. Tables 1.6 and 1.7 show the number of students, by gender and subject, for academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2 respectively. Table 1.7 shows that there are 4 students in the year 2021/2 who identified as "other". It is difficult to look for causal relationships between the number of students identifying as 'other' and subjects chosen, since these numbers are too small. A qualitative study would be interesting, for exploring these relationships.

Female participation was analysed by working out proportions for each subject course in the first and second year over the two years. There are some variations in female participation between academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2, and between the $1^{\text {st }}$ Year and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year, the lowest proportions of female participation are consistent across both years, and for both $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year students. For the Advanced level, these lowest proportions were in Applied Mathematics (Mechanics, 22\%), Computing (25\%), Graphical Communication (31\%), Information Technology (17\%), Physics (33\%) and Pure Mathematics (31\%). At Intermediate level, the lowest proportions of female participation were in Applied Mathematics (Mechanics, 32\%), Computing (28\%), Economics (31\%), Engineering Drawing and Graphical Communication (29\%), and Information Technology (37\%).

It is important to note that there are spikes and depressions in female participation that may not necessarily be caused by gender trends. For example, when comparing female participation in Geography at Advanced level, the proportion is at $91 \%$ in the first year in 2020/1, and at 31\% in the second year in 2021/2. In Information Technology, the proportion was at $14 \%$ in the first year in 2020/1, and at $33 \%$ in the second year in 2021/2. However, at both Intermediate and Advanced level, as shown in Table 3.6, female participation in Applied Mathematics (Mechanics), Computing, Graphical Communication and Information Technology is low in both years. These findings are comparable to the low female participation in the Faculties for the Build Environment, Engineering and Information and Communication Technology at the University of Malta, as established in previous sections.

Table 1.6. Number of students by subject and gender, 2020/1

| Subject | 2020/1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1st Year |  | 1st <br> Year <br> Total | 2nd Year |  | 2nd <br> Year <br> Total | F <br> (\%) <br> 1st <br> Year | F (\%) <br> 2nd <br> Year |
|  | F | M |  | F | M |  |  |  |
| Adv. Accounting | 63 | 38 | 101 | 68 | 51 | 119 | 62 | 57 |
| Adv. Applied Maths ( Mechanics ) | 1 | 9 | 10 |  |  |  | 10 | 0 |
| Adv. Art | 13 | 5 | 18 | 14 | 2 | 16 | 72 | 87 |
| Adv. Biology | 152 | 60 | 212 | 176 | 71 | 247 | 72 | 71 |
| Adv. Chemistry | 98 | 41 | 139 | 127 | 52 | 179 | 70 | 71 |
| Adv. Computing | 17 | 38 | 55 | 13 | 46 | 59 | 31 | 22 |
| Adv. Economics | 26 | 16 | 42 | 15 | 15 | 30 | 62 | 50 |
| Adv. English | 166 | 60 | 226 | 167 | 60 | 227 | 73 | 74 |
| Adv. French | 7 | 2 | 9 | 6 |  | 6 | 78 | 100 |
| Adv. Geography | 4 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 91 | 42 |
| Adv. German | 10 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 91 | 90 |
| Adv. Graphical Communication | 3 | 8 | 11 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 27 | 30 |
| Adv. History | 9 | 12 | 21 | 8 | 8 | 16 | 43 | 50 |
| Adv. Home Economics \& Human Ecology | 22 | 1 | 23 | 41 | 5 | 46 | 96 | 89 |
| Adv. Information Technology | 2 | 12 | 14 | 3 | 24 | 27 | 14 | 11 |
| Adv. Italian | 7 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 78 | 77 |
| Adv. Maltese | 102 | 40 | 142 | 130 | 51 | 181 | 72 | 72 |
| Adv. Marketing | 78 | 52 | 130 | 80 | 65 | 145 | 60 | 55 |
| Adv. Music | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 75 | 71 |
| Adv. Philosophy | 22 | 7 | 29 | 16 | 13 | 29 | 76 | 55 |
| Adv. Physics | 54 | 104 | 158 | 56 | 108 | 164 | 34 | 34 |
| Adv. Pure Maths | 59 | 116 | 175 | 65 | 128 | 193 | 34 | 34 |
| Adv. Religious Knowledge | 3 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 43 | 11 |
| Adv. Sociology | 34 | 12 | 46 | 52 | 14 | 66 | 74 | 79 |
| Adv. Spanish | 9 |  | 9 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 100 | 75 |
| Adv. Theatre and Performance | 9 | 2 | 11 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 82 | 92 |
| Int. Accounting | 6 | 3 | 9 | 12 | 10 | 22 | 67 | 54 |
| Int. Applied Maths (Mechanics) | 3 | 8 | 11 | 3 | 9 | 12 | 27 | 25 |
| Int. Art | 10 | 3 | 13 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 77 | 90 |
| Int. Biology | 84 | 16 | 100 | 73 | 17 | 90 | 84 | 81 |
| Int. Chemistry | 13 | 2 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 87 | 61 |
| Int. Classical Studies | 30 | 15 | 45 | 20 | 10 | 30 | 67 | 67 |
| Int. Computing | 10 | 23 | 33 | 5 | 16 | 21 | 30 | 24 |
| Int. Economics | 8 | 16 | 24 | 6 | 12 | 18 | 33 | 33 |
| Int. Engineering Drawing and Graphical Communication | 15 | 28 | 43 | 14 | 32 | 46 | 35 | 30 |


| Int. English | 251 | 222 | $\mathbf{4 7 3}$ | 206 | 198 | $\mathbf{4 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int. Environmental Science | 73 | 40 | $\mathbf{1 1 3}$ | 56 | 39 | $\mathbf{9 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 9}$ |
| Int. French | 25 | 4 | $\mathbf{2 9}$ | 13 | 4 | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 6}$ |
| Int. Geography | 6 | 9 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 8 | 7 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 3}$ |
| Int. German | 12 | 10 | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 8 | 5 | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 1}$ |
| Int. History | 7 | 12 | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 6 | 9 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ |
| Int. Home Economics \& Human |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ecology | 18 | 5 | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | 7 |  | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Int. Information Technology | 17 | 17 | $\mathbf{3 4}$ | 19 | 40 | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ |
| Intermediate Italian | 11 | 11 | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 10 | 4 | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 1}$ |
| Int. Maltese | 50 | 27 | $\mathbf{7 7}$ | 40 | 27 | $\mathbf{6 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 8}$ |
| Int. Marketing | 92 | 89 | $\mathbf{1 8 1}$ | 67 | 61 | $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 2}$ |
| Int. Music | 4 | 3 | $\mathbf{7}$ | 5 | 4 | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{5 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ |
| Int. Philosophy | 70 | 51 | $\mathbf{1 2 1}$ | 73 | 50 | $\mathbf{1 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 9}$ |
| Int. Physical Education | 35 | 42 | $\mathbf{7 7}$ | 25 | 39 | $\mathbf{6 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 9}$ |
| Int. Physics | 87 | 68 | $\mathbf{1 5 5}$ | 84 | 69 | $\mathbf{1 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ |
| Int. Psychology | 260 | 89 | $\mathbf{3 4 9}$ | 235 | 99 | $\mathbf{3 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ |
| Int. Pure Maths | 126 | 69 | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ | 117 | 86 | $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 8}$ |
| Int. Religious Knowledge | 10 | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | 20 | 21 | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 9}$ |
| Int. Sociology | 81 | 42 | $\mathbf{1 2 3}$ | 47 | 22 | $\mathbf{6 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 8}$ |
| Int. Spanish | 13 | 1 | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 4 | 3 | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{9 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 7}$ |
| Int. Systems Of Knowledge | 482 | 315 | $\mathbf{7 9 7}$ | 513 | 357 | $\mathbf{8 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 9}$ |
| Int. Theatre and Performance | 19 | 3 | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 19 | 6 | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 6}$ |
| Duke of Edinburgh's International |  | $\mathbf{3 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ |
| Award | $\mathbf{4}$ | 1 | $\mathbf{5}$ | 0 | 0 |  | $\mathbf{5 8}$ |  |
| Enrichment Programme | 108 | 68 | $\mathbf{1 7 6}$ | 4 | 3 | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{6 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 7}$ |
| Basic Course in Journalism | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Photography, Introduction to | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Teatru Kulleġg, Kumitat | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Teatru Kulleġg, Membership | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Book Chat Club | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chinese for Beginners | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hsieb Hieles JC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total |  |  |  | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |  |  |  |

Source: Junior College Student Services Office, 2022

Table 1.7. Number of students by subject and gender, 2021/2


| Int. Engineering Drawing and Graphical Communication | 7 | 27 |  | 34 | 11 | 23 | 34 | 21 | 32 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int. English | 241 | 269 |  | 510 | 185 | 170 | 355 | 47 | 52 |
| Int. Environmental Science | 66 | 38 | 2 | 106 | 81 | 43 | 124 | 62 | 65 |
| Int. French | 17 | 6 |  | 23 | 15 | 3 | 18 | 74 | 83 |
| Int. Geography | 9 | 19 |  | 28 | 5 | 9 | 14 | 32 | 36 |
| Int. German | 18 | 10 |  | 28 | 10 | 9 | 19 | 64 | 53 |
| Int. History | 8 | 12 |  | 20 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 40 | 38 |
| Int. Home Economics \& Human Ecology | 21 | 6 |  | 27 | 11 | 5 | 16 | 78 | 69 |
| Int. Information Technology | 12 | 29 |  | 41 | 14 | 23 | 37 | 29 | 38 |
| Intermediate Italian | 18 | 14 |  | 32 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 56 | 54 |
| Int. Maltese | 37 | 18 |  | 55 | 39 | 21 | 60 | 67 | 65 |
| Int. Marketing | 84 | 109 |  | 193 | 83 | 69 | 152 | 43 | 55 |
| Int. Music | 7 | 1 |  | 8 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 87 | 50 |
| Int. Philosophy | 55 | 46 | 1 | 102 | 70 | 48 | 118 | 54 | 59 |
| Int. Physical Education | 31 | 34 |  | 65 | 31 | 33 | 64 | 48 | 48 |
| Int. Physics | 96 | 92 |  | 188 | 80 | 68 | 148 | 51 | 54 |
| Int. Psychology | 272 | 108 | 4 | 384 | 261 | 92 | 353 | 71 | 74 |
| Int. Pure Maths | 113 | 97 |  | 210 | 113 | 84 | 197 | 54 | 57 |
| Int. Religious Knowledge | 11 | 9 |  | 20 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 55 | 38 |
| Int. Sociology | 72 | 37 | 2 | 111 | 75 | 36 | 111 | 65 | 68 |
| Int. Spanish | 13 | 2 |  | 15 | 12 | 3 | 15 | 87 | 80 |
| Int. Systems Of Knowledge | 462 | 366 | 4 | 832 | 532 | 342 | 874 | 55 | 61 |
| Int. Theatre and Performance | 6 | 2 |  | 8 | 24 | 4 | 28 | 75 | 86 |
| Duke of Edinburgh's International Award | 1 | 3 |  | 4 | 1 |  | 1 | 25 | 100 |
| Enrichment Programme | 13 | 26 |  | 39 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 33 | 0 |
| Basic Course in Journalism | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 100 | 0 |
| Photography, Introduction to | 31 | 33 | 1 | 65 |  |  |  | 48 | 0 |
| Teatru Kulleġg, Kumitat |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 60 |
| Teatru Kulleġg, Membership | 9 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 69 | 71 |
| Book Chat Club | 2 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 100 | 50 |
| Chinese for Beginners | 8 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  | 100 | 0 |
| Hsieb \#ieles JC |  | 2 |  | 2 | 4 |  | 4 | 0 | 100 |
| Grand Total | 2859 | 2258 | 27 | 5144 | 3019 | 1994 | 5013 | 56 | 60 |

Source: Junior College Student Services Office, 2022

## Female proportion of drop-out rates at Junior College

Table 1.8 shows that the female proportion of students at entry stage for both 2020/1 and 2021/2 were 59\% and 60\%, except for a slight decrease to $56 \%$ in the first year in 2021/2. The female drop-out proportion for the first year in $2020 / 1$ was $47 \%$, increasing to $58 \%$ in the third year. In academic year 2021/2 the female proportion of drop outs was $56 \%$ and $54 \%$, for the first and second years, respectively.

