



Student Equity Annual Report 2025-2026

Document record		
Maintained by	Student Equity	
Approved by	Senate	March 13 th , 2026

Student Equity Annual Report 2025 - 2026

Introduction

The Student Equity Annual Report 2025–26 for Brunel University of London aims to present the most up-to-date student equality data available, at the time of preparation, by protected characteristic as defined by the Equality Act 2010. Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are required as part of their Public Sector Equality Duties to monitor and publish equality information under the general duty compliance with regards to staff and people affected by its policies and practices every year. For more information regarding the Duties, see [Public Sector Equality Duty: guidance for public authorities - GOV.UK](#). The University's Staff ED&I team are currently preparing the annual employee monitoring report 2025 (insert link when approved) which should be read in conjunction with this report which will examine the student population for 2025–26 undergraduate and postgraduate students (taught and research), and the attrition and awarding data for 2024–25 for undergraduate and postgraduate taught students. It will highlight key areas of concern in the data where there are disparities between protected characteristics and make a set of recommendations on what further analysis might be required and signpost to the University's Equity Strategy and Delivery Plan 2025-29 [Equity Strategy 2025-2029](#) which sets out a bold vision to create a fair and equitable centre of teaching and research excellence and to meet the Specific Duties under the Public Sector Equality Duty to publish the institution's equality objectives every four years. The second part of the report will examine how Brunel is currently giving 'due regard' to the equality duties and provide guidance on what further action should be taken.

The protected characteristics considered in this report refer to age, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender reassignment, and sexual orientation as defined by the Equality Act 2010. However, it excludes data on maternity and pregnancy, as well as marriage and civil partnership, as higher education institutions (HEIs) are not specifically required to report on these categories and the University does not collect this data.

Student Equality Data

The data in this annual report draws primarily on internal University data managed by Strategic Planning.

- The report draws from the latest 5 years of available full-year data, including the student population data for 2025-26 (based on census data from 1st November 2025), and attrition and award outcome data up to 2024-25, processed in autumn 2025.
- The population data includes undergraduate (UG), taught postgraduate (PGT), and research postgraduate (PGR) students, while attrition and awards outcome data focuses on taught students (UG and PGT) because of availability of equality data.
- The primary focus of this annual report is on the principal University-campus-based provision, referred to as 'core', which constitutes the majority of Brunel student population. Groups such as Apprentices, Online Learners, Distance

Learners, Associates and Transnational Education (TNE) students have not been specifically included.

- University-wide data is presented augmented by college-level data to illustrate how trends in different student demographics might vary across different areas. However, data is not provided for individual departments or programmes.
- The data now reflects the up-to-date college structures with the changes to the College of Arts, Law and Social Sciences, 'CALSS' (previously CBASS) and the newly formed Brunel Business School, 'BBS' alongside College for Health Medicines and Life Sciences, 'CHMLS' and College of Engineering, Design and Physical Sciences, 'CEDPS'.
- All the student numbers (headcounts) have been rounded to the nearest 5, in line with HESA best practices. For example, 1 or 2 students are rounded to 0; 3 to 7 are rounded to 5; and 8 or 9 are rounded to 10.
- Analysis of intersectional data for age, ethnicity, gender/sex and disability has been extended in this report by considering the equity impacts on the student population, attrition and awarding.

The analysis also draws on sector data for comparison from 2022-23 which is taken from Advance HE Student Equality Data dashboard (published in November 2025 - [2024 Student Equality Data Dashboards | Tableau Public](#)).

Student Population Data

Before examining the equality data by protected character, a brief overview of the student body over the last 5 years will be presented.

Population

The size and shape of Brunel's student body have changed significantly over recent years, as illustrated in the table below:

Student Population	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Course Group	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
UG: home	7,805	6,735	5,780	5,360	5,850
UG: overseas	2,825	3,005	2,970	2,720	2,270
PGT: home	1,260	980	790	735	805
PGT: overseas	2,895	3,559	3,280	1,635	1,420
DR: home	345	349	350	340	335
DR: overseas	385	370	340	355	335
Total	15,515	14,998	13,510	11,145	11,015

Table 1: Student Population Trend over last 5 years

The last five years have seen several significant changes in terms of the student population. The number of UK-domiciled ('home') students has fallen steadily since 2021-22, following the Covid-19 pandemic mainly due to a decrease in undergraduate recruitment although there is a small upturn in 2025-26. There has been a similar downturn in overseas undergraduates since 2022-23. At postgraduate taught level, we have also seen a decline in the home students from 2021-22 though with a small increase in 2025-26. There has been a similar sharp decline in overseas

postgraduate taught students since 2022-23 following various changes in government immigration policy and geopolitics more generally. The number of home doctoral researchers has remained relatively stable over the last 5 years although there has been a decrease in the number of doctoral researchers since 2021-22.

The overall changing population trends have also driven changes in the composition of the protected characteristics which lead to various implications in terms of inequities for students at the University and will be considered in the detailed equality data analysis below.

Attrition

UG: Since 2022–23 there has been a decrease in attrition rates for core undergraduate students overall when attrition rates were at their highest at 12.6% with students leaving without their intended award or completing with a lower award. In 2024–25, this had decreased to 9%. However, it remains high amongst students at fheq level 4 at 16.1% compared to 19.2% in 2022–23. There is a slight discrepancy between home and international students at 16.7% compared to 13.8% respectively.

At college level, overall attrition trends vary from 6.5% in CHMLS to 10.7% in CALSS. This pattern can also be seen replicated amongst home students at all levels across the colleges ranging from 7.7% in CHMLS to 11.5% in CALSS. The highest attrition rates persist at fheq 4 level across all the colleges amongst home students ranging from 13.2% in CHMLS to 19.5% in CALSS.

PGT: The last three years has seen a significant decrease in postgraduate taught attrition falling from 796 who left with no award and 285 who completed with a lower award in 2022-23 compared to 157 who left the university with no award and 203 who completed with a lower award in 2024-25. However, it should be noted that this reflects the sharp decline in numbers in postgraduate taught students as referred to above.

Awards (degree classifications)

UG: The proportion of 1st degrees awarded for undergraduates, has risen in the last two years for core students, from 15% - 24%. The proportion of 2:2 awards have remained largely consistent at 42% with a slight decrease in the proportion of 2:2 degrees awarded from 31% to 25%. At college level, there is small variation ranging from 62% of undergraduates in CEDPS being awarded a 1st or 2:1 to 67% in BBS.

By fee status, 66% of home students and 66% of overseas student were awarded a 1st or 2:1 classification in 2024-25. These figures represent a 10% increase on the part of the home students and an 8% increase on the part of the overseas students over the last 2 years.

By college, outcomes for both home and overseas students are very similar to the University as a whole. The proportion of 1st and 2:1s awarded to home students was 65% in CALSS, 63% in CEDPS, 66% in CHMLS and 69% in BBS. With respect to

the overseas students, the range of good degrees awarded was slightly wider across the colleges at 59% in CALSS, 60% in CEDPS, 73% in CHMLS and 72% in BBS.

PGT: The distribution of distinction and merit classifications at postgraduate level saw a slight increase from 8% to 9% and 39% to 42% respectively from 2023-24 to 2024-25.

By fee status, 18% of home PGT students were awarded a distinction compared to 8% of overseas students who achieved a distinction while the gap was significantly reduced to those being awarded a merit to 44% and 43% respectively.