Table 1.8. Female proportion of entry stage students and drop out numbers 2020/1 and 2021/2

|  |  | Entry stage |  |  |  |  | Drop out |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | M | $\mathbf{X}$ | Total | $\mathbf{F}(\%)$ | F | M | $\mathbf{X}$ | Total | $\mathbf{F}(\%)$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 / 1}$ | 1st Year | 587 | 398 | $\mathbf{1}$ | 986 | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 9}$ | 89 | $\mathbf{0}$ | 168 | $\mathbf{4 7}$ |
|  | 2nd Year | 566 | 386 | $\mathbf{0}$ | 952 | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | 19 | 14 | $\mathbf{0}$ | 33 | $\mathbf{5 8}$ |
|  | 1st Year | 467 | 368 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 839 | $\mathbf{5 6}$ | 87 | 66 | $\mathbf{1}$ | 154 | $\mathbf{5 6}$ |
|  | 2nd Year | 610 | 407 | $\mathbf{0}$ | 1017 | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | 21 | 18 | $\mathbf{0}$ | 39 | $\mathbf{5 4}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Junior College Student Services Office, 2022

## International Students at Junior College

As shown in Table 1.9, the female proportion of international students in academic year 2020/1, was $57 \%$ and $60 \%$ for first year and second year students respectively. In academic year 2021/2 the proportion was $59 \%$ for both years.

Comparing qualified students (non-provisional) from EU countries, to those categorised as non-EU, in academic 2020/1, one finds that female participation was higher among non-EU students (61\%) than among EU students (52\%) in the first year, although female participation was greater among EU students (69\%) than non-EU students (60\%) in the second year. In academic year 2021/2, female proportions in the first year were higher among EU students (69\%) than non-EU (52\%) students. In the same academic year, proportions were similar for both EU (61\%) and non-EU (59\%) students.
It would be interesting to explore further the reasons for these disparities, in order to understand the motivations for and barriers to international female student participation.

Table 1.9. Proportion of female international students, 2020/1 and 2021/2

| 2020/21 |  |  |  |  | 2021/22 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| First year International students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | F (\%) | Male | Female | Total | F (\%) |
| Qualified - EU | 11 | 12 | 23 | 52 | 11 | 12 | 23 | 52 |
| prov 1-EU | 5 | 10 | 15 | 67 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Qualified - non EU | 10 | 16 | 26 | 61 | 5 | 11 | 16 | 69 |
| Prov 1-non EU | 5 | 4 | 9 | 44 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Total | 31 | 42 | 73 | 57 | 16 | 23 | 39 | 59 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Second year International students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | F(\%) | Male | Female | Total | F (\%) |
| Qualified - EU | 5 | 11 | 16 | 69 | 11 | 17 | 28 | 61 |
| Qualified - non EU | 6 | 9 | 15 | 60 | 12 | 17 | 29 | 59 |
| Total | 11 | 20 | 31 | 64 | 23 | 34 | 57 | 60 |
| TOTAL (both years) | 42 | 62 | 104 | 60 | 39 | 57 | 96 | 59 |

Source: Junior College Student Services Office, 2022

## 3. University awards conferred, by gender, $F / I / C / S$ and course level

Table 2.0 illustrates the number of awards conferred in 2019/20 and 2020/1, by gender and faculty/institute/centre/school. Female participation in the population of student graduates (61\%) reflects the female proportion of student population at the University (60\%).

Within Faculties, the highest numbers of awards conferred were to students of the Faculty of Economics, Management and Accountancy (556 in 2019/20, 604 in 2020/1), with an average of $51 \%$ awards to female students in 2019/20, which however increased to $58 \%$ in 2020/1. A high number of awards were also conferred to students of the Faculty of Health Sciences (356 in 2019/20, 349 in 2020/1) and the Faculty of Laws (351 in 2019/20, 349 in 2020/1). The Faculty of Health Sciences had a high percentage of female awardees in both years (76\% in 2019/20, 71\% in 2020/1), and in the Faculty of Laws female awardees had high representation as well ( $62 \%$ in 2019/20, $64 \%$ in 2020/1).

Withing the Faculty of Education awards conferred increased between academic year 2019/20 (279) and 2020/1 (432), with a stark majority female participation rate of 85-89\%. Other Faculties with a large female awardee majority, were the Faculty of Social Well Being ( 307 or $76 \%, 273$ or $77 \%$ of awardees in 2019/20 and 2020/1 respectively) with $76-77 \%$ female awardees, and the Faculty of Arts (332, 264 awardees in 2019/20 and 2020/21 respectively) with 73-74\% female awardees. In the Faculty of Medicine and Surgery there were 252 and 242 awardees in 2019/20 and 2020/21 respectively, with a female participation of 56-60\%.

Other Faculties had lower numbers of awardees, with female proportions being the lowest in the Faculties of Engineering (21\%, 10\%) and ICT (19\%, 21\%) in 2019/20 and 2020/1 respectively. However, the number of awardees in these Faculties are also lower than in other Faculties, with totals of 108 and 90 for the Faculty of Engineering, and 19 and 21 for the Faculty of ICT, for 2019/20 and 2020/21 respectively.

Within Institutes, Centres and Schools, the number of awardees are low, so that female proportions often vary greatly between the two academic years. However, it is important to consider that there were no female students at the Institute of Aerospace Technologies in both academic years. Even there were only a few students at this Institute, the presence of female students in these technologies is critical.

Table 2.0. University graduates in 2019/20 and 2020/1 by faculty/institute and gender

|  |  | Nov-20 |  |  |  | Nov-21/Mar-22 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Faculty/ Institute/ Centre/School | Level | F | M | Tot. | F <br> (\%) | F | M | Tot. | F (\%) |
| Faculty for Social Wellbeing | Bachelor | 143 | 47 | 190 | 75 | 119 | 41 | 160 | 74 |
|  | Diploma | 19 | 5 | 24 | 79 | 23 | 4 | 27 | 85 |
|  | Doctorate | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50 |
|  | Masters | 64 | 20 | 84 | 76 | 58 | 15 | 73 | 79 |
|  | PGCert | 3 | 1 | 4 | 75 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 87 |
|  | PGDiploma | 3 | 1 | 4 | 75 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 67 |
|  | TOTAL | 233 | 74 | 307 | 76 | 210 | 63 | 273 | 77 |
| Faculty for the Built <br> Environment | Bachelor | 19 | 37 | 56 | 34 | 20 | 36 | 56 | 36 |
|  | Diploma | 37 | 52 | 89 | 42 | 42 | 48 | 90 | 47 |
|  | Doctorate | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 |
|  | Masters | 31 | 22 | 53 | 58 | 30 | 33 | 63 | 48 |
|  | PGDiploma | 5 | 2 | 7 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 93 | 113 | 206 | 45 | 93 | 117 | 210 | 44 |
| Faculty of Arts | Bachelor | 157 | 52 | 209 | 75 | 129 | 31 | 160 | 81 |
|  | Diploma | 14 | 5 | 19 | 74 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 100 |
|  | Doctorate | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 37 |
|  | Masters | 55 | 29 | 84 | 65 | 43 | 25 | 68 | 63 |
|  | PGCert | 5 | 1 | 6 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | PGDiploma | 10 | 3 | 13 | 77 | 15 | 8 | 23 | 65 |
|  | TOTAL | 242 | 90 | 332 | 73 | 195 | 69 | 264 | 74 |
| Faculty of Dental Surgery | Bachelor | 6 | 2 | 8 | 75 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 |
|  | Diploma | 6 | 1 | 7 | 86 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 100 |
|  | Masters | 8 | 5 | 13 | 61 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 50 |
|  | Doctorate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 20 | 8 | 28 | 71 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 58 |
| Faculty of Economics, Management and Accountancy | Bachelor | 146 | 138 | 284 | 51 | 174 | 128 | 302 | 58 |
|  | Diploma | 27 | 26 | 53 | 51 | 29 | 29 | 58 | 50 |
|  | Doctorate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 113 | 103 | 216 | 52 | 140 | 102 | 242 | 58 |


|  | PGDiploma | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | 286 | 270 | 556 | 51 | 343 | 261 | 604 | 57 |
| Faculty of Education | Bachelor | 96 | 3 | 99 | 97 | 172 | 14 | 186 | 92 |
|  | Diploma | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 |
|  | Doctorate | 3 | 1 | 4 | 75 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 |
|  | Masters | 104 | 20 | 124 | 84 | 110 | 32 | 142 | 77 |
|  | PGCert | 42 | 6 | 48 | 88 | 74 | 14 | 88 | 84 |
|  | PGDiploma | 3 | 0 | 3 | 100 | 11 | 3 | 14 | 79 |
|  | TOTAL | 249 | 30 | 279 | 89 | 369 | 63 | 432 | 85 |
| Faculty of Engineering | Bachelor | 21 | 50 | 71 | 30 | 15 | 41 | 56 | 27 |
|  | Diploma | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Doctorate | 2 | 3 | 5 | 40 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 25 |
|  | Masters | 6 | 22 | 28 | 21 | 3 | 27 | 30 | 10 |
|  | TOTAL | 29 | 79 | 108 | 27 | 19 | 71 | 90 | 21 |
| Faculty of Health Sciences | Bachelor | 185 | 59 | 244 | 76 | 168 | 67 | 235 | 71 |
|  | Diploma | 38 | 15 | 53 | 72 | 23 | 13 | 36 | 64 |
|  | Doctorate | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 67 |
|  | Masters | 30 | 7 | 37 | 81 | 35 | 7 | 42 | 61 |
|  | PGCert | 12 | 0 | 12 | 100 | 19 | 12 | 31 | 61 |
|  | PGDiploma | 6 | 3 | 9 | 66 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50 |
|  | TOTAL | 271 | 85 | 356 | 76 | 248 | 101 | 349 | 71 |
| Faculty of Information and Communication Technology | Bachelor | 14 | 53 | 67 | 21 | 16 | 68 | 84 | 19 |
|  | Diploma | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 60 |
|  | Doctorate | 2 | 7 | 9 | 22 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 2 | 21 | 23 | 8 | 14 | 43 | 57 | 25 |
|  | PGCert | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|  | PG Diploma | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 19 | 83 | 102 | 19 | 33 | 120 | 153 | 21 |
| Faculty of Laws | Bachelor | 94 | 56 | 150 | 63 | 91 | 48 | 139 | 65 |
|  | Diploma | 29 | 15 | 44 | 66 | 19 | 6 | 25 | 76 |
|  | Doctorate | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 75 |
|  | Masters | 93 | 59 | 152 | 61 | 110 | 68 | 178 | 62 |
|  | PGCert | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | PGDiploma | 2 | 1 | 3 | 67 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 100 |
|  | TOTAL | 219 | 132 | 351 | 62 | 225 | 124 | 349 | 64 |
| Faculty of Media and Knowledge Sciences | Bachelor | 51 | 40 | 91 | 56 | 43 | 38 | 81 | 53 |
|  | Diploma | 5 | 7 | 12 | 42 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 |
|  | Doctorate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50 |
|  | Masters | 5 | 5 | 10 | 50 | 8 | 7 | 15 | 53 |
|  | PGDiploma | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 |
|  | TOTAL | 61 | 53 | 114 | 53 | 54 | 46 | 100 | 54 |
| Faculty of Medicine and Surgery | Bachelor | 36 | 21 | 57 | 63 | 26 | 17 | 43 | 60 |
|  | Diploma | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Doctorate | 4 | 2 | 6 | 67 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 40 |
|  | Masters | 100 | 73 | 173 | 58 | 101 | 81 | 182 | 55 |
|  | PGCert | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |


|  | PGDiploma | 12 | 2 | 14 | 86 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 63 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | 152 | 100 | 252 | 60 | 136 | 106 | 242 | 56 |
| Faculty of Science | Bachelor | 25 | 31 | 56 | 45 | 28 | 31 | 59 | 47 |
|  | Diploma | 5 | 5 | 10 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50 |
|  | Doctorate | 2 | 1 | 3 | 67 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 33 |
|  | Masters | 5 | 7 | 12 | 42 | 15 | 14 | 29 | 52 |
|  | TOTAL | 37 | 44 | 81 | 46 | 47 | 51 | 98 | 48 |
| Faculty of Theology | Bachelor | 2 | 7 | 9 | 22 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 60 |
|  | Doctorate | 1 | 3 | 4 | 25 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 14 |
|  | Masters | 25 | 15 | 40 | 62 | 21 | 17 | 38 | 55 |
|  | PGDiploma | 1 | 3 | 4 | 25 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 100 |
|  | TOTAL | 29 | 28 | 57 | 51 | 31 | 25 | 56 | 55 |
| Institute for Climate Change and Sustainable Development | Masters | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Doctorate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 |
|  | TOTAL | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 |
| Edward de Bono Institute for the Design and Development of Thinking | Diploma | 5 | 4 | 9 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 5 | 4 | 9 | 56 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 60 |
|  | PG Diploma | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 67 |
|  | TOTAL | 10 | 11 | 21 | 48 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 64 |
| Institute for European Studies | Bachelor | 26 | 21 | 47 | 55 | 21 | 15 | 36 | 58 |
|  | Masters | 2 | 8 | 10 | 20 | 7 | 16 | 23 | 30 |
|  | TOTAL | 28 | 29 | 57 | 49 | 28 | 31 | 59 | 47 |
| Institute for Physical Education and Sport | Bachelor | 8 | 14 | 22 | 36 | 7 | 10 | 17 | 41 |
|  | Diploma | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 8 | 14 | 22 | 36 | 7 | 11 | 18 | 39 |
| Institute for Sustainable Energy | Doctorate | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 1 | 3 | 4 | 25 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 17 |
|  | PGDiploma | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1 | 5 | 6 | 17 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 17 |
| Institute for Tourism, Travel and Culture | Bachelor | 15 | 11 | 26 | 58 | 21 | 2 | 23 | 91 |
|  | Diploma | 2 | 7 | 9 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 9 | 4 | 13 | 69 |
|  | TOTAL | 18 | 18 | 36 | 50 | 30 | 7 | 37 | 81 |
| Institute of Aerospace Technologies | Diploma | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Doctorate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Institute of Digital Games | Doctorate | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 29 |
|  | PGCert | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | PGDiploma | 1 | 2 | 3 | 33 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50 |


|  | TOTAL | 1 | 6 | 7 | 14 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 33 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Institute of Earth Systems | Bachelor | 11 | 18 | 29 | 38 | 12 | 11 | 23 | 52 |
|  | Diploma | 2 | 3 | 5 | 40 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 40 |
|  | Masters | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 43 |
|  | PGDiploma | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 14 | 23 | 37 | 38 | 22 | 25 | 47 | 47 |
| Institute of Linguistics and Language Technology | Bachelor | 2 | 1 | 3 | 67 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 40 |
|  | Doctorate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | PGDiploma | 12 | 0 | 12 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 14 | 2 | 16 | 87 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 33 |
| Institute of Maltese Studies | Doctorate | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 75 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 75 |
| Institute of Space Sciences and Astronomy | Doctorate | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Islands and Small States Institute | Diploma | 5 | 0 | 5 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 1 | 3 | 4 | 25 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 20 |
|  | TOTAL | 6 | 3 | 9 | 67 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 20 |
| Mediterranean <br> Academy of Diplomatic Studies | Masters | 11 | 10 | 21 | 52 | 13 | 11 | 24 | 54 |
|  | PG Diploma | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 11 | 10 | 21 | 52 | 13 | 12 | 25 | 52 |
| Mediterranean Institute | Doctorate | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Centre for Biomedical Cybernetics | Masters | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Centre for Distributed Ledger Technologies | Masters | 4 | 2 | 6 | 67 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 40 |
| Centre for English Language Proficiency | Masters | 5 | 2 | 7 | 71 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 75 |
|  | PG Diploma | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 6 | 2 | 8 | 75 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 75 |
| Centre for Entrepreneurship and Business Incubation | Masters | 5 | 10 | 15 | 33 | 8 | 16 | 24 | 33 |
|  | PGCert | 2 | 1 | 3 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 7 | 11 | 18 | 39 | 8 | 16 | 24 | 33 |
| Centre for Environmental | Masters | 2 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 100 |


| Education and Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Centre for Labour Studies | Bachelor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 32 | 46 | 30 |
|  | Diploma | 6 | 2 | 8 | 75 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 100 |
|  | Masters | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 |
|  | TOTAL | 7 | 3 | 10 | 70 | 25 | 32 | 57 | 44 |
| Centre for the Liberal Arts and Sciences | Bachelor | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 75 |
|  | Diploma | 2 | 1 | 3 | 67 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2 | 3 | 5 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 60 |
| Centre for the Study and Practice of Conflict Resolution | Masters | 10 | 2 | 12 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Euro- <br> Mediterranean Centre for Educational Research | Masters | 4 | 2 | 6 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | PGCert | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 |
|  | TOTAL | 5 | 2 | 7 | 71 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 |
| School of Performing Arts | Bachelor | 5 | 9 | 14 | 36 | 13 | 8 | 21 | 62 |
|  | Diploma | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Doctorate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Masters | 4 | 5 | 9 | 44 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 9 | 22 | 31 | 29 | 13 | 11 | 24 | 54 |
| ALL F/I/C/S | TOTAL | 2106 | 1366 | 3472 | 61 | 2187 | 1405 | 3592 | 61 |

Analysing data on awardees, by gender and levels of awards (Table 4.0), one finds that in November 2020 the highest proportions of female graduates were at postgraduate certificate ( $85 \%$ ) and professional doctorate ( $86 \%$ ) levels, and the lowest at doctoral level (43\%). At Masters level the proportion of female graduates reflects the proportion of female students at the University (60\%). In November 2021 and March 2022, the proportion of female graduates was still highest at postgraduate certificate level (76\%), although this proportion decreased from the prior conferment by $10 \%$. At professional doctorate level the proportion also reduced from 86\% in 2020 to 63\% in the graduations of November 2021 and March 2022. The lowest proportion of female graduates was at doctoral level, which further decreased to 34\% in the graduations of November 2021 and March 2022.

Table 2.1 - Certificates, Diplomas and degrees conferred in November 2020 and November 2021/March 2022, by gender

|  | Nov-20 |  |  |  | Nov-21/March-22 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level | F | M | Total | F (\%) | F | M | Total | F (\%) |
| Pre-Tertiary Certificate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 40 |
| Certificate | 51 | 38 | 89 | 57 | 61 | 30 | 91 | 67 |
| Diploma | 203 | 165 | 368 | 55 | 187 | 134 | 321 | 58 |
| Degree | 1062 | 672 | 1734 | 61 | 1100 | 645 | 1745 | 63 |
| Postgraduate Certificate | 67 | 12 | 79 | 85 | 101 | 31 | 132 | 76 |
| Postgraduate Diplomas | 44 | 24 | 68 | 65 | 44 | 21 | 65 | 68 |
| Master Degrees | 700 | 467 | 1167 | 60 | 754 | 562 | 1316 | 57 |
| Professional Doctorates | 12 | 2 | 14 | 86 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 63 |
| Doctoral Degree | 18 | 24 | 42 | 43 | 19 | 37 | 56 | 34 |
| Other | 35 | 28 | 63 | 56 | 25 | 8 | 33 | 76 |
| Grand Total | 2192 | 1432 | 3624 | 60 | 2304 | 1481 | 3785 | 61 |

## 4. Course level and gender, female participation at the doctorate level

Female students over-represented male students at all levels except at doctoral level, where their representation was at $45 \%$ in the academic year 2019/20. This proportion grew to $48 \%$ in the academic year 2020/1 (Table 2.2, Figure 1.0), but there needs to be a more in-depth analysis to explore the real barriers women are facing in entering the doctoral levels of education, since this percentage is far from the representational population levels of females at the University (60\%).

The next section on full-time and part-time students further indicates that there is a wider gender gap for full-time doctorate students, where female participation is at 41\%, than for part-time doctorate students where female participation is higher (53\%) (Table 2.4). This gap is wide enough to beg the question as to what are the actual reasons why, particularly, women would prefer to enter doctoral studies on a part-time basis, and if these preferences correlate with traditional social expectations on women, especially in assuming a bigger share of family responsibilities.

Diagram 3.5 indicates gaps in gender representation at various levels of education, and how this has varied in the past three years 2020-2022. It indicates that within some course levels parity between female and male students is increasing (area narrows in the mid-section of the graph). However, at pre-tertiary certificate levels, there seems to be a reverse shift, where male participation, underrepresented in 2020 (36\%) became overrepresented in 2022 ( $79 \%$ ). Female representation at Masters level stood at 61-62\%, a rate which represents gender proportions in the total student population (60\%), while at professional doctoral levels, female representation reached 81\% in 2022.

Table 2.2 - Total number of students, by gender (percentage) and course level, 2019/20, 2020/1, 2021/2

|  | 2019/20 |  |  | 2020/1 |  |  | 2021/2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Course Level | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | M (\%) | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{M} \\ \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | M (\%) | Total |
| Pre-Tertiary Certificate | 64 | 36 | 28 | 40 | 60 | 15 | 21 | 79 | 24 |
| Certificates | 62 | 38 | 264 | 68 | 32 | 201 | 71 | 29 | 273 |
| Diplomas | 55 | 45 | 507 | 59 | 41 | 483 | 53 | 47 | 455 |
| Degrees | 60 | 40 | 6664 | 60 | 40 | 5914 | 60 | 40 | 5531 |
| Postgraduate Certificates | 87 | 13 | 63 | 79 | 21 | 127 | 79 | 21 | 52 |
| Postgraduate Diplomas | 95 | 5 | 20 | 100 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 5 |
| Masters Degree | 61 | 39 | 2870 | 61 | 39 | 3946 | 62 | 38 | 4019 |
| Doctoral Degrees | 45 | 55 | 352 | 46 | 54 | 417 | 48 | 52 | 443 |
| Professional Doctorate | 76 | 24 | 25 | 71 | 29 | 21 | 81 | 19 | 26 |
| Others | 60 | 40 | 389 | 63 | 37 | 449 | 57 | 43 | 441 |
| Grand Total | 60 | 40 | 11182 | 60 | 40 | 11574 | 60 | 40 | 11269 |

Figure 1.0. Comparing student participation, by gender and course level, 2020-2022


Figure 1.0. Student proportions, by gender and course level, 2019/20


Figure 1.1 Student proportions, by gender and course level, 2020/1


Figure 1.2. Student proportions, by gender and course level, 2021/2
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## Mode of attendance, gender and course level

Student data indicates that participation at full-time or part-time attendance mode varies among course levels. It is a reality that some certificate and undergraduate diploma levels serve as entry points for students who do not follow the traditional academic path at university. The majority of the students would be following these courses on a part-time basis, would be working at the same time to improve their position in the labour market. Table 3.17 indicates that total female participation, in both full-time and part-time courses, in 2020/1 and 2021/2, stands at $60 \%$, or very close. However, this participation is not distributed consistently at all levels of academic courses. One can see that this participation is at its lowest at the doctoral level (Ph.D.) level in full-time attendance (Table 2.3, Figure 1.3, Table 2.4, Figure 1.4).

The data shows that at certificate level, although female participation is higher than that of males, this participation has decreased in the full-time courses from 68\% in 2020/1 to 50\% in 2021/2, and proportionally in the part-time courses, from $68 \%$ in $2020 / 1$ to $76 \%$ in

2021/2 (Table 2.4, Diagram 3.6). It would be interesting to explore further why female students are choosing the part-time option, and therefore taking longer to finish the certificate level. At the diploma level one can see the opposite, where women show an increased preference for full-time courses in 2021/2 (Table 2.4).

It is interesting to note that gender participation in postgraduate diplomas is $100 \%$ female in full-time mode of attendance, and 79\% female in part-time mode. One can explore reasons for this, whether there have been courses targeting female populations, or whether there are other reasons. Another difference to note is the difference in female participation between professional and Ph.D. doctorates. Professional doctorates have a higher female participation, with a majority of students being pharmacists. In professional doctorate fulltime courses the participation increased from $71 \%$ in 2020/1 to $81 \%$ in 2021/2. This increase contrasts strongly with the participation of women in Ph.D. doctorates which increased from $39 \%$ in 2020/11 to $41 \%$ in 2021/2 (Table 3.18). These figures indicate that there is a gender bias in the choice of professional or Ph.D. doctorate. Diagram 3.6 further indicates the larger gap between full-time and part-time female participation ( 78 full-time, 547 parttime) in doctoral (Ph.D.) studies in 2021/2, as compared to a smaller gap in the male population (111 full-time, 547 part-time) (Table 3.17, Diagram 3.6). This gap does indicate that a larger proportion of women, when compared to men, are choosing to follow doctoral studies at part-time mode of attendance, and that there is a higher proportion, therefore, of females that finish their doctoral studies at a later stage in life than their male counterparts.