By college, the University trend is generally reflected but there was some variation by college in the precise combination of PGT classifications. For 2024-25, the proportions of distinctions and merits awarded was 7% and 36% in CALSS, 12% and 34% for CEDPS, 7% and 53% for BBS and 11% and 38% for CHMLS respectively.

Age

Population

The proportion of students under 21 years of age across all types has increased over recent years from 55.1% in 2022-23 to 64.3% in 2025-26. However mature students, those over 21 years of age, have generally decreased. Amongst the 21-24 age group, this has decreased from 22.7% in 2022-23 to 17.6% in 2025-26 and for those aged 25-29 years, from 11.7% to 8.5% for the same time-period. The percentage of students aged 40 and above has remained relatively stable.

Age	2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25		2025-26	
	No.	%								
Under 21	9,045	58.3%	8,255	55.1%	7,505	55.5%	6,950	62.3%	7,085	64.3%
21-24	3,485	22.4%	3,405	22.7%	2,940	21.8%	2,250	18.8%	1,940	17.6%
25-29	1,580	10.2%	1,755	11.7%	1,605	11.9%	1,035	9.3%	935	8.5%
30-39	995	6.2%	1,110	7.4%	985	7.3%	655	5.9%	635	5.7%
40+	460	3.0%	455	3.0%	475	3.5%	420	3.8%	425	3.9%

Table 2: Student Population by age

At sector level, 46.6% of students were under 21 years, 20.3% were between 22-25 years, 19% were between 25-39 years and 14% over 40 years of age in 2022-23 showing a higher proportion of students from the youngest age group at the time.

There is a significant disparity between home students and overseas students across the age groups. In 2025–26, 74.1% of home students were under 21 years of age compared to 47.3% overseas students. The proportions of students within the age groups, 21-24 years and 25-29 years were 27.8% and 14.5% were overseas compared to 11.7% and 5.0% home students respectively.

There is some disparity across the different course types across the colleges with the majority of undergraduate students remain aged under 21 years on entry, ranging from BBS having the highest proportion at 90.1% to 82.8% in CALSS in 2025-26. Among postgraduate taught students, the majority are aged 21-24 years across all colleges, with BBS and CEDPS having the highest proportions in this

group at 56.9% and 50.8% respectively. Postgraduate research students show a more diverse age distribution, with a notable concentration in the 30-39 age group and 40+ years in BBS, 36.3% and 33.3% respectively. In CALSS, 38.5% are 40+ years whilst in CHMLS and CEDPS, the age range is spread more evenly.

College	Course Group	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40+
BBS	UG	90.1%	8.7%	1.0%	0.1%	0.2%
	PGT	8.4%	56.9%	22.0%	11.4%	11.1%
	DR	-	9.8%	20.6%	36.3%	33.3%
CALSS	UG	82.8%	12.1%	3.3%	1.1%	0.6%
	PGT	6.0%	39.8%	30.7%	15.3%	18.2%
	DR	-	10.1%	23.5%	27.9%	38.5%
CEDPS	UG	88.4%	9.2%	1.6%	0.7%	0.1%
	PGT	3.8%	50.8%	29.2%	11.5%	4.8%
	DR	1.0%	21.5%	33.6%	31.5%	12.4%
CHMLS	UG	88.1%	11.4%	3.4%	2.2%	1.8%
	PGT	2.7%	34.9%	22.0%	21.7%	18.6%
	DR	3.3%	27.5%	26.4%	18.7%	24.2%

Table 3: % mix of population by age, by college and course type for 2025-26

Attrition

UG: The attrition gaps between undergraduates of under 21 years and 21-24 years, the age groups with the highest numbers of students have both decreased over the last three years from 12.3% and 15% in 2022-23 to 8.4% and 11.7% respectively in 2024-25. There is a variation in trend in the older age groups with a slight increase in attrition from 2023-24 to 2024-25 but the numbers are relatively small.

UG attrition	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
By disclosure of age										
<21 years	595	5.8%	1,035	10.4%	1,110	12.3%	830	10.4%	605	8.4%
21-24 years	70	7.8%	170	17.8%	145	15.0%	145	15.1%	100	11.7%
25-29 years	20	10.4%	30	15.0%	30	16.0%	15	9.5%	25	14.0%
30-39 years	10	9.6%	20	16.1%	10	8.7%	5	5.9%	15	14.5%
40-49 years	0	4.4%	5	11.5%	5	11.6%	5	6.8%	10	17.4%
50-59 years	0	14.3%	0	17.6%	0	0.0%	0	11.8%	0	21.4%
60 years and over			0	100.0%	0	25.0%	0	25.0%		33.3%
Not known			5	60%	0	100.0%	0	%		

Table 4: UG attrition by age

At fheq level 4 and foundation level, we can see that rates of attrition amongst undergraduates remain higher in 2024-25 compared to the overall undergraduate population at 16.5% amongst students under 21 years compared to 8.4%. The highest rates of attrition at fheq level 4 and foundation level are within CEDPS at 195 students in 2024-2025.

PGT: With the significant decrease in postgraduate taught students since 2022-23, it is difficult to determine a current trend but 2024-25 sees attrition rates amongst the postgraduate taught students predominantly within the 21-24 years and 25-29 years age groups at 21.8% (160) and 23.8% (105) respectively. At college level, the

highest attrition rates are within CEDPS at 30.6% for 21-24 years (75 students) and 25-29% (50 students).

Awards

UG: The awarding of 1st and 2:1s have increased across the age groups since 2022-23 although there is some variance in the different age groups. The lower age groups, under 21 and 21-24 years have consistently been awarded a lower proportion of 'good degrees' at 65% and 62% respectively in 2024-25 although there is no disparity between home and overseas students.

UG awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%								
By disclosure of age										
<21	2,030	79%	1,590	64%	1,285	55%	1,220	58%	1,285	65%
21-24	165	78%	135	66%	110	56%	135	55%	145	62%
25-29	45	85%	35	79%	30	69%	30	69%	35	77%
30-39	20	90%	10	63%	20	62%	20	54%	25	80%
40-49	5	88%	15	72%	5	70%	5	47%	5	70%
50-59	0	50%	0	50%	5	78%	5	38%	0	100%
60+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	100%

Table 5: Percentage of 'good' degrees awarded to UG students by age group

There is some variation between the different age groups within the colleges in 2024-25 and in the lower age groups, we also see the fewer number of 'good degrees' being awarded reflected.

College	<21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59
BBS	69%	70%	75%	100%	-	-
CALSS	62%	64%	73%	86%	50%	-
CEDPS	62%	55%	71%	75%	-	-
CHMLS	67%	61%	83%	73%	75%	100%

Table 6: % mix of UG good degrees by age group and by college for 2024-25

PGT: At postgraduate taught level there has been a relatively even distribution of distinction and merit classifications being awarded across the different age groups in recent years although fewer were awarded to the lowest age group of under 21 years in 2024-25. We see the higher proportions of awards being made in the higher age groups from 30-39 years and above although there are proportionately fewer students.