Table 2.3. Full-time and part-time students, by gender and level, 2020/1-2021/2

|  | 2020/1 |  |  |  |  |  | 2021/2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Full Time |  |  | Part Time |  |  | Full Time |  |  | Part Time |  |  |
| Course Level | Female | Male | Total | Female | Male | Total | Female | Male | Total | Female | Male | Total |
| Certificates | 19 | 9 | 28 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 25 | 25 | 50 | 5 | 19 | 24 |
| Dipolomas | 166 | 118 | 284 | 118 | 55 | 173 | 138 | 84 | 222 | 170 | 53 | 223 |
| Degrees | 3175 | 2209 | 5384 | 117 | 82 | 199 | 3087 | 2051 | 5138 | 105 | 128 | 233 |
| Postgraduate Diploma | 1 | 0 | 1 | 343 | 187 | 530 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 249 | 144 | 393 |
| Masters Degree | 1540 | 989 | 2529 | 100 | 27 | 127 | 1629 | 981 | 2610 | 41 | 11 | 52 |
| Doctoral Degrees | 72 | 111 | 183 | 857 | 560 | 1417 | 78 | 111 | 189 | 862 | 547 | 1409 |
| Professional Degrees | 15 | 6 | 21 | 120 | 114 | 234 | 21 | 5 | 26 | 135 | 119 | 254 |
| Other | 67 | 31 | 98 | 216 | 135 | 351 | 72 | 46 | 118 | 180 | 143 | 323 |
| Total | 5055 | 3473 | 8528 | 1871 | 1160 | 3046 | 5055 | 3303 | 8358 | 1747 | 1164 | 2911 |

Figure 1.3. Full-time and part-time students, by gender and level, 2021/2


## Source: Author

Table 2.4. Proportion of full-time and part-time female students (\%), 2020/1,2021/2

| Mode of <br> Attendance |  | Level | 2020/1 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 2021/2 |  |  |  |
| Full-Time | Certificates | 68 | 50 |
|  | Diplomas | 58 | 62 |
|  | Degrees | 59 | 60 |
|  | Postgraduate <br> Diploma | 100 | 100 |
|  | Masters Degree | 61 | 62 |
|  | Doctoral Degrees | 39 | 41 |
|  | Professional Degrees | 71 | 81 |
|  | Other | 68 | 61 |
| Full-Time Total | Total | 59 | 60 |
| Part-Time | Pre-Tertiary <br> Certificate | 40 | 21 |
|  | Certificates | 68 | 76 |
|  | Diplomas | 59 | 45 |
|  | Degrees | 65 | 63 |
|  | Postgraduate |  |  |
|  | Diploma | 79 | 79 |
|  | Masters Degree | 60 | 61 |
|  | Doctoral Degrees | 51 | 53 |
|  | Other | 61 | 56 |
| Part-Time Total | Total | 61 | 60 |

Figure 1.4. Comparison between full-time and part-time female students, by course level, 2020/1 (A) and 2021/2 (B).


## Source: Author

## The association between age and gender in Ph.D. studies

As seen, previously, data indicates a gender bias at Ph.D. level, including in the mode of study (full-time or part-time). Therefore, this research further explored the influence of age and gender on decisions to pursue a Ph.D. level of education. Data on the age of entry of current Ph.D. students was gathered from the Academic Registry, and analysed for full-time and part-time students. The ages of current Ph.D. students upon initial registration varied between 20 and 70. A radar chart (Figure 1.5), was used to compare data between female and male students.

The radar chart illustrates the points where female and male students have registered for their Ph.D.. When one compares Cohort A (full-time students) to Cohort B (part-time students), one can see that male and female participation is more equitable at part-time level, as can be seen by the areas covered by the male and female plotting lines. For fulltime students, although there are more females who have registered at the age of 22 , the radar chart indicates a large gap in participation for females aged 23 to 31, and even after this age, female participation only peaks at the ages of 43,47 and 50 (Figure 1.5, Cohort A.). It would be interesting to explore reasons for the peak in female participation in full-time Ph.D. level at the age of 22 , if these reasons are simply unique to the current group, or whether women are considering a full-time Ph.D. at an earlier age as a strategy to further their career before they may possibly assume parenting roles, which can be more timeconsuming on women due to parenting social norms and expectations.

Figure 1.5. The age of current Ph.D. students on initial registration, by gender and mode of attendance

## A. Full-time students


B. Part-time students
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## Student population in Faculties: Focusing on gender and mode of attendance

Not all UM entities had part-time students between 2020/1-2021/2, and some had more than others. Table 2.5 shows that faculties which registered a substantial number of parttime students where the faculties of education, arts, social wellbeing and health sciences, the areas with a high concentration of female students. Faculties where part-time students were 10 percent, or less, of all students, consisted of the faculties of dental surgery, built environment, laws and science.

The gender breakdown of full-time and part-time students attending UM in 2020/1and 2021/2 indicates that female part-time students tended to outnumber male part-time students in all faculties apart from the faculties of economics, management and accountancy; engineering; information and communication technology; together with media and knowledge sciences.

Table 2.5. Full-time and part-time students, by Faculty and gender, 2020/1-2021/2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Full-time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Part-time |  | Full-time |  | Part-time |  |
| Faculty | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Faculty of Arts | 588 | 277 | 225 | 147 | 579 | 272 | 283 | 155 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Faculty for the Built |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environment | 178 | 243 | 12 | 21 | 183 | 254 | 6 | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Faculty of Dental Surgery | 62 | 32 | 3 | 2 | 80 | 32 | 3 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Faculty of Economics, Management and Accountancy | 619 | 509 | 166 | 164 | 595 | 509 | 142 | 150 |
| Faculty of Education | 398 | 93 | 343 | 72 | 398 | 101 | 236 | 57 |
| Faculty of Engineering | 72 | 243 | 12 | 25 | 75 | 223 | 12 | 31 |
| Faculty of Health Sciences | 619 | 219 | 240 | 98 | 568 | 192 | 214 | 80 |
| Faculty of Information and Communication Technology | 70 | 295 | 25 | 79 | 69 | 284 | 27 | 73 |
| Faculty of Laws | 581 | 324 | 49 | 28 | 599 | 284 | 38 | 27 |
| Faculty of Media and Knowledge Sciences | 157 | 110 | 16 | 10 | 159 | 81 | 23 | 14 |
| Faculty of Medicine and Surgery | 583 | 397 | 70 | 49 | 614 | 363 | 89 | 57 |
| Faculty of Science | 166 | 178 | 13 | 15 | 176 | 192 | 13 | 15 |
| Faculty for Social Wellbeing | 554 | 224 | 259 | 97 | 544 | 187 | 250 | 126 |
| Faculty of Theology | 6 | 36 | 61 | 33 | 4 | 36 | 63 | 33 |

## Gender and mode of attendance in Institutes

Table 2.6 shows that the majority of students attending institutes were full-time students in $2020 / 1$ and 2021/2. The exception is the Edward de Bono Institute for the Design and Development of Thinking, where the majority of students were part-time students, highly represented by females ( $64 \%$ in 2020/1, $67 \%$ in 2021/2). The Institute for Physical Education and Sport had almost equal number of full-time and part-time students in 2020/1 (51\% parttime students), but in 2021/2 there was a majority percentage of full-time students (64\%).

Table 2.6 - Full-time and part-time students, by institute and gender, 2029/1-2021/2

|  | 2020/1 |  |  |  | 2021/2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Full-time |  | Part-time |  | Full-time |  | Part-time |  |
|  | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M |
| Institute for Climate Change and Sustainable Development | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Edward de Bono Institute for the Design and Development of Thinking | 9 | 0 | 21 | 12 | 4 | 6 | 24 | 12 |


| Institute for European <br> Studies | 57 | 49 | 5 | 11 | 54 | 41 | 7 | 10 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Institute for Physical <br> Education and Sport | 24 | 36 | 25 | 37 | 26 | 44 | 15 | 24 |
| Institute for Sustainable <br> Energy | 4 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 4 |
| Institute for Tourism, <br> Travel and Culture | 95 | 27 | 5 | 6 | 104 | 32 | 6 | 8 |
| Institute of Aerospace <br> Technologies | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| Institute of Digital Games | 12 | 16 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 23 | 1 | 3 |
| Institute of Earth Systems | 43 | 41 | 8 | 17 | 36 | 28 | 5 | 16 |
| Institute of Linguistics and <br> Language Technology | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Institute of Maltese Studies | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| Institute of Public <br> Administration and <br> Management | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| International Institute for <br> Baroque Studies | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 15 |
| Institute of Space Sciences <br> and Astronomy | 2 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Islands and Small States <br> Institute | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Mediterranean Academy of <br> Diplomatic Studies | 2 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| Mediterranean Institute | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

The data in Table 2.6 shows salient differences between full-time and part-time female and male students in the different institutes. Female full-time students are the majority in the Institute for Tourism, Travel and Culture ( $78 \%$ in 2020/1, $76 \%$ in 2021/2), however female participation in the Institute for Physical Education and Sport is low (38\%-40\%) for both fulltime and part-time students. It would be interesting to explore reasons for this low participation, especially when considering that gender equity in sport is an important theme, and features in UM Futsal's social policy paper (UM Newspoint, 2020). Further, Malta is taking part in the Erasmus+ project Progres, to promote gender mainstreaming in sports (Progres Project, 2021).

Although the participation of students is low at the Institute of Space Science and Astronomy, female participation grew from $27 \%$ in 2020/1 to $40 \%$ in 2021/2. Similarly, fulltime female participation at the Islands and Small States Institute increased from $22 \%$ in $2020 / 1$ to $50 \%$ in 2021/2. It would be interesting to observe these trends in the coming years.

In contrast, female participation as full-time students at the Institute of Digital Games reduced from $43 \%$ in 2020/1 to $26 \%$ in 2021/2, while at the Institute of Earth Systems female full-time students' representation increased from 51\% in 2020/1 to 56\% in 2021/2,
however the population of part-time female students here reduced from 32\% in 2020/1 to $24 \%$ in 2021/2.

## Gender and mode of attendance in Centres and Schools

Among the centres, the Centre for the Liberal Arts and Sciences, Centre for Environmental Education and Research, Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Educational Research, Centre for Labour Studies and Centre for Molecular Medicine and Biobanking accepted students on a part-time level only. Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, International School for Foundation Studies, Centre for the Study and Practice of Conflict Resolution and the Centre for Traditional Chinese Medicine had only students studying on a full-time basis. The representation of female part-time students was a majority when compared to male parttime students at the School of Performing Arts, the Centre for English Language Proficiency, the Centre for Molecular Medicine and Biobanking, the Centre for Environmental Education and Research, the Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Educational Research, the Centre for Labour Studies and the Centre for the Liberal Arts and Sciences (Table 2.7).

Table 2.7 - Gender desegregation of data of full-time and part-time students, per centre, 2021-2022

|  | 2020/1 |  |  |  | 2021/2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Full-time |  | Part-time |  | Full-time |  | Part-time |  |
| School/Centre | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M |
| School of Performing Arts | 40 | 16 | 6 | 5 | 43 | 11 | 12 | 8 |
| Centre for Biomedical Cybernetics | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Centre for Distributed Ledger Technologies | 5 | 11 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 17 | 3 | 15 |
| Centre for English Language Proficiency | 5 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Centre for <br> Entrepreneurship and <br> Business Incubation | 9 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| Centre for Molecular Medicine and Biobanking | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| Centre for the Study and Practice of Conflict Resolution | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Centre for Traditional Chinese Medicine | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Euro-Mediterranean <br> Centre for Educational <br> Research | 49 | 16 | 9 | 3 | 49 | 16 | 10 | 5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| International School for <br> Foundation Studies | 20 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| Centre for Environmental <br> Education and Research | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 |
| Centre for Labour Studies | 0 | 0 | 70 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 46 |
| Centre for the Liberal Arts <br> and Sciences | 0 | 0 | 191 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 134 |

The wider gaps between male and female participation can be noted in the EuroMediterranean Centre for Educational Research, where the female full-time student population was $75 \%$ of the total students for 2020/1 and 2021/2. For female part-time students, this percentage decreased from $75 \%$ in 2020/1 to $67 \%$ in 2021/2). Similarly, at the School of Performing Arts full-time female student participation increased from $71 \%$ in 2020/1 to $80 \%$ in 2021/2; part-time female students also increased from $54 \%$ to $60 \%$ during the same period. In contrast, female participation of full-time students at the Centre for Distributed Ledger Technologies reduced from 31\% in 2020/1 to $15 \%$ in 2021/2.

Increased parity between male and female participation can also be noted in the International Foundation Studies, where female participation dropped from 62\% in 2020/1 to $57 \%$ in 2021/2, with the entry of more male students. One can note more gender parity in the Centre for Labour Studies and increased parity in the Centre for the Liberal Arts and Sciences, where the percentage of female part-time students decreased from $63 \%$ in 2020/1 to $56 \%$ in $2021 / 2$. The reason for this is that the number of female students dropped by 21 , while the number of male students increased by 22 (Table 2.7).

## 5. Students granted suspension of studies in academic years2019/20, 2020/1 and 2021/2

Before analysing the data, one needs to point out that the number of students granted suspension of studies may vary in this time period, since the COVID-19 pandemic had a negative impact on students especially those with health issues and/or dependents they needed to take care of.

When analysing granted suspensions at course level, one can observe that the largest number of suspensions were granted at Masters level. Suspensions granted at Masters level amounted to $68 \%$ in 2019/20 and $66 \%$ in 2020/1, but reduced to $58 \%$ in 2022. The for this change in 2021/2 is that there was an increase in suspensions granted at the Undergraduate degree level in 2021/2, which increased from $22 \%$ and $26 \%$ in 2019/20 and 2020/1 respectively, to $34 \%$ in 2021/2 (Table 3.2).

As Table 2.8 demonstrates, on the whole, more female students were granted suspension of studies. In academic year 2019/20 female students made up $59 \%$ of the total of granted
suspensions of study. In academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2 the share was $54 \%$ and $57 \%$ respectively. At undergraduate degree level, female students had a much higher proportion of suspensions granted (70\%) in 2020, which reduced in 2020/1to 51\%, and increased again in 2021/2 to $64 \%$. Granted suspensions at Masters level were also over represented by female students, although at a smaller proportion ( $55 \%$ in 2019/20, $56 \%$ in 2020/1 and 53\% in $2021 / 2$. At Ph.D. level, $60 \%$ of those granted suspension were female in 2020 , although there were no suspension of studies granted to female students in 2020/1 and 2021/2.