PGT awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
By disclosure of age										
<21	10	48%	10	61%	10	52%	20	44%	20	40%
21-24	570	62%	650	62%	570	51%	620	44%	570	50%
25-29	240	65%	340	65%	355	55%	430	48%	355	51%
30-39	100	69%	175	77%	225	59%	265	53%	190	56%
40-49	30	68%	45	68%	45	59%	45	61%	50	54%
50-59	10	80%	10	65%	10	53%	10	77%	5	56%
60+	0	50%	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	67%

Table 7: Percentage of PGT distinction and merit awards by age group

It should be noted that there is a discrepancy between the proportion of distinction and merit awards made to home postgraduate taught students compared to overseas. In 2024-25, we see 59% of 21- 24, 68% of 25-29 and 70% of 30-39 home students compared to 49% of 21- 24, 50% of 25-29 and 56% of 30-39 overseas students being awarded distinctions and merits.

There is some variation between the different age groups between the colleges in 2024-25 of postgraduate taught students being awarded distinction and merit classification. BBS generally awards the highest proportion of distinction and merits to most age groups from 21-24 years upwards. CALSS awards the fewest in the mid age range groups.

College	<21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+
BBS	34%	59%	59%	75%	68%	0%	-
CALSS	50%	43%	40%	40%	53%	-	100%
CEDPS	50%	44%	45%	57%	38%	75%	0%
CHMLS	67%	49%	55%	38%	50%	50%	100%

Table 8: % mix of PGT distinction and merit awards by age group and by college for 2024-25

Disability

Population

The total proportion of students disclosing disabilities has reduced slightly from 15.8% in 2024-25 to 15.2% in 2025-26. There remains a significant disparity between the disclosures by home students and overseas students at 19.7% and 7.4% in 2025-26 respectively which has persisted over the last five years.

	2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25		2025-26	
	No.	%								
Disability										
Not known / refused.	25	0.1%	25	0.2%	60	0.5%	130	1.2%	195	1.8%
Disability	2,290	14.8%	2,155	14.4%	1,955	14.5%	1,765	15.8%	1,670	15.2%
No disability	13,210	85.1%	12,805	85.5%	11,490	85.0%	9,355	83.0%	9,150	83.0%

Table 9: Student Population by disability

At sector level, 16.6% of students disclosed a disability in 2022-23 showing a slightly lower proportion of students at Brunel disclosed at the time.

Students report a wide variety of different types of disability under the HESA categories. In the 2025-26, the highest proportion of students report multiple disabilities and learning difficulties whilst there has been a slight decrease in disclosures concerning mental health over the last 5 years.

	2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25		2025-26	
	No.	%								
Type of disability										
Not known incl refused	25	0.1%	25	0.2%	65	0.5%	130	1.2%	195	1.8%

Other	240	1.5%	175	1.2%	125	0.9%	90	0.8%	75	0.7%
No Disability	13,210	85.1%	12,805	85.5%	11,490	85.0%	9,255	83.0%	9,150	83.0%
Develop- Mental	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hearing Impairment	20	0.1%	25	0.2%	30	0.2%	35	0.3%	30	0.3%
Learning Difficulties	765	4.9%	690	4.6%	560	4.2%	415	3.7%	405	3.7%
Long-term Illness	185	1.2%	205	1.4%	170	1.3%	170	1.5%	170	1.6%
Mental health	610	3.9%	545	3.6%	415	3.1%	360	3.2%	290	2.6%
Mobility	40	0.3%	45	0.3%	35	0.3%	30	0.3%	30	0.3%
Multiple disabilities	320	2.1%	340	2.3%	495	3.7%	540	4.8%	540	4.9%
Social Communi- cative	90	0.6%	105	0.7%	100	0.7%	90	0.8%	100	0.9%
Visual Impairment	20	0.1%	25	0.2%	30	0.2%	35	0.3%	30	0.3%

Table 10: Student Population by type of disability

We can see some further variation by college and course type. In 2025-26, there are higher proportions of students who disclose a disability in CALSS across all course types compared to BBS which has the lowest.

College	Course Group	Not-known incl refused	Disability	No disability
BBS	UG	0.9%	10.2%	88.9%
	PGT	3.4%	5.3%	91.4%
	DR	4.9%	11.8%	83.3%
CALSS	UG	1.5%	24.9%	73.6%
	PGT	5.3%	17.3%	77.5%
	DR	4.5%	24.0%	71.5%
CEDPS	UG	1.5%	17.3%	85.3%
	PGT	4.6%	5.0%	90.5%
	DR	2.7%	10.4%	86.9%
CHMLS	UG	2.6%	19.1%	81.3%
	PGT	2.6%	19.1%	78.3%
	DR	4.4%	18.7%	76.9%

Table 11: % mix of population by disability disclosure, by college and course type for 2025-26

In the intersectional data for age and disability, we see that the highest proportions of disability disclosed fall within the younger age groups in 2025-26 at 9.2% by students under 21 years of age and 2.7% for ages 21-24.

Disability / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40+
Not known / incl refused	0.7%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%
Disability	9.2%	2.7%	1.5%	0.9%	0.9%
No disability	54.4%	14.4%	6.7%	4.6%	2.9%

Table 12: intersectional % mix of population by disability disclosure and age for 2025-26

Attrition

UG: From 2020-21 to 2024-25, attrition rates for students with declared disabilities has risen from 5.2% to 9.9%. Whilst there was a similar trend amongst students who had not disclosed a disability until 2022-23, there has been a decline over the last two years. It is concerning to see that this trend in decreasing attrition rates is not currently being seen amongst disabled students.

UG attrition	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
By disclosure of disability										
Disability	100	5.2%	165	8.7%	150	8.8%	135	8.0%	150	9.9%
No disability	600	6.3%	1105	11.8%	1145	13.4%	870	11.4%	605	8.9%
Unknown incl refused	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.8%	0	4.2%	5	8.8%

Table 13: UG attrition by disability

At fheq 4 and foundation levels, the last five years have seen overall rates of attrition across the colleges for disabled students rise from 9.9% to 2020-21 to 17.2% in 2024-25. Rates are slightly higher amongst overseas students at 19.4% compared to home students to 16.9% in 2024 -25.

The intersectional data between disability and age for undergraduate attrition for 2024-25 across all levels highlight that the two lower age groups and that of 30-39 years reflect the higher levels in attrition rates amongst disabled students compared to non-disabled students at 8.6%, 15% and 19.4% respectively.

Disability / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+
Not known / incl refused	10.5%	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-
Disability	8.6%	15%	11.5%	19.4%	9.5%	10.0%	50.0%
No disability	8.3%	10.8%	15.3%	12.8%	24.0%	29.4%	0.0%

Table 14: intersectional % mix of undergraduate attrition by disability disclosure and age for 2024-25

PGT: Attrition rates amongst postgraduate taught students who have disclosed a disability are higher than non-disabled students in 2024-25 at 17.7% (45 students) and 11.8% (300 students) respectively. This is a shift from the previous two years where rates had been higher amongst non-disabled students.

In the intersectional data between disability disclosure and age, we see disproportionately higher levels of attrition for disabled postgraduate taught students across the age ranges and between the 25-29 years age group and 50-59 years, it is higher than for the non-disabled students.

Disability / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+
Not known / incl refused	50.0%	41.2%	20.0%	22.2%	0.0%	-	-
Disability	9.6%	23.3%	17.9%	21.7%	23.7%	60.0%	0.0%
No disability	11.5%	12.0%	11.2%	11.5%	11.5%	25.0%	28.6%

Table 15: intersectional % mix of postgraduate attrition by disability disclosure and age for 2024-25

Awards

UG: The combined proportion of 1st and 2:1 awards was 68% for disabled students compared to 65% for non-disabled students in 2024-25 which has risen over the last three years in line with the overall numbers being awarded 'good degrees'.

UG awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%								
Disability										
Yes	335	78%	280	73%	270	62%	280	62%	260	68%
No	1,935	80%	1,500	63%	1,185	54%	1,135	57%	1,240	65%
Not known incl Refused	-	-	0	50%	5	67%	0	17%	5	50%

Table 16: Percentage of 'good' degrees awarded to UG students by disability

There is a disparity between home and overseas students with disabilities with a higher proportion of non-disabled overseas being awarded 1st or 2:1 at 67% compared to 61% of disabled students.

There is some variation in the proportion of 'good degrees' being awarded to disabled students across the colleges and the gap between students with disabilities and non-disabled but in 2024-25 it is relatively small. BBS awards the higher number of 1st and 2:1 degrees to disabled undergraduates and CALSS the lowest.

College	Disability	No disability	Not known incl refused
BBS	73%	69%	-
CALSS	66%	63%	-
CEDPS	67%	61%	-
CHMLS	68%	67%	0.2%

Table 17: % mix of UG good degrees by disability and by college for 2024-25

The intersectional data for disability and age shows that in the under 21 age group, disabled students are being awarded a slightly lower proportion of 1st and 2:1 classifications compared to non-disabled students in 2024-25, and also in the 25-29 age group whilst the other groups show that the disabled students are being awarded a higher proportion of 'good' degrees.

Disability / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50+
Not known / incl refused	50%	100%	-	-	-	-
Disability	67%	63%	75%	80%	83%	100%
No disability	68%	59%	90%	67%	50%	-

Table 18: intersectional % mix of undergraduate awarding by disability disclosure and age for 2024-25

PGT: At postgraduate taught level, in the last three years there has been only a small variation between students who disclose a disability and non-disabled being awarded a distinction or a merit. In 2024-25, there was parity in the proportion of students across disabled and non-disabled.

PGT awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%								
By disability										

Disability	85	56%	130	70%	85	56%	95	50%	85	51%
No disability	880	64%	1,150	64%	1,125	53%	1,295	47%	1,090	51%
Not known incl refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	52%

Table 19: Percentage of distinctions and merits awarded to PGT students by disability disclosure

There is a disparity in the awarding of distinctions and merits between the home and overseas postgraduate taught students by disability disclosure. In 2024-25, 55% home students were disabled compared to 49% overseas which reflects the general trends for disclosures by domicile.

At college level, we see some variation between the proportions of distinctions and merits awarded by disability disclosure in 2024-25 to postgraduate taught students who have disclosed a disability. In CALSS and CHMLS, a slightly higher number of awards are made to disabled students.

College	Disability	No disability	Not know incl refused
BBS	51%	60%	77%
CALSS	58%	42%	25%
CEDPS	44%	46%	50%
CHMLS	52%	49%	0%

Table 20: % mix of PGT distinctions and merit awards by disability disclosure and by college for 2024-25

In the intersectional data for disability and age for the awarding of distinctions and merits to postgraduate taught students, we see very small disparities between students who have disclosed a disability and those who have not amongst the 21-24 years and the 30-39 years age groups. There is a wider gap amongst students over the age of 40 but the numbers are very low.

Disability / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59
Not known / incl refused	0%	56%	50%	67%	0%	-
Disability	-	52%	50%	54%	56%	0%
No disability	41%	50%	51%	56%	65%	63%

Table 21: intersectional % mix of post graduate taught awarding by disability disclosure and age for 2024-25

Ethnicity

Population

Brunel continues to be one of the most ethnically diverse student populations in the UK across all course types. At sector level in 2022-23, 28.2% of students in higher education were from racially minoritised backgrounds compared to 21.0% white students at Brunel. In 2025-26, Asian students made up the largest group, at the University at 42.1% while white students accounted for 19.3%. We have seen a small decrease in both groups over the last 12 months. Black students represented 17.3%, a gradual increase since 2023-24.

Ethnicity	2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25		2025-26	
	No.	%								
Arab	880	5.7%	825	5.5%	685	5.1%	645	5.8%	715	6.5%
Asian	5,925	38.1%	6,610	44.1%	6,310	46.7%	4,810	43.1%	4,635	42.1%
Black	2,710	17.5%	2,420	16.2%	2,100	15.5%	1,805	16.2%	1,910	17.3%
Chinese	820	5.3%	625	4.2%	560	4.2%	520	4.7%	470	4.3%
Not known incl Refused	150	1.0%	150	1.0%	235	1.7%	170	1.5%	205	1.8%
Other incl mixed	1,350	8.7%	1,200	8.0%	1,020	7.6%	960	8.6%	960	8.7%
White	3,695	23.8%	3,150	21.0%	2,600	19.3%	2,245	20.1%	2,125	19.3%

Table 22: Student Population by ethnicity

There is a significant disparity between the proportions of home and overseas students by ethnicity across all course types for every college in 2025-26: 51.2% Asian overseas students compared to 36.8% home students, 13.2% white overseas compared to 22.8% home and 8.9% black overseas compared to 22.1% home students.

There are various disparities in the proportion of different ethnicities represented by course type across the colleges in 2025-26: in BBS and CEDPS we see the highest number of Asian undergraduate and postgraduate taught students; the highest proportion of white students are doctoral researchers in CHMLS; at undergraduate level, the proportion of black students across the colleges is relatively consistent.

College	Course Group	Arab	Asian	Black	Chinese	Not known incl refused	Other incl Mixed	White
BBS	UG	6.0%	49.8%	18.3%	2.5%	1.5%	10.1%	11.9%
	PGT	5.2%	71.8%	8.0%	4.7%	0.4%	5.0%	4.9%
	DR	25.5%	20.6%	19.6%	9.8%	2.9%	8.8%	12.7%
CALSS	UG	5.3%	34.8%	20.6%	1.5%	2.4%	11.4%	24.0%
	PGT	5.0%	44.8%	18.5%	7.0%	1.2%	7.2%	16.3%
	DR	6.7%	14.5%	12.3%	5.0%	1.7%	10.1%	49.7%
CEDPS	UG	7.1%	45.7%	18.3%	2.5%	2.4%	8.4%	15.7%
	PGT	4.8%	61.1%	12.9%	4.8%	1.6%	5.8%	9.1%
	DR	21.1%	20.5%	7.7%	20.5%	1.3%	6.0%	22.8%
CHMLS	UG	6.2%	38.1%	18.2%	5.9%	1.8%	9.0%	20.8%
	PGT	3.1%	22.9%	18.2%	5.2%	1.3%	7.7%	41.5%
	DR	4.4%	14.3%	4.4%	3.3%	1.1%	9.9%	62.6%

Table 23: % mix of population by ethnicity, by college and course type for 2025-26

Through an intersectional lens, we see that the overlap between ethnicity and age reflects the trend identified by the single characteristic for the 2025-26 population. High rates of Asian students are shown throughout the different age groups across the University. This pattern is also replicated in the white and black student cohorts.