Table 2.8 - Students granted a suspension of studies during the period 2020-2022, by gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2019 / 20$ |  |  |  | $2020 / 1$ |  |  |  | Total |  |
| Course Level | F | M | Total | F | M | Total | F | M | To21/2 |
| Diplomas | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 9 |
| Degrees | 31 | 13 | 44 | 24 | 23 | 47 | 45 | 25 | 70 |
| Masters | 75 | 61 | 136 | 67 | 52 | 119 | 62 | 56 | 118 |
| Doctorate | 6 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| Other | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 118 | 83 | 201 | 98 | 83 | 181 | 116 | 88 | 204 |

## 6. Student mobility within and outside the EU, by gender

## Number of students on Erasmus KA103 (within the EU) and KA107 (outside the EU) mobility

Student data indicates that the number of students on Erasmus KA 103 mobility, to Universities within the EU, reduced drastically in 2020/1 (from 369 to 115), but started to increase once again in 2021/2 (287).

Female students were the large majority of students on Erasmus KA103 mobility, making up between $70 \%$ and $73 \%$ of the total students. The largest majority of students travelled for studying purposes (an average of $75 \%$ ), when comparing this to traineeship mobilities.

Table 2.9 - Number of students on Erasmus KA103 mobility in 2020-2022, by gender

|  | 2019/20 |  |  | 2020/1 |  |  | 2021/2 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | M | F | Total | M | F | Total | M | F | Total |
| Study | 82 | 197 | 279 | 20 | 63 | 83 | 71 | 153 | 224 |
| Traineeship | 27 | 63 | 90 | 11 | 21 | 32 | 14 | 49 | 63 |
| TOTAL | 109 | 260 | 369 | 31 | 84 | 115 | 85 | 202 | 287 |

Source: Erasmus Office, 2022.

## Conclusion

This data indicates that gender segregation in Maltese education remains high. Additionally, the European Institute of Gender Equality (2021) Malta Country Report finds that in 2018 almost half of the female university students were concentrated in feminized fields of study, namely in education, health, welfare, humanities and arts. In 2019, 49\% of the female students were concentrated in education, health, welfare, humanities and arts. The EIGE (2021) report maintains that the gender gap in enrolment is one of the highest in the EU (p.23). EIGE's comparison of the 2018 data with data in 2001 indicates that Malta has witnessed a sharp widening in the gap in gender segregation in higher education. It finds that in $2018,50 \%$ of all women university students are still enrolled in the most feminized fields of study, such as education, health, welfare, humanities and arts. The gender gap in enrolment is one of the highest in the EU, as female students still tend to be concentrated in feminized sectors, while male students are concentrated in STEM related sectors.
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## International Students at the University of Malta

## Methodology

Raw data was gathered during July and August 2022, from the Office of the Registrar, the international student population for academic years 2020/1 and 2021/2, focusing on gender and nationality. The raw data was organized and analysed according to data required for Key area 3 of the Equity Plan. In this report, unless otherwise stated, all data sources were from the Office of the Registrar.

International students are steadily increasing as a proportion of the total number of university students (Table 1.0). In fact, international students increased their proportion from $10 \%$ to $13 \%$ of the total student population in the years 2019/20 to 2021/2. (Table 1.0). The proportion of females in the international population ( $62 \%$ ) was slightly higher than that of females in the local population ( $60 \%$ ) in 2019/20. Additionally, while the percentage of female students in the local population remained at $60 \%$ from 2019/20 to 2021/2, the percentage of female students in the international population increased from $62 \%$ to $65 \%$ (Table 1.0). This trend can possibly be explored as to the reasons for which female international students are increasingly seeking the University of Malta as a place to continue their academic studies. It also opens the possibility for exploring more closely the needs of female international students.

Table 1.0. Total nr of local and international students by gender, 2019/20, 2020/1, 2021/2

|  | 2019/20 |  |  |  | 2020/1 |  |  |  | 2021/2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | M | Total | F (\%) | F | M | Total | F (\%) | F | M | Total | F (\%) |
| Local Students | 5962 | 4055 | 10017 | 60\% | 6130 | 4160 | 10290 | 60\% | 5850 | 3948 | 9798 | 60\% |
| International Students | 722 | 443 | 1165 | 62\% | 796 | 473 | 1269 | 63\% | 952 | 519 | 1471 | 65\% |



Figure 1.0. Proportions of local/international students 2019/20, 2020/21 and 2021/2

## Source: Author

International student population data, as illustrated in Figure 1.1, shows that the proportion of non-EU to EU students was at $58 \%$ in 2019/20, which then decreased to $51 \%$ in 2020/1 and increased again 1 to $58 \%$ in 2021/2 (Figure 1.1). EU female student proportion growth is key. While the proportion of female students in the non-EU population increased from 61\% in 2019/20 to $62 \%$ in 2021/2, EU female students increased from $63 \%$ to $68 \%$ in the same period. (Table 1.1).


Figure 1.1. Proportion of EU to non-EU students 2019/20, 2020/1, 2021/2

## Source: Author

Table 1.1 - Proportions of student populations, by gender and EU/Non-EU status

| Year | Proportion of Non-EU <br> students in the <br> international population | EU - Percentage of <br> female students in EU <br> population | Non-EU- Percentage <br> of female students <br> in non-EU <br> population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ | $58 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0} / \mathbf{2 1}$ | $51 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1 / 2 2}$ | $58 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $62 \%$ |

## Source: Author

While the EU female population are increasing in relation to their EU male counterparts, female non-EU students are still the largest group of international students, amounting to $35 \%$ of the total international population, followed by female EU students, which amount to $30 \%$. In contrast the proportion of male EU students have reduced from $16 \%$ in 2020 to $14 \%$ in $2021 / 2$, and that of non-EU male students from $22 \%$ to $21 \%$ in the same period (Figure 1.2). Figure 1.2 also indicates clearly a dip in the line chart for non-EU students in 2020/1, which is especially prominent in the female population. Conversely, the line chart indicates a rise for EU students in 2020/1, especially prominent in female students.


Figure 1.2. Proportion of EU/Non-EU international students, by gender

## Source: Author

## Students from countries in the European Union

When comparing the number of EU students, by gender, data shows that in the period between academic year 2019/20 to academic year 2021/2, the number of female students increased steadily, from 319 to 438 , while the number of male students seems to increase very slightly, and even decreases from 217 in 2020/11 to 208 in 20/22 (Figure 1.3). The number of EU female students in 2021/2 (438) are more than double the number of EU male students (208).


Figure 1.3. Number of EU students 2019/20, 2020/1 and 2021/2, by gender

## Source: Author

Data on EU students in 2021/2 shows that the largest groups of EU nationalities were Italian ( 149 students, 90 female), German ( 90 students, 60 female) and Spanish ( 44 students, 32 female) (Figures 1.4, 1.5). The figures also show a sharp drop in British EU nationalities, from 91 in 2020/1 to 5 in 2021/2. This drop reflects the event of Brexit, which has led to policies that have categorized British students as non-EU students. As non-EU students, the number of British students in 2021/2 were 64. This still indicates a drop in the number of British students in 2021/2 (Diagrams 4.0, 4.1).


Figure 1.4. Number of male EU students, by nationality, 2019/20, 2020/1 and 2021/2
Source: Author


Figure 1.5. Number of female EU students, by nationality, 2019/20, 2020/1 and 2021/2

## Students from countries outside the European Union

When comparing the number of non-EU students by gender, data shows that from academic year 2019/20 to the year 2021/2,1 the number of female students increased steadily, from 403 to 514, while the number of male students also increased, although at a slower pace, from 258 in 9/2020 to 311 in 2021/2 (Figure 1.6). This trend indicates a ratio of female to male at 1.7:1 in the non-EU student population.


Figure 1.6. Number of non-EU students, by gender, 2019/20, 2020/1 and 2021/2

## Source: Author

Data for 2021/2 indicates that the largest groups of non-EU nationalities were American (66 students, 40 female), British ( 64 students, 39 female) and Kuwaiti ( 61 students, 30 female), followed by Indian ( 55 students, 31 female) and Omani ( 51 students, 29 female) nationalities (Figures 1.6, 1.7). For most nationalities, there was an increase in the number of students in 2021/2 from the previous year, however for Omani nationalities the number of students did not reach the levels set in 2019/20 ( 78 students, 50 female), and this decline is more marked among female Omani students. There is a similar gender trend among Chinese students. Although the total number of Chinese students slightly reduced from 38 in 2019/20, to 34 in 2021/2, there has been a decrease in the number of female students, from 34 in 2019/20, to 16 in 2021/2, while the number of male Chinese students has slightly increased from 14 to 18 over the same period.


Figure 1.6. Number of male non-EU students, by nationality, 2019/20, 2020/1 and 2021/2
Source: Author


Figure 1.7. Number of female non-EU students, by nationality, 2019/20, 2020/1 and 2021/2

## Academic Staff at the University of Malta

## Methodology

Data was obtained from the Office of the Academic Registrar, and other sources as cited in the report.

## Academic staff by grade and sex

The majority of professors were male in the two consecutive academic years 2019/202020/21, however there was a slight shift in 2020/1, with the increase of 6 female professors, raising the percentage of female professors from $18.5 \%$ to $22.2 \%$ (Table 1.0).

Men were also over-represented in the associate professor grade (75.4\% in 2020; 76.7\% in $2020 / 1$ ), and at senior lecturer level ( $64.7 \%$ in 2019/20, $61.6 \%$ in 2020/1). The discrepancy between male and female staff was lower at lecturer level ( $51 \%$ in 2019/20, and $48.3 \%$ in 2020/1, were male), and at assistant lecturer level, female academics surpassed their male counterparts by a few percentage points in both years ( $61 \%$ in 2019/20; 59.2\% in 2020/1). This might mean that more female academics were recruited at this level, or it might also mean that women never move beyond this level for one reason or another - what can be referred to as the sticky floor syndrome. The irony is that at associate academic level, the number of men once more surpass their female counterparts, which might confirm the sticky floor hypothesis.

When it came to visiting academic staff, the majority of the staff were male at all level. In the case of visiting (part-time) staff, the professors were all males (Tables 1.0). This does not bode well for potential female academics if this position is used as a stepping stone towards getting a more permanent post at UM.

Table 1.0 indicates that at the level of Senior Lecturer II the percentage of female employees has increased from 50\% in the year 2019/20 to $55.4 \%$ in the year 2020/21. However, comparing the same years, the percentage of female employees at Senior Lecturer I reduced from $51.5 \%$ to $48 \%$. The percentage becomes skewed in favour of women when it comes to the percentage of lecturers, however at the level of assistant lecturer the percentage of male employees increased drastically from the year 2019/20 (35.7\%) to reach par with the percentage of female employees (50\%) in the year 2020/21. Once again, more research needs to be conducted to find out why female academics are stuck to the lower echelons at UM.

Table 1.0 - University of Malta academic staff by grade and sex, 2019/20, 2020/1

| Post | 2020 |  |  |  |  | 2021 |  |  |  |  | Charge in \% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Resident Academics | M |  | F |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Total } \\ \hline 130 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | M |  | F |  | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline \text { Total } \\ \hline 135 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | M | F+ |
| Professor | 106 | 81.5\% | 24 | 18.5\% |  | 105 | 77.8\% | 30 | 22.2\% |  |  |  |
| Associate Professor | 107 | 75.4\% | 35 | 24.6\% | 142 | 112 | 76.7\% | 34 | 23.3\% | 146 | + | - |
| Senior Lecturer | 156 | 64.7\% | 85 | 35.3\% | 241 | 162 | 61.6\% | 101 | 38.4\% | 263 | - | + |
| Lecturer | 97 | 51.1\% | 93 | 48.9\% | 190 | 85 | 48.3\% | 91 | 51.7\% | 176 | - | + |
| Assistant Lecturer | 32 | 39.0\% | 50 | 61.0\% | 82 | 29 | 40.8\% | 42 | 59.2\% | 71 | + | - |
| Associate Academic | 10 | 62.5\% | 6 | 37.5\% | 16 | 13 | 56.5\% | 10 | 43.5\% | 23 | - | + |
| Visting Staff (part-time) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visiting Professor | 5 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 5 | 4 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 4 | = | = |
| Visiting Associate Professor | 5 | 71.4\% | 2 | 28.6\% | 7 | 4 | 80.0\% | 1 | 20.0\% | 5 | + | - |
| Visiting Senior Lecturer | 200 | 71.4\% | 80 | 28.6\% | 280 | 221 | 69.1\% | 99 | 30.9\% | 320 | - | + |
| Visiting Lecturer | 106 | 66.7\% | 53 | 33.3\% | 159 | 120 | 65.6\% | 63 | 34.4\% | 183 | - | + |
| Visiting Assistant Lecturer | 84 | 53.2\% | 74 | 46.8\% | 158 | 112 | 53.6\% | 97 | 46.4\% | 209 | + | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Junior College |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Senior Lecturer I | 33 | 50.0\% | 33 | 50.0\% | 66 | 25 | 44.6\% | 31 | 55.4\% | 56 | - | + |
| Senior Lecturer II | 33 | 48.5\% | 35 | 51.5\% | 68 | 39 | 52.0\% | 36 | 48.0\% | 75 | + | - |
| Lecturer | 4 | 33.3\% | 8 | 66.7\% | 12 | 4 | 26.7\% | 11 | 73.3\% | 15 | - | 1 |
| Assistant Lecturer | 5 | 35.7\% | 9 | 64.3\% | 14 | 6 | 50.0\% | 6 | 50.0\% | 12 | + | - |
| Total | 983 | 62.6\% | 587 | 37.4\% | 1,570 | 1,041 | 61.5\% | 652 | 38.5\% | 1,693 | - | $+$ |

```
University of Malta Academic Staff in 2020 and 2021 *o
```

Source: NCPE 2022, p.16.

## Associate and full Professors

Data shows that the percentage of female academics who are associate and full professors grows at a slower pace when compared to their male counterparts. The percentage improved, in decimal points, between 2015/6 (14.2 \%) to 2020/1 (16.6\%), however this improvement is considerably slow when compared to the percentage of male counterparts, which improved from $29.8 \%$ in 2015/6 to $37.6 \%$ in 2020/1.

Table 1.1-\% of Academics at associate and full professors by gender, 2015-2021

|  | Female | Male |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 6}$ | 14.2 | 29.8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 7}$ | 13.1 | 31.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 8}$ | 14.3 | 33.9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 9}$ | 14.7 | 35.9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ | 16.3 | 37.2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0} \mathbf{1}$ | 16.6 | 37.6 |

Sources: Annual Reports 2018/9, p. 18; 2019/20, p. 22.; Academic registrar (2022)

## Percentage of Academic staff with doctorates

According to the UM annual reports, female academic staff are less likely to be in receipt of a doctorate. As Table 1.2 demonstrates, the percentage of both female and male academic staff is increasing. This means that the rate of male academic staff with a doctorate tends to remain higher.

Table 1.2 - Percentage of Academic staff with doctorates by gender, 2015/6-2020/1

|  | Female | Male |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 6}$ | 64.5 | 79.5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 7}$ | 66.1 | 80.5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 8}$ | 68.3 | 82.8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 / 9}$ | 68.9 | 84.0 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9 / 2 0}$ | 72.5 | 84.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0} \mathbf{1}$ | 73.2 | 85.3 |

Sources: UM Annual Reports 2018-2019, p. 18; 2019-2020, p. 22.; Academic Registrar (2022).

## Technical, Administrative \& Support Staff at the University of Malta

## Methodology

The Equity Office analysed data for technical administrative and support staff. The data was provided by the Office for Human Resource Management and Development at the University in September 2022. Therefore, the data reflects the employment situation in September 2022.

The data was analysed, considering two groups separately:
A. those whose employment is part of the collective agreement, and who are part of the salary scale system
B. those whose employment is not part of the collective agreement, and are not part of the salary scale system

The analysis was done for the purpose of understanding gender dynamics related to occupations (adopting the binary female or male for now) and level of career advancement (salary scale indicator). The results were compared to the gender ratios and patterns which emerge in student data. The purpose was to compare the gender dynamics in each sector, to see whether one reflects the other, why and what can be done to rectify this.

## A. Technical \& Administrative Staff who are part of the Collective Agreement

Appendix 1.0 shows technical, administrative and support staff categories, organised into salary scales, post descriptions, and proportion of employees by occupational category, post and gender.

The data in Appendix 1.0 was used to analyse the proportion of workers in each occupational category. Table 1.0 shows that, out of a total of 920 employees, the highest occupational categories are found within the administration/managerial sector (479, or 52.04\% of total employees), followed by laboratory (76), IT services (74), library (65), messengers (50), technical (40) and industrial (36) employees. The lower occupational category proportion of employees work in the sports sector (4), architectural sector (9), dental services (12) counselling and student advisory services (16), systems engineering (19), childcare services (19) and as scientific officers (21).

The data was analysed to find the proportion of female participation in each occupational sector. Table 1.0 indicates that $57.28 \%$ of technical, administrative and support staff are female. This percentage closely parallels the percentage of female students attending the University (60\%). Comparing the proportion of female employees in each occupational category, the highest female proportions are found in the childcare ( $94.73 \%$ ), architectural (88.88\%), dental services (83.32\%) and administration/managerial sector (77.04\%) categories. Comparatively, women were least represented in the industrial (2.78\%),
technical (5\%), IT (18.91\%), systems engineering (21.05\%) and sports (25\%) categories. The low number of female workers in these categories compares with the low number of female students taking STEM subjects. This information presents an opportunity for the University to encourage/facilitate both staff and students to access STEM subjects and job opportunities.

The data was also analysed to compare occupational sectors by gender (Figure 1.0). Figure 1.0 illustrates a sharp distinction between the proportion of female employees working in the administrative and managerial occupational category, and those in other categories. Comparatively, the proportions of male employees in various categories are more evenly distributed than those of female employees.

Table 1.0. Number of employees, by occupational category and gender, September 2022

| Category | Nr | Male | Female | \% female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Admin/Managerial | 479 | 110 | 369 | 77.04 |
| Laboratory | 76 | 57 | 19 | 25.00 |
| IT | 74 | 60 | 14 | 18.91 |
| Library | 65 | 30 | 35 | 53.85 |
| Messengers | 50 | 27 | 23 | 46.00 |
| Technical | 40 | 38 | 2 | 05.00 |
| Industrial | 36 | 35 | 1 | 2.78 |
| Scientific Officers | 21 | 8 | 13 | 61.90 |
| Childcare | 19 | 1 | 18 | 94.73 |
| Systems Engineers | 19 | 15 | 4 | 21.05 |
| Counselling/Student Advisory | 16 | 6 | 10 | 62.50 |
| Dental | 12 | 2 | 10 | 83.32 |
| Architects | 9 | 1 | 8 | 88.88 |
| Sports | 4 | 3 | 1 | 25.00 |
| Total | 920 | 393 | 527 | 57.28 |

## Source: HRMD



Figure 1.0. Number of employees in each occupational sector, by gender (September 2022)

## Source: Author

## Career progression, pay and gender

In order to analyse the relationship between career progression, pay and gender, data provided by the Office for Human Resource Management and Development (Appendix 1.0) was analysed to find the proportion of employees in each salary scale, and the proportion of female employees within each scale and occupational post (Table 1.1)

Table 1.1. Number of employees in each occupational post, by salary scale and gender

| Scale | Post | Male | Female |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | Asst. Registrar | 3 | 3 |
|  | Manager II | 4 | 11 |
|  | Head of Student Advisory <br> Services |  | 0 |
|  | Counselling Services Prof. |  | 1 |
|  | Senior IT Specialist II |  | 3 |
|  | Senior IT Systems Engineer II | 4 | 1 |
|  | Senior IT Officer II | 4 | 0 |
|  | IMS Support Manager | 1 | 0 |
|  | Senior Systems Engineer | 6 | 2 |


|  | Laboratory Manager | 4 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Senior Architect/Civil Engineer | 1 | 0 |
|  | Total | 29 | 23 |
|  | Manager I | 8 | 16 |
|  | Senior Admin | 6 | 19 |
|  | Student Advisor | 1 | 1 |
|  | Asst. Tech. Manager | 4 | 0 |
|  | Health \& Safety Officer | 1 | 0 |
|  | Senior IT Specialist I | 3 | 0 |
| 6 | Senior IT Systems Engineer I | 6 | 0 |
|  | Senior IT Officer I | 9 | 0 |
|  | IMS Support Specialist | 0 | 6 |
|  | Systems Engineer | 1 | 1 |
|  | Scientific Officer | 3 | 0 |
|  | Asst. Lab. Manager | 13 | 0 |
|  | Architect/Civil Engineer | 0 | 5 |
|  | Total | 55 | 48 |
|  | Senior Administrator | 3 | 6 |
|  | Admin Specialist | 3 | 36 |
|  | Chaplain | 1 | 0 |
|  | Counselling Services Prof. | 0 | 5 |
|  | Student Advisor | 1 | 0 |
|  | Social Worker | 0 | 2 |
|  | Health \& Safety Officer | 2 | 0 |
|  | Technical Officer II | 4 | 0 |
| 7 | IT Specialist | 2 | 0 |
|  | IT Systems Engineer | 3 | 0 |
|  | IT Officer III | 13 | 0 |
|  | Sen. IMS Support Officer | 2 | 2 |
|  | Systems Engineer | 7 | 1 |
|  | Scientific Officer | 2 | 6 |
|  | Senior Lab. Officer | 5 | 0 |
|  | Sports Development Officer | 0 | 1 |
|  | Architect/Civil engineer | 0 | 3 |
|  | Total | 48 | 62 |
| 8 | Admin Specialist | 1 | 5 |
|  | Sen Asst Librarian | 3 | 7 |
|  | Technical Officer II | 4 | 0 |
|  | IT Officer II | 8 | 0 |
|  | Sen. IMS Support Officer | 3 | 1 |
|  | Systems Engineer | 1 | 0 |
|  | Scientific Officer | 3 | 7 |
|  | Senior Lab. Officer | 11 | 4 |
|  | Lab. Officer | 3 | 0 |
|  | Total | 37 | 24 |
| 9 | Admin Specialist | 11 | 33 |


|  | Asst Librarian | 6 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Asst Chaplain | 1 | 0 |
|  | Technical Officer I | 3 | 0 |
|  | Sen. IMS Support Officer | 0 | 1 |
|  | Lab. Officer | 9 | 2 |
|  | Total | 30 | 42 |
| 10 | Admin Specialist | 5 | 54 |
|  | Asst Librarian | 4 | 8 |
|  | Lab. Officer | 2 | 0 |
|  | Sen. Dental Surgery Asst. | 0 | 1 |
|  | Total | 11 | 63 |
| 11 | Admin II | 15 | 34 |
|  | Admin I | 0 | 1 |
|  | Technical Officer I | 10 | 1 |
|  | Conf/Events Technician | 1 | 0 |
|  | Lab. Officer | 6 | 8 |
|  | Sen. Dental Surgery Asst. | 0 | 1 |
|  | Electrical Maintenance Officer | 1 | 0 |
|  | IMS Support Officer | 1 | 0 |
|  | Total | 34 | 45 |
| 12 | Admin II | 22 | 84 |
|  | Admin I | 1 | 0 |
|  | Library Asst | 13 | 11 |
|  | Lay Pastoral Asst. | 1 | 1 |
|  | Asst. Tech. Officer | 2 | 0 |
|  | Decontamination Officer | 1 | 0 |
|  | Dental Surgery Asst. | 0 | 1 |
|  | Total | 40 | 97 |
| 13 | Admin I | 2 | 22 |
|  | Centre Coordinator | 0 | 1 |
|  | Childcare Asst. | 0 | 1 |
|  | Asst. Tech. Officer | 5 | 0 |
|  | Electrical Maintenance Officer | 2 | 0 |
|  | Decontamination Officer | 1 | 0 |
|  | Dental Surgery Asst. | 0 | 7 |
|  | Leading Gardener | 3 | 0 |
|  | Total | 13 | 31 |
| 14 | Admin I | 6 | 15 |
|  | Library Asst | 1 | 0 |
|  | Childcare Asst. | 0 | 1 |
|  | Early Childhood Ed. | 1 | 1 |
|  | Asst. Tech. Officer | 2 | 1 |
|  | Lab. Assistant | 1 | 1 |
|  | Senior Handyperson | 11 | 0 |
|  | Gardener | 3 | 0 |
|  | Senior Beadle | 7 | 1 |


|  | Beadle | 1 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sen. Sports Attendant | 1 | 0 |
|  | Total | 34 | 20 |
| 15 | Admin I | 16 | 29 |
|  | Receptionist/Tel Operator | 1 | 0 |
|  | Library Supp Officer | 1 | 2 |
|  | Childcare Asst. | 0 | 8 |
|  | Lab. Assistant | 3 | 2 |
|  | Beadle | 7 | 9 |
|  | Sen. Sports Attendant | 2 | 0 |
|  | Total | 30 | 50 |
| 16 | Admin I | 2 | 1 |
|  | Library Supp Officer | 1 | 1 |
|  | Gardener | 2 | 0 |
|  | Beadle | 5 | 1 |
|  | Handyperson | 5 | 0 |
|  | Total | 15 | 3 |
| 17 | Receptionist/Tel Operator10 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Library Supp Officer | 1 | 0 |
|  | Childcare Attendant | 0 | 3 |
|  | Beadle | 7 | 12 |
|  | Handyperson | 4 | 0 |
|  | Total | 13 | 15 |
| 18 | Childcare Attendant | 0 | 3 |
|  | Labourer | 1 | 0 |
|  | Cleaner | 0 | 1 |
|  | Total | 1 | 4 |
| 20 | Labourer | 3 | 0 |

## Source: HRMD

Table 1.1 indicates that the larger proportions of female staff are concentrated in salary scales 12 (97) and 10 (63), with smaller peaks in scales 7 (62), 9 (42) and 11 (45). In comparison, the larger proportions of male staff peaks in scale 6 (55) and 7(48), with smaller peaks in scales 12 (40), 8 (37) and 14 (34). This is also illustrated more clearly in Figure 1.1.