Ethnicity / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40+
Arab	4.1%	0.8%	0.6%	0.7%	0.3%
Asian	28.3%	8.6%	3.2%	1.3%	0.7%
Black	11.6%	2.4%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%
Chinese	1.9%	1.1%	0.8%	0.4%	0.1%

Not known / incl refused	1.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Other incl mixed	5.9%	1.3%	0.7%	0.5%	0.2%
White	11.4%	3.0%	1.8%	1.6%	1.5%

Table 24: intersectional % mix of population by ethnicity and age for 2025-26

In the intersectional data for disability and ethnicity, we see that the highest numbers of disclosures are by white students at 5.0% in 2025-26 which reflects the annual average disclosure. It is important to note that the number of disclosures by Asian students is disproportionately low at 4.1% given their significantly high representation in the student population overall. Similarly, disclosures by black disabled students are also lower than their overall representation.

Ethnicity / Disability	Not known incl refused	Disability	No disability
Arab	0.1%	0.9%	5.5%
Asian	0.7%	4.1%	37.3%
Black	0.3%	2.5%	14.5%
Chinese	0.1%	0.4%	3.8%
Not known / incl refused	0.1%	0.3%	1.5%
Other incl mixed	0.2%	1.9%	6.6%
White	0.3%	5.0%	14.0%

Table 25: intersectional % mix of population by ethnicity and disability disclosure for 2025-26

Attrition

UG: For the last three years, attrition levels among the University's undergraduates have been gradually decreasing across most ethnicities excluding the 'not known' field which has increased from 9.8% in 2022-23 to 21.7% in 2024-25. The second highest percentage was amongst black students at 12.3% in 2024-25 which whilst we see a small decline is still of concern.

UG attrition	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
By disclosure of ethnicity										
Other	55	5.9%	125	12.4%	115	12.7%	90	11.2%	70	9.4%
Asian	250	5.6%	415	9.2%	555	12.6%	410	9.8%	295	7.6%
Black	150	7.4%	315	15.0%	275	15.2%	225	13.7%	185	12.3%
Mixed	60	8.1%	105	14.2%	100	15.0%	70	12.2%	55	10.9%
Not known	5	5.8%	15	10.2%	10	9.8%	25	18.2%	30	21.7%
White	170	5.6%	300	10.6%	245	10.1%	180	9.4%	120	7.5%

Table 26: UG attrition by ethnicity group

In the intersectional data for ethnicity and age for 2024-25, we see high rates of attrition levels overall by black students in the under 21 years age group at 10.6%. This is higher than the rate for Asian and white students' attrition at 7.3% and 7.6% respectively who account for a higher proportion of the population overall. Attrition rates are also significantly higher for black students across most of the other age groups.

Ethnicity / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+
-----------------	----------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-----

Asian	7.3%	10.1%	12.3%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Black	10.6%	16.7%	25.0%	23.7%	21.1%	33.3%	-
Not known / incl refused	20.6%	19.0%	37.5%	40.0%	-	-	-
Other	8.8%	13.9%	11.8%	14.3%	0.0%	-	-
Mixed	9.7%	20.0%	0.0%	33.3%	-	0.0%	-
White	7.6%	5.8%	7.3%	2.8%	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%

Table 27: intersectional % mix of undergraduate attrition by ethnicity and age for 2024-25

The intersectional data for ethnicity and disability for 2024-25 also highlights the higher rates of undergraduate overall attrition for black, mixed race and students from other ethnic groups at 12.9%, 13.0% and 11.0% respectively who have disclosed a disability. Whilst the attrition rate for disabled Asian students seems proportionately lower, it is important to note that disclosure rates are lower amongst Asian disabled students.

Ethnicity / Disability	Not known incl refused	Disability	No disability
Asian	16.0%	7.1%	7.6%
Black	12.9%	12.9%	12.3%
Not known / incl refused	0.0%	24.3%	21.2%
Other	0.0%	11.0%	8.9%
Mixed	0.0%	13.0%	10.3%
White	0.0%	8.6%	7.1%

Table 28: intersectional % mix of undergraduate attrition by ethnicity and disability disclosure for 2024-25

PGT: The highest attrition rates amongst the postgraduate taught population are amongst the Asian and black ethnicities at 12.0% (235) and 19.6% (60) in 2024-25. This reflects the trends in the previous two years where the Asian and black ethnic groups show the highest attrition rates.

In the intersectional data for ethnicity and age for 2024-25, we see that the higher rates of attrition amongst postgraduate taught students are predominantly from different ethnicities other than white across the age groups and the numbers of black students who discontinue are proportionately the highest across the age groups.

Ethnicity / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+
Asian	14.3%	12.5%	11.8%	10.0%	8.0%	42.9%	0.0%
Black	0.0%	18.1%	19.5%	21.5%	16.7%	20.0%	0.0%
Not known / incl refused	0.0%	8.0%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	0.0%	12.1%	17.1%	17.4%	10.0%	66.7%	0.0%
Mixed	-	11.5%	26.7%	20.0%	50.0%	-	0.0%
White	0.0%	6.8%	7.2%	10.4%	15.6%	22.2%	16.7%

Table 29: intersectional % mix of postgraduate taught attrition by ethnicity and age for 2024-25

The intersectional data for ethnicity and disability for postgraduate attrition for 2024-25 shows the highest rates of black students with disabilities and from different ethnicities. Whilst the percentage of attrition amongst Asian students seem slightly lower, it should be noted that disclosure levels are also lower.

Ethnicity / Disability	Not known incl refused	Disability	No disability
Asian	31.4%	17.2%	11.3%
Black	20.0%	22.9%	18.9%
Not known / incl refused	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%
Other	50.0%	22.2%	13.6%
Mixed	-	26.7%	15.4%
White	0.0%	12.8%	8.1%

Table 30: *intersectional % mix of postgraduate attrition by ethnicity and disability disclosure for 2024-25.*

Awards

UG: The awarding gap between students of different ethnicities being awarded a 'good degree' continues to be an issue at Brunel overall. Whilst 2024-25 saw a general increase in the number of students being awarded 1st and 2:1 degrees across all ethnicities, the gap between white and black students was 18% and between white and Asian students was 13% respectively.

UG awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%								
Other	175	77%	145	65%	120	48%	105	49%	110	64%
Asian	945	79%	725	62%	560	52%	610	58%	685	63%
Black	300	70%	235	52%	190	46%	205	47%	215	58%
Mixed	150	77%	120	74%	100	64%	85	62%	95	69%
Not known incl Refused	10	56%	20	58%	15	57%	20	68%	15	68%
White	690	86%	545	74%	475	67%	390	67%	380	76%

Table 31: *Percentage of 'good' degrees awarded to UG students by ethnicity*

The gaps widen between home and overseas domiciled students with 81% white, 74% black and 60% Asian overseas students being awarded a 1st or 2:1 compared to 76% white, 64% Asian and 55% black undergraduates.

At college level, the ethnicity disparity is also visible with the black undergraduate students mainly being awarded the fewest numbers of 'good degrees' with the lowest proportion of 51% in CEDPS and white students receiving the highest in 2024-25 ranging from 74% to 79%.

College	Other	Asian	Black	Mixed	Not known incl refused	White
BBS	63%	69%	60%	74%	75%	79%
CALSS	45%	56%	60%	85%	60%	78%
CEDPS	73%	57%	51%	68%	86%	74%
CHMLS	77%	67%	60%	54%	60%	75%

Table 32: *% mix of UG good degrees by ethnicity and by college for 2024-25*

The intersectional data for ethnicity and age shows that amongst the youngest age groups, the number of black students being awarded 1st and 2:1 degrees is significantly lower compared to other ethnicities, a 9% gap in 2024-25. This then reduces amongst the 21-24 age group where the Asian students are awarded the fewest at 57% but then reverts to the black students although it should be noted that the numbers are much fewer.