The data may indicate that women are attracted to work at the University of Malta, but tend to be concentrated in less diversified, and less well remunerated sectors. The large numbers of female workers in scales 12 and 10 may indicate gender barriers in career progression, however more research needs to be conducted to find out why this is the case, taking into consideration the age of workers and years of tenure.


Figure 1.1. Number of employees along pay scales, by gender

## Source: Author

## Gender, post descriptions, and employment categories related to salary scales

In the first section, the data analysis focused on gender and employment categories within the technical, administrative and support staff population. This was followed by an analysis of gender and salary scales, to find out whether there are gender differences along salary scale lines. In this section, data analysis will focus on gender and employment categories along salary scales, dividing these scales into three sections: scales 5-7, 8-11, 12-14 and 1520.

## Salary scales 5-7, by gender

In salary scales 5 to 7 (Figure 1.2), the largest number of female staff work as Administration Specialists (scale 7, 36 females, 3 males), Senior Administrators (scale 6, 19 females, 6 males), and in the posts of Manager I (scale 6, 16 females, 8 males). Male employees predominate in other senior positions, especially in IT, systems engineering, technical and laboratory management. For example, in IT management, in scales 5 to 7 , there are no female employees, except in the grades of IMS Support Specialist (scale 6, 6 female), Senior IT Systems Engineer II (scale 5, 1 female), and Senior IT Specialist II (scale 5, 3 female). This means that there are only 10 females working in scales 5-7 in the IT sector, out of a total of 56 IT employees working in these salary scales.

Similarly, in systems engineering, out of a total of 18 employees working as Senior Systems Engineers and Systems Engineers, only 4 are female. In laboratory management, only 2 out of 22 laboratory managers, assistant laboratory managers and senior laboratory officers, are
female. The gender contrast is even more evident in the technical sector, with no female employees out of a total of 11, in salary scales 5-7.

Figure 1.2. Occupations and salary scales 5-7, by gender


## Source: Author

## Salary scales 8-11, by gender

Figure 1.3 was used to analyse occupations and salary scales by gender, in salary scales 8 to 11. Similar to the findings in the previous section on salary scales 5 to 7 , the largest number of female employees work as Administration Specialists in scale 10 ( 54 females, 5 males) and scale 9 ( 33 females, 11 males). The number of female workers also peaks in salary scale 11 within the post of Administrator II ( 34 females, 15 males).

In salary scale 8, female employees predominate as Administration Specialists ( 5 females, 1 male), Senior Assistant Librarians ( 7 females, 3 males) and Scientific Officers ( 7 females, 3 males). However, there is a sheer lack of female employees in occupations such as Technical Officers II (4 males, 0 females), IT Officers II (8 males, 0 females), Senior IMS Support Officers (3 males, 1 female), Systems Engineers (1 male, 0 females), Senior Laboratory Officers ( 11 males, 4 females), and Laboratory Officers ( 3 males, 0 females. This
is also the case for scales 9 to 11, where female employees are overrepresented in the administrative posts, but underrepresented in all other posts.

In scale 9, female employees also predominate as Administration Specialists, while there is only one female working as a Senior IMS Support Officer. Although there are equal numbers of female and male employees working in the post of Assistant Librarian ( 6 females, 6 males), the post of Assistant Librarian is also predominantly female ( 4 males, 8 females). In scale 10, there is one female employee working as a Senior Dental Surgery Assistant, while in scale 11, besides the post of Administrator II, female employees predominate as Laboratory Officers ( 6 males, 8 females).


Figure 1.3. Occupations and salary scales 8-11, by gender

## Source: Author

## Salary scales 12-14, by gender

In salary scales 12 to 14, as indicated in Figure 1.4, the largest number of female employees work in salary scale 12, in the position of Administrator II ( 84 females, 22 males). The numbers contrast with the number of female employees working in the post of Administrator II in scale 11 ( 34 females, 15 males). Female employees also predominate in the post of Administrator I at salary scale 13 ( 22 females, 2 males). Within the post of Administrator I at scale 11 there is 1 female employee, and no male employees, while in the same post at salary scale 12 there are no female employees and one male employee. In scale 13 and 14 , the number of female employees working as Administrator I increase once
again, with 22 female and 2 male employees at scale 13 , and 15 female and 6 male employees at scale 14. Here, one can explore whether this situation is one of seniority, which leaves a gap in some scales compared to others.


Figure 1.4. Occupations and salary scales 12-14, by gender

## Source: Author

## Salary scales 15-20, by gender

Figure 1.5 illustrates the proportion of female and male employees within corresponding occupations and salary scales. As seen before with other salary scales, the diagram indicates an overrepresentation of female staff in the position of Administrator I at salary scale 15 (29 females, 16 males). Moreover, workers within the childcare sector are all female. Beadles at salary scale 17 tend to be female rather than male ( 12 females, 7 males), although the gender ratio is reversed at salary scale 16 ( 5 males, 1 female, 5 males).

In salary scale 18, there are three female childcare attendants, while in salary scale 20 there are three male labourers.


Figure 1.5. Occupations and salary scales 15-20, by gender
Source: Author

## Conclusion

The data analysis in this report finds that:
a) There is segregation and segmentation of workers along gendered lines
b) The challenges of attaining work-life balance and career progression are greater for female staff who tend to get stuck in certain roles and positions
c) Women are concentrated in feminized occupational sectors
d) Women are working in fewer occupational sectors than men
e) Women are concentrated in occupations within mid-level salary scales

## B. Technical \& Administrative Staff who are not part of the Collective Agreement

Appendix 2.0 shows all the posts occupied by technical and administrative staff whose contract is not part of the Collective Agreement. There are 585 contract workers, making up $38.9 \%$ of all employees. $52 \%$ of these employees are female, forming a slightly smaller proportion of female workers when compared to the proportion of female workers who are part of the Collective Agreement (57.28\%).

The data compiled in Appendix 2.0 indicates that posts are more varied among female contract employees when compared to female employees whose occupation is part of the Collective Agreement. Additionally, there is a stronger gender balance in major posts such as those of Research Support Officers II (77 male, 68 female), Research Support Officers I ( 38 male, 30 female) and Research Support Officers III ( 27 male, 18 female).

Posts where a gender imbalance was noted included the posts of Project Support Officer II (3 male, 15 female), summer school teachers ( 2 male, 16 female) and summer student workers ( 20 male, 7 female). The gender imbalance within these posts can be explored in order to consider solutions for improving gender balance.

Appendix 1.0. Post descriptions and relative salary scales, \% by gender and section (September 2022)

| Scale | Post Description | Total | \% of <br> total <br> workers | \% of workers in same category | M | F | \% F <br> From Section | \% F <br> From <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Administrative \& Managerial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Assistant Registrar | 6 | 0.65 | 1.25 | 3 | 3 | 50.00 | 0.63 |
| 5 | Manager II | 15 | 1.63 | 3.13 | 4 | 11 | 73.00 | 2.30 |
| 6 | Manager I | 24 | 2.61 | 5.01 | 8 | 16 | 67.00 | 3.34 |
| 6 | Senior Administrator | 25 | 2.71 | 5.22 | 6 | 19 | 76.00 | 3.97 |
| 7 |  | 9 | 0.98 | 1.88 | 3 | 6 | 67.00 | 1.25 |
| 7 | Administration Specialist | 39 | 4.23 | 8.14 | 3 | 36 | 92.00 | 7.52 |
| 8 |  | 6 | 0.65 | 1.25 | 1 | 5 | 83.00 | 1.04 |
| 9 |  | 44 | 4.78 | 9.19 | 11 | 33 | 75.00 | 6.89 |
| 10 |  | 59 | 6.41 | 12.31 | 5 | 54 | 91.00 | 11.27 |
| 11 | Administrator II | 49 | 5.32 | 10.23 | 15 | 34 | 69.00 | 7.10 |
| 12 |  | 106 | 11.52 | 22.13 | 22 | 84 | 79.00 | 17.54 |
| 11 | Administrator I | 1 | 0.11 | 0.21 | 0 | 1 | 100.00 | 0.21 |
| 12 |  | 1 | 0.11 | 0.21 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 13 |  | 24 | 2.61 | 5.01 | 2 | 22 | 92.00 | 4.59 |


| 14 |  | 21 | 2.28 | 4.38 | 6 | 15 | 71.00 | 3.13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 |  | 45 | 4.89 | 9.39 | 16 | 29 | 64.00 | 6.05 |
| 16 |  | 3 | 0.33 | 0.63 | 2 | 1 | 33.00 | 0.21 |
| 15 | Receptionist/ Telephone Operator | 1 | 0.11 | 0.21 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 17 |  | 1 | 0.11 | 0.21 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 479 | 52.04 |  | 110 | 369 |  | 77.04 |
|  | Library |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Senior Assistant Librarian | 10 | 1.09 | 15.38 | 3 | 7 | 70.00 | 10.77 |
| 9 | Assistant Librarian | 12 | 1.30 | 18.46 | 6 | 6 | 50.00 | 9.23 |
| 10 |  | 12 | 1.30 | 18.46 | 4 | 8 | 67.00 | 12.31 |
| 12 | Library Assistant | 24 | 2.61 | 36.92 | 13 | 11 | 46.00 | 16.92 |
| 14 |  | 1 | 0.11 | 1.54 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 15 | Library Support Officer | 3 | 0.33 | 4.61 | 1 | 2 | 67.00 | 3.08 |
| 16 |  | 2 | 0.22 | 3.08 | 1 | 1 | 50.00 | 1.54 |
| 17 |  | 1 | 0.11 | 1.54 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 65 | 7.07 |  | 30 | 35 |  | 53.85 |
|  | Counselling \& Student Advisory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Head of Student Advisory Services | 1 | 0.11 | 6.25 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | Chaplain | 1 | 0.11 | 6.25 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 5 | Counselling Services Professional | 1 | 0.11 | 6.25 | 0 | 1 | 100.00 | 6.25 |
| 7 |  | 5 | 0.54 | 31.25 | 0 | 5 | 100.00 | 31.25 |
| 6 | Student Advisor | 2 | 0.22 | 12.50 | 1 | 1 | 50.00 | 6.25 |
| 7 |  | 1 | 0.11 | 6.25 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | Social Worker | 2 | 0.22 | 12.50 | 0 | 2 | 100.00 | 12.50 |
| 9 | Assistant Chaplain | 1 | 0.11 | 6.25 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 12 | Lay Pastoral Assistant | 2 | 0.22 | 12.50 | 1 | 1 | 50.00 | 6.25 |
|  | TOTAL | 16 | 1.75 |  | 6 | 10 |  | 62.50 |
|  | Childcare |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Centre Coordinator | 1 | 0.11 | 5.26 | 0 | 1 | 100.00 | 5.26 |
| 13 | Childcare Assistant | 1 | 0.11 | 5.26 | 0 | 1 | 100.00 | 5.26 |
| 14 |  | 1 | 0.11 | 5.26 | 0 | 1 | 100.00 | 5.26 |
| 15 |  | 8 | 0.87 | 42.10 | 0 | 8 | 100.00 | 42.11 |
| 14 | Early Childhood Educator | 2 | 0.22 | 10.53 | 1 | 1 | 500.00 | 5.26 |
| 17 | Childcare <br> Attendant | 3 | 0.33 | 15.79 | 0 | 3 | 100.00 | 15.79 |
| 18 |  | 3 | 0.33 | 15.79 | 0 | 3 | 100.00 | 15.79 |
|  | TOTAL | 19 | 2.08 |  | 1 | 18 |  | 94.73 |
|  | Technical |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Asst. Tech. Manager | 4 | 0.43 | 10.00 | 4 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |


| 6 | Health \& Safety Officer | 1 | 0.11 | 2.50 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 |  | 2 | 0.22 | 5.00 | 2 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | Tech. Officer II | 4 | 0.43 | 10.00 | 4 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 8 |  | 4 | 0.43 | 10.00 | 4 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 9 | Tech. Officer I | 3 | 0.33 | 7.50 | 3 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 11 |  | 11 | 1.20 | 27.50 | 10 | 1 | 0.09 | 2.50 |
| 11 | Conferences \& Events Technician | 1 | 0.11 | 2.50 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 12 | Asst. Tech. Officer | 2 | 0.22 | 5.00 | 2 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 13 |  | 5 | 0.54 | 12.50 | 5 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 14 |  | 3 | 0.33\% | 7.50\% | 2 | 1 | 33.33 | 2.50 |
|  | TOTAL | 40 | 4.35 |  | 38 | 2 |  | 5.00 |
|  | Information Tech. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Sen. IT Specialist II | 4 | 0.43 | 5.41 | 1 | 3 | 75.00 | 4.05 |
| 5 | Sen. IT Syst. Eng. II | 5 | 0.54 | 6.76 | 4 | 1 | 20.00 | 1.35 |
| 5 | Senior IT Officer II | 4 | 0.43 | 5.40 | 4 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 5 | IMS Support Manager | 1 | 0.11 | 1.35 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 6 | Senior IT Specialist I | 3 | 0.33 | 4.05 | 3 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 6 | Sen. IT Syst. Eng. I | 6 | 0.65 | 8.11 | 6 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 6 | Senior IT Officer I | 9 | 0.98 | 12.16 | 9 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 6 | IMS Support Specialist | 6 | 0.65 | 8.11 | 0 | 6 | 100.00 | 8.11 |
| 7 | IT Specialist | 2 | 0.22 | 2.70 | 2 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | IT Systems Engineer | 3 | 0.33 | 4.05 | 3 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | IT Officer III | 13 | 1.41 | 17.57 | 13 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 8 | IT Officer II | 8 | 0.87 | 10.81 | 8 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | Sen. IMS Support Officer | 4 | 0.43 | 5.40 | 2 | 2 | 50.00 | 2.70 |
| 8 |  | 4 | 0.43 | 5.40 | 3 | 1 | 25.00 | 1.35 |
| 9 |  | 1 | 0.11 | 1.35 | 0 | 1 | 100.00 | 1.35 |
| 11 | IMS Support Officer | 1 | 0.11 | 1.35 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 74 | 8.03 |  | 60 | 14 |  | 18.91 |
|  | Systems Engineers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Sen. Syst. <br> Engineer | 8 | 0.87 | 42.10 | 6 | 2 | 25.00 | 10.53 |
| 6 | Systems Engineer | 2 | 0.22 | 10.53 | 1 | 1 | 50.00 | 5.26 |
| 7 |  | 8 | 0.87 | 42.10 | 7 | 1 | 12.50 | 5.26 |
| 8 |  | 1 | 0.11 | 5.26 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 19 | 2.07 |  | 15 | 4 |  | 21.05 |
|  | Scientific Officers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Scientific Officer | 3 | 0.33 | 14.29 | 3 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 |  | 8 | 0.87 | 38.10 | 2 | 6 | 75.00 | 28.57 |


| 8 |  | 10 | 1.09 | 47.62 | 3 | 7 | 70.00 | 33.33 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | 21 | 2.29 |  | 8 | 13 |  | 61.90 |
|  | Laboratory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Lab. Manager | 6 | 0.65 | 7.90 | 4 | 2 | 33.33 | 2.63 |
| 6 | Asst. Lab. Manager | 13 | 1.41 | 17.11 | 13 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | Sen. Lab. Officer | 5 | 0.54 | 6.58 | 5 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 8 |  | 15 | 1.63 | 19.74 | 11 | 4 | 26.67 | 5.26 |
| 8 | Laboratory Officer | 3 | 0.33 | 3.95 | 3 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 9 |  | 11 | 1.20 | 14.47 | 9 | 2 | 18.18 | 2.63 |
| 10 |  | 2 | 0.22 | 2.63 | 2 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 11 |  | 14 | 1.52 | 18.42 | 6 | 8 | 57.14 | 10.53 |
| 14 | Laboratory Assistant | 2 | 0.22 | 2.63 | 1 | 1 | 50.00 | 1.32 |
| 15 |  | 5 | 0.54 | 6.58 | 3 | 2 | 40.00 | 2.63 |
|  | TOTAL | 76 | 8.26 |  | 57 | 19 |  | 25.00 |
|  | Dental |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Senior Dental Surgery Assistant | 1 | 0.11 | 8.33 | 0 | 1 | 100.00 | 8.33 |
| 11 |  | 1 | 0.11 | 8.33 | 0 | 1 | 100.00 | 8.33 |
| 12 | Decontamination Officer | 1 | 0.11 | 8.33 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 13 |  | 1 | 0.11 | 8.33 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 12 | Dental Surgery Assistant | 1 | 0.11 | 8.33 | 0 | 1 | 100.00 | 8.33 |
| 13 |  | 7 | 0.76 | 58.33 | 0 | 7 | 100.00 | 58.33 |
|  | TOTAL | 12 | 1.31 |  | 2 | 10 |  | 83.32 |
|  | Architects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Sen. <br> Architect/Civil <br> Engineer | 1 | 0.11 | 11.11 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 6 | Architect/Civil Engineer | 5 | 0.54 | 55.55 | 0 | 5 | 100.00 | 55.55 |
| 7 |  | 3 | 0.33 | 33.33 | 0 | 3 | 100.00 | 33.33 |
|  | TOTAL | 9 | 0.98 |  | 1 | 8 |  | 88.88 |
|  | Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Electrical <br> Maintenance Officer | 1 | 0.11 | 2.78 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 13 |  | 2 | 0.22 | 5.55 | 2 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 13 | Leading Gardener | 3 | 0.33 | 8.33 | 3 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 14 | Senior <br> Handyperson | 11 | 1.19 | 30.56 | 11 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 14 | Gardener | 3 | 0.33 | 8.33 | 3 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 16 |  | 2 | 0.22 | 5.55 | 2 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 16 | Handyperson | 5 | 0.54 | 13.89 | 5 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 17 |  | 4 | 0.43 | 11.11 | 4 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 18 | Labourer | 1 | 0.11 | 2.78 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0 |  | 3 | 0.33 | 8.33 | 3 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 18 | Cleaner | 1 | 0.11 | 2.78 | 0 | 1 | 100.00 | 2.78 |
|  | TOTAL | 36 | 3.92 |  | 35 | 1 |  | 2.78 |
|  | Messengers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | Senior Beadle | 8 | 0.87 | 16.00 | 7 | 1 | 12.50 | 2.00 |


| 14 | Beadle | 1 | 0.11 | 2.00 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 |  | 16 | 1.74 | 32.00 | 7 | 9 | 56.25 | 18.00 |
| 16 |  | 6 | 0.65 | 12.00 | 5 | 1 | 16.67 | 2.00 |
| 17 |  | 19 | 2.06 | 38.00 | 7 | 12 | 63.16 | 24.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 50 | 5.43 |  | 27 | 23 |  | 46.00 |
|  | Attendants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Sports Development Officer | 1 | 0.11 | 25 | 0 | 1 | 100.00 | 25.00 |
| 14 | Senior Sports Attendant | 1 | 0.11 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 15 |  | 2 | 0.22 | 50 | 2 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 4 | 0.44 |  | 3 | 1 |  | 25.00 |
|  | Total employees | 920 |  |  | 393 | 527 |  | 57.28 |

## Equity Office, 2022; Source: HRMD

Appendix 2.0 Grade descriptions, by gender and grade proportions

| Grade Description | Total | \% of total <br> employees | Male | Female | \% of <br> total <br> female |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic Registrar | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Accountant | 5 | 0.85 | 1 | 4 | 0.01 |  |
| Administrative Director | 10 | 1.71 | 7 | 3 | 0.01 |  |
| Administrator II | 6 | 0.17 | 1.03 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Advisor | 1 | 0.17 | 4 | 2 | 0.006 |  |
| Area Officer | 2 | 0.34 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Assistant Accountant | 1 | 0.17 |  | 2 | 0.006 |  |
| Assistant to the Director U3A | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Audio-visual \& Graphic design <br> Coordinator | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Campaign Officer | 1 | 0.17 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Chief Executive-RIDT | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Chief info officer \& Director IT services | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Chief Internal Auditor | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |  |
| Childcare Centre Coordinator | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |  |
| Clerical assistant | 3 | 0.51 |  | 2 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Clinical Administrator | 2 | 0.34 | 1 | 1 | 0.003 |  |
| Conferences \& Events technician | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |  |
| Consultant | 3 | 0.51 | 0 | 3 | 0.01 |  |
| Content \& Media Relations Officer | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |  |
| Content creator | 2 | 0.34 |  | 0 | 2 | 0.006 |
| Coordinator (OTH) |  |  |  | 0.003 |  |  |


| Cast modelling specialist | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Curator Manager | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Data Protection Officer | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Deputy Director | 11 | 1.88 | 7 | 4 | 0.013 |
| Deputy Registrar | 2 | 0.34 | 0 | 2 | 0.006 |
| Editor | 2 | 0.34 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Engineer/Scientist | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Equity Coordinator | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Executive | 2 | 0.34 | 0 | 2 | 0.006 |
| Executive Manager | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| General Administrator | 5 | 0.85 | 2 | 3 | 0.01 |
| Graphic Designer | 2 | 0.34 | 1 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Head of Corporate Services | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Head of Counselling Services | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Head of Section Summer School | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Head of Technical Services | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| It services Deputy Director \& Head of User Services | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Junior Executive | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Labarotary Manager | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Manager (Contract) | 8 | 1.37 | 2 | 6 | 0.02 |
| Manager, Business Incubator | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Manufacturing Specialist | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Marie Curie European RO | 6 | 1.03 | 2 | 4 | 0.013 |
| Mentor | 8 | 1.37 | 1 | 7 | 0.023 |
| Museum Curator | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Occupational Therapist | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Operations \& Events Manager | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Practical Demonstrator | 5 | 0.85 | 0 | 5 | 0.016 |
| Pre-doctoral research student | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pre-Masters research student | 5 | 0.85 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Principal Area Officer | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Principal Subject Officer | 4 | 0.68 | 2 | 2 | 0.006 |
| Project Administrator | 4 | 0.68 | 0 | 4 | 0.013 |
| Project Coordinator | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Project Manager | 2 | 0.34 | 0 | 2 | 0.006 |
| Project Support Officer | 2 | 0.34 | 1 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Project Support Officer I | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Project Support Officer II | 18 | 3.08 | 3 | 15 | 0.05 |
| Project Support Officer III | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Project Manager (MGT) | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Rector | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Research Assistant | 3 | 0.51 | 0 | 3 | 0.01 |
| Research Project Manager | 6 | 1.03 | 1 | 5 | 0.016 |
| Research Support Assistant | 17 | 2.91 | 8 | 9 | 0.03 |
| Research Support Officer | 9 | 1.54 | 7 | 2 | 0.006 |


| Research Support Officer I | 68 | 11.62 | 38 | 30 | 0.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Research Support Officer II | 145 | 24.79 | 77 | 68 | 0.22 |
| Research Support Officer III | 45 | 7.69 | 27 | 18 | 0.06 |
| Research Support Officer IV | 7 | 1.2 | 4 | 3 | 0.01 |
| Reviewer | 2 | 0.34 | 1 | 1 | 0.003 |
| Senior Accountant | 3 | 0.51 | 0 | 3 | 0.01 |
| Senior Auditor | 3 | 0.51 | 0 | 3 | 0.01 |
| Senior Executive | 9 | 1.54 | 3 | 6 | 0.02 |
| Senior Implementor | 3 | 0.51 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Senior Legal Executive | 4 | 0.68 | 0 | 4 | 0.013 |
| Senior Manager | 5 | 0.85 | 1 | 4 | 0.013 |
| Senior Research Advisor | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.01 |
| Student Recruitment Specialist | 2 | 0.34 | 1 | 1 | 0.01 |
| Student Services Coordinator | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Worker | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.01 |
| Subject Area Officer | 8 | 1.37 | 3 | 5 | 0.016 |
| Subject Teacher | 15 | 2.56 | 7 | 8 | 0.026 |
| Summer/Student Worker | 27 | 4.61 | 20 | 7 | 0.023 |
| Summer Worker | 5 | 0.85 | 3 | 2 | 0.006 |
| Supervisor | 4 | 0.68 | 0 | 4 | 0.013 |
| Supervisor Architect | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Supervisor I | 4 | 0.68 | 2 | 2 | 0.006 |
| Supervisor II | 4 | 0.68 | 2 | 2 | 0.006 |
| Swimming Coordinator | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| TAS Apprentice | 3 | 0.51 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Teacher-Summer school | 18 | 3.08 | 2 | 16 | 0.052 |
| Technical Coordinator | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Technical Officer I | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Theatre Technician II | 1 | 0.17 | 0 | 1 | 0.003 |
| University Secretary | 1 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 585 |  | 279 | 306 |  |

## Source: HRMD