Ethnicity / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+
Asian	64%	57%	72%	79%	100%	25%	-
Black	55%	59%	53%	60%	43%	43%	-
Mixed	69%	75%	83%	100%	0%	50%	-
Not known	66%	56%	75%	25%	-	-	-
White	75%	76%	85%	72%	80%	100%	100%

Table 33: intersectional % mix of undergraduate awarding by ethnicity and age for 2024-25

The intersectional data for ethnicity and disability shows that black students who have disclosed a disability receive the lowest proportion of undergraduate 1st and 2:1 classification in 2024-25. This is a 19% gap compared to disabled white students, 79% who are awarded a 1st or 2:1.

Ethnicity / Disability	Not known incl refused	Disability	No disability
Other	0%	76%	63%
Asian	50%	62%	63%
Black	-	62%	57%
Mixed	-	69%	69%
Not known	-	50%	75%
White	-	70%	76%

Table 34: intersectional % mix of undergraduate awarding by ethnicity and disability disclosure for 2024-25

PGT: We have seen an awarding gap between white postgraduate taught students and those from other ethnic minorities for several years. In 2024-25, the gap between white and black students was 18% and between white and Asian students was 22%.

PGT awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%								
Other	80	63%	110	62%	120	54%	80	48%	55	50%
Asian	460	60%	630	61%	635	49%	885	43%	815	48%
Black	105	56%	135	61%	160	48%	185	51%	110	52%
Mixed	40	71%	35	70%	40	70%	30	59%	25	65%
Not known incl Refused	10	64%	10	90%	0	33%	10	57%	30	55%
White	270	75%	315	77%	255	71%	205	70%	160	70%

Table 35: Percentage of PGT distinction and merit awards by ethnicity

There are also disparities between home and overseas postgraduate taught students with 66% white, 55% black and 48% Asian overseas students receiving a 1st or 2:1 award compared to 74% white, 66% Asian and 49% black home students respectively.

At college level, the ethnicity disparity persists amongst the postgraduate taught students with the white students mainly being awarded the highest numbers of distinction and merit classifications in 2024-25. CALSS has the lowest number of distinction and merit awards amongst Asian and black students whilst BBS has the highest.

College	Other	Asian	Black	Mixed	Not known incl refused	White
BBS	55%	59%	63%	50%	70%	79%

CALSS	50%	36%	37%	63%	50%	80%
CEDPS	44%	43%	53%	67%	47%	72%
CHMLS	55%	40%	50%	80%	38%	59%

Table 36: % mix of PGT distinction and merit awards by ethnicity and by college for 2024-25

In the intersectional data by ethnicity and age for the proportion of distinction and merit awards for the postgraduate taught students, we see that the white students receive the higher number of awards and students from different racially minoritised groups receive fewer.

Ethnicity / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+
Other	-	54%	52%	33%	56%	0%	-
Asian	36%	47%	47%	59%	54%	100%	100%
Black	50%	65%	48%	47%	42%	0%	-
Mixed	-	50%	100%	83%	0%	-	0%
Not known	100%	30%	71%	56%	75%	100%	-
White	100%	67%	75%	68%	68%	100%	100%

Table 37: intersectional % mix of PGT distinction and merit awards by ethnicity and age for 2024-25

In the intersectional data by ethnicity and disability, we see a variation of distinction and merit awards being received by the postgraduate taught students. Disabled students generally receive few awards ranging from a gap of 21% amongst the white students to 12% amongst the black students but it should be noted that significantly more white students without a disability are awarded a distinction or merit compared to black students who have not disclosed. With the Asian disabled students however, we see a higher proportion receiving distinction and merit classifications compared to their non-disabled counterparts.

Ethnicity / Disability	Not known incl refused	Disability	No disability
Other	0%	33%	52%
Asian	48%	54%	48%
Black	100%	41%	53%
Mixed	-	78%	61%
Not known	67%	50%	54%
White	0%	54%	75%

Table 38: intersectional % mix of PGT distinction and merit awards by ethnicity and disability disclosure for 2024-25

Gender / Sex

It should be noted that this report continues to report on data under the term 'gender' because this is how the data category has previously been defined by the sector and the data collected and analysed across the sector, is termed in Tableau by the University. However, this use of the term is at odds with the term 'sex' and its definition which is one of the characteristics protected by the Equality Act, 2010 and the terminology and respective set by HESA on equality data collection across the sector by the term 'sex' [Data Dictionary 25056 | HESA](#). This records options as Female, Male, or Other (where legally documented) with which Brunel complies.

Population

In 2025-26, the total core student population at Brunel comprised 44.9% female students and 54.8% male students; proportions which have remained relatively stable over the last five years. The overall distribution across 'home' and overseas students is also quite consistent. While the broader UK higher education sector has a higher proportion of students who are women at 57.1% in 2022-23, Brunel's higher proportion of men students is largely attributable to the University's technical subject mix and greater numbers of male students pursuing STEM programmes.

By gender / sex	2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25		2025-26	
	No.	%								
Female	7,030	45.3%	6,755	45.1%	6,170	45.7%	5,040	45.2%	4,945	44.9%
Male	8,435	54.3%	8,175	54.6%	7,305	54.0%	6,080	54.5%	6,035	54.8%
Not known / refused	60	0.4%	50	0.3%	40	0.3%	35	0.3%	35	0.3%

Table 39: Student Population by gender/sex

There is significant variation in the distribution between gender/sex amongst the colleges. CEDPS continues to have a significant majority of male undergraduate students at 78.4%, postgraduate 67.3% and 61.1% doctoral researchers in 2025-26. In contrast CALSS and CHMLS have a much stronger presence of female students at each level. The number of students with an unknown/non-declared gender/sex is very small and not statistically significant.

College	Course Group	Male	Female	Not known incl refused
BBS	UG	66.6%	33.3%	0.1%
	PGT	59.3%	40.7%	-
	DR	53.9%	45.1%	1.0%
CALSS	UG	36.6%	62.6%	0.7%
	PGT	40.0%	59.7%	0.2%
	DR	28.5%	68.2%	3.4%
CEDPS	UG	78.4%	21.4%	0.3%
	PGT	67.3%	69.4%	-
	DR	61.1%	38.6%	0.3%
CHMLS	UG	36.8%	63.1%	0.2%
	PGT	30.2%	68.1%	0.4%
	DR	31.9%	32.7%	-

Table 40: % mix of population by gender/sex, by college and course type for 2025-26

It should be noted that gender/sex diversity often varies significantly within departments and amongst course levels. Different subject areas are expected to make themselves aware of these distributions and monitor trends accordingly.

The intersectional data by gender/sex and age for the overarching student population in 2025- 26 shows a wide disparity in the lowest age group of under 21 years between male and female at 37.4% and 26.7% respectively. This evens out at

the 25-29 age group and in the higher age groups, there are slightly higher proportions of female students.

Gender/sex / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40+
Male	37.4%	9.2%	4.2%	2.4%	1.5%
Female	26.7%	8.3%	4.2%	3.3%	2.3%
Not known / incl refused	0.2%	0,0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 41: intersectional % mix of population by gender/sex and age for 2025-26

The intersectional data by gender/sex and disability for the overarching student population in 2025-26 shows higher disclosure by female students at 8.3% compared to male students at 6.7% proportionately given that the overall population has 10% more male students.

Gender/sex / Disability	Not known incl refused	Disability	No disability
Male	0.8%	6.7%	47.3%
Female	1.0%	8.3%	35.6%
Not known / incl refused	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%

Table 42: intersectional % mix of population by gender/sex and disability disclosure for 2025-26

The intersectional data by gender/sex and ethnicity for the overarching student population in 2025-26 shows a significant disparity between the proportions of male and female Asian students at 24.4% and 17.7% respectively. Whilst for other ethnicities, there is closer parity between male and female students such as 9.5% and 9.6% white students and 9.0% and 8.3% black students respectively.

Ethnicity/sex / Gender	Not known incl refused	Male	Female
Arab	0.0%	3.9%	2.6%
Asian	0.0%	24.4%	17.7%
Black	0.0%	9.0%	8.3%
Chinese	0.0%	2.3%	1.9%
Not known / incl refused	0.1%	1.0%	0.8%
Other incl mixed	0.0%	4.7%	4.0%
White	0.1%	9.5%	9.6%

Table 43: intersectional % mix of population by gender/sex and ethnicity for 2025-26

Attrition

UG: For 2024-25, we see a 10.9% attrition rate for men compared to 6.6% for women across all levels of UG study. This continues the trend in a steady decrease since 2022–23 where attrition rates were at their highest in recent years, and there is a notable decrease in attrition for men by almost a third in the last 2 years.

UG attrition	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
By gender/ Sex										
Female	205	4.1%	380	7.9%	370	8.5%	300	7.7%	235	6.6%
Male	490	7.7%	885	13.7%	930	15.6%	700	13.1%	525	10.9%

Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%						
Not specified/other	5	12.0%	0	4.5%	5	10.5%	5	8.8%	5	10.3%

Table 44: UG attrition by gender/sex

The intersectional data by gender/sex and age shows higher attrition rates amongst male undergraduate students in the lowest age groups for 2024-25 in line with the overall population data. However, the disparity persists within the 21-24 and 25-29 age groups unlike the population proportions where it narrows. It should be noted that the numbers for the higher age groups are small and the difference in the percentages are not significant.

Gender/sex / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59
Male	10.4%	12.9%	17.8%	17.8%	14.3%	14.3%
Female	5.6%	9.9%	10.2%	12.5%	18.8%	23.8%
Not known / incl refused	7.7%	50.0%	0.0%	-	-	-

Table 45: intersectional % mix of undergraduate attrition by gender/sex and age for 2024-25

The intersectional data for undergraduate attrition for gender/sex and disability shows a slightly higher proportion of male students with a disability compared to female students. However, it should be noted that the overall population has 10% more male students overall.

Gender/sex / Disability	Not known incl refused	Disability	No disability
Male	9.7%	11.4%	10.8%
Female	8.1%	8.3%	6.0%
Not known / incl refused	-	21.4%	0.0%

Table 46: intersectional % mix of undergraduate attrition by gender/sex and disability disclosure for 2024-25

In the intersectional data by gender/sex and ethnicity, we see higher levels of undergraduate attrition amongst male students across all ethnicities particularly those students of black, mixed and other ethnicities. Female students who have white or Asian ethnicity have the lowest rates of undergraduate attrition.

Ethnicity / Gender/sex	Not known incl refused	Male	Female
Asian	0.0%	9.3%	5.3%
Black	0.0%	15.6%	8.3%
Not known / incl refused	16.7%	20.8%	23.3%
Other	-	11.5%	7.0%
Mixed	-	11.3%	10.5%
White	12.5%	9.5%	4.9%

Table 47: intersectional % mix of undergraduate attrition by gender/sex and ethnicity for 2024-25

PGT: The trend of a higher rate of attrition amongst male postgraduate taught students compared female continues and in 2024-25 we see 14.7% (200) compared to 10.7% (160) respectively.

The intersectional data by gender/sex and age amongst male postgraduate taught students also show higher attrition rates in the lower age groups for 2024-25 as seen amongst the undergraduate students. It does shift to female students in the higher age group fields but the numbers are very small.

Gender/sex / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+
Male	14.8%	13.5%	16.3%	15.2%	12.2%	25.0%	0.0%
Female	11.1%	10.8%	8.3%	10.9%	13.2%	38.5%	28.6%
Not known / incl refused	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%		

Table 48: intersectional % mix of postgraduate taught attrition by gender/sex and age for 2024-25

The intersectional data for postgraduate taught attrition for gender/sex and disability show a higher proportion amongst male students who disclosed a disability compared to female students at 27.0% to 13.8% respectively in 2024-25.

Gender/sex / Disability	Not known incl refused	Disability	No disability
Male	45.5%	27.0%	13.4%
Female	12.5%	13.8%	10.2%
Not known / incl refused	-	0.0%	0.0%

Table 49: intersectional % mix of postgraduate taught attrition by gender/sex and disability disclosure for 2024-25

In the postgraduate taught attrition intersectional data by gender and ethnicity in 2024-25, we see higher rates amongst male students particularly of black, mixed or other ethnicities. Female students who have white or Asian ethnicity have the lowest rates of postgraduate taught attrition.

Ethnicity / Gender/sex	Not known incl refused	Male	Female
Asian	-	13.7%	10.2%
Black	-	23.6%	17.2%
Not known / incl refused	0.0%	4.8%	5.0%
Other	-	20.6%	10.0%
Mixed	-	25.9%	11.1%
White	0.0%	11%	8.3%

Table 50: intersectional % mix of postgraduate taught attrition by gender/sex and ethnicity for 2024-25

Awards

UG: For the last three years, the proportion of ‘good degrees’ being awarded has increased across the undergraduate population maintaining the disparity between female students and male students. In 2024-5, 71% of female students were awarded a 1st or 2:1 compared to 61% male students despite there being a higher number of male students in the university population.

UG awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%								
Female	1,175	82%	900	70%	725	58%	650	61%	725	71%
Male	1,085	77%	875	60%	730	54%	755	55%	770	61%

Unknown	0	100%	0	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not specified/ Other	5	100%	10	62%	5	57%	5	58%	0	67%

Table 51: Percentage of 'good' degrees awarded to UG students by gender/sex

The trend is reflected across home and overseas students but in 2024-25 there is a greater disparity between the gender/sex group with 69% female and 62% home undergraduates being awarded 'good degrees' compared to 76% male and 60% overseas students.

The gender/sex gap is consistent across the colleges with female students being awarded a higher number of 'good degrees' but with some variation in the proportion of good degrees being awarded ranging from 8% in CEDPS to 13% in CHMLS.

College	Male	Female	Unknown	Not specified / other
BBS	66%	76%	-	-
CALSS	57%	67%	-	-
CEDPS	60%	68%	-	67%
CHMLS	59%	72%	0.2%	

Table 52: % mix of UG good degrees by gender/sex and by college for 2024-25

The intersectional data for gender/sex and age for the undergraduate students shows that in the two younger age groups, the male students are being awarded a lower proportion of 1st and 2:1 classifications in 2024-25. This reverses in the 25-29 age group and there is parity from the 30 years age group upwards although there are fewer numbers of students.

Gender/sex / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50+
Male	61%	60%	79%	80%	50%	100%
Female	71%	66%	76%	80%	50%	100%
Unknown	100%	-	-	-	-	-
Not specified / other	67%	-	-	-	-	-

Table 53: intersectional % mix of undergraduate awarding by gender/sex and age for 2024-25

In the intersectional data for gender/sex and disability, we see that whilst there is very little difference between the disabled and non-disabled by gender / sex, male students who have disclosed a disability are being awarded the lower proportion of 1st and 2:1 degree classifications in 2024-25.

Gender/sex / Disability	Not known incl refused	Disability	No disability
Male	33%	62%	61%
Female	67%	72%	70%
Unknown	-	100%	100%
Not specified / other	-	67%	-

Table 54: intersectional % mix of undergraduate awarding by gender/sex and disability disclosure for 2024-25

The intersectional data for gender/sex and ethnicity for the undergraduate students shows the disparity between female and male students reflected across all the ethnicities. It is the black male students who are receiving the lowest proportion of 1st

and 2:1 awards in 2024-25 compared to other ethnicities, and 21% lower than white male students.

Ethnicity / Gender/sex	Not specified / other	Male	Female
Other	-	63%	67%
Asian	-	59%	68%
Black	-	51%	65%
Mixed	-	63%	76%
Not known	100%	82%	57%
White	50%	72%	81%

Table 55: *intersectional % mix of undergraduate awarding by gender/sex and ethnicity for 2024-25*

PGT: At postgraduate taught level there has been a slight gender/sex gap between female and male students being awarded a distinction or merit classification over recent years. In 2024-25, it widened to 8% with 55% of female students and 47% of male students respectively being awarded a distinction or merit.

PGT awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%								
By gender/ Sex										
Female	515	65%	645	68%	605	58%	680	50%	665	55%
Male	450	62%	590	62%	605	50%	710	45%	525	47%
Other	5	75%	0	20%	5	67%	0	50%	5	100%

Table 56: *Percentage of distinctions and merits awarded to PGT students by gender/sex*

There is a significant disparity in the awarding of distinctions and merits between the home and overseas postgraduate taught students by gender/sex. In 2024-25, we see 61% female and 66% male home students compared with 54% female and 46% male overseas students.

At college level, we see some variation between the proportions of distinctions and merits awarded by gender/sex in 2024-25 with few distinction and merit awards being received by male postgraduate taught students.

College	Male	Female	Other
BBS	56%	64%	-
CALSS	38%	46%	100%
CEDPS	42%	55%	100%
CHMLS	47%	55%	25%

Table 57: *% mix of PGT distinctions and merit awards by gender/sex and by college for 2024-25*

The intersectional data for gender/sex and age for the postgraduate taught students shows the gap between female and male students receiving distinction and merit awards reflected across most of the age group fields excluding students over 50 years of age in 2024-25 but these are very small numbers. We see the widest gap amongst the under 21 and 25-29 age groups in 2024-25 between female and male students of 11%.

Gender/sex / Age	Under 21	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+

Male	35%	48%	45%	52%	50%	60%	100%
Female	46%	53%	56%	59%	55%	50%	50%
Not known / incl refused	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	-

Table 58: intersectional % mix of PGT distinction and awards by gender/sex and age for 2024-25

In the intersectional data for gender/sex and disability for the postgraduate taught students, whilst there is parity between disabled and non-disabled female students, we see a gap of 12% with female students who disclose a disability receiving a higher proportion of distinctions and merit compared to male students who disclose.

Gender/sex / Disability	Not known incl refused	Disability	No disability
Male	58%	43%	47%
Female	47%	55%	55%
Not known / incl refused	-	100%	100%

Table 59: intersectional % mix of PGT distinction and merit awards by gender/sex and disability disclosure for 2024-25

The intersectional data for gender/sex and ethnicity for the postgraduate taught students shows a disparity across all ethnicities though there is a variation in distinction and merit awards for female and male students according to ethnicity in 2024-25. For the white students there is a small disparity between gender. However, across the racially minoritised groups, we see a higher proportion of female students receiving distinctions and merits. The wider gender/sex gaps are amongst students from mixed race backgrounds at 23% and other ethnicities at 23%.

Ethnicity / Gender/sex	Not known incl refused	Male	Female
Other	-	38%	61%
Asian	-	45%	51%
Black	-	49%	53%
Mixed	-	53%	76%
Not known	100%	47%	58%
White	100%	69%	70%

Table 60: intersectional % mix of PGT distinction and merit awards by gender/sex and ethnicity for 2024-25

Gender Reassignment

Population

Brunel takes an inclusive approach to gender reassignment as defined by the equality legislation. The data collection obligations determined by HESA mean that our data on this area is framed by asking students to self-declare whether their gender identity is the same as they were assigned at birth.

In 2025-26, 97.3% of students chose to self-declare that they identify in the same gender they were assigned at birth, while 2.0% chose not to disclose or refused to answer. A small proportion, 0.7% identified as a different gender from the one assigned as birth. The numbers are very small and there has been a decrease over the five-year period.

	2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25		2025-26	
	No.	%								
Gender identity same at birth										
Yes	15,080	97.1%	14,545	97.1%	13,140	97.2%	10,860	97.4%	10,720	97.3%
No	145	0.9%	135	0.9%	110	0.8%	85	0.8%	75	0.7%
Not known / refused	300	1.9%	300	2.0%	265	2.0%	210	1.9%	220	2.0%

Table 61: Student Population by gender reassignment

At sector level, 1.2% of students disclosed that they did not identify with the gender that they were assigned at birth in 2022-23.

There is a slight variation in proportion of students who do not identify in the same gender as they were assigned at birth by college ranging from 0.4% in BBS and CHMLS to 1.6% in CALSS.

Attrition

UG: The rates of attrition by gender reassignment status are so small that it is not possible to see discernible statistical difference in the last 5 years.

UG attrition	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
By gender reassignment status	No.	%								
Information refused	15	6.9%	25	11.8%	30	15.1%	25	13.2%	15	9.8%
No	10	11.2%	15	14.9%	15	15.6%	10	9.5%	10	13.7%
Yes	675	6.1%	1230	11.2%	1260	12.5%	975	10.8%	735	9.0%

Table 62: UG attrition by gender reassignment status

None of the intersectional data for gender reassignment with other protected characteristics such as age, disability, ethnicity or gender show any significant information as the data numbers are so small.

PGT: No attrition is recorded amongst the postgraduate taught students regarding gender reassignment. However, it should be noted that information was refused by 15 students. As such it is not possible to conduct any intersectional analysis.

Awards

UG: The proportion of 1st and 2:1 classifications awarded has increased since 2023-24 across all categories, but there is no statistically significant gap in awards outcome by gender reassignment status.

UG awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
Gender same at birth	No.	%								
No	10	63%	10	69%	15	64%	15	50%	15	82%
Yes	2,235	79%	1,735	64%	1,420	56%	1,370	58%	1455	65%

Information Refused	20	78%	35	69%	25	67%	30	62%	30	82%
---------------------	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----

Table 63: Percentage of 'good' degrees awarded to UG students by gender reassignment

PGT: Because of the very small numbers concerned and the sensitivity of the question, it is not possible to provide data on the proportions of postgraduate taught students who do not identify in the same gender assigned at birth.

Religion or Belief

Population

Brunel continues to be richly diverse in terms of the range of religions or beliefs including none disclosed by the student population. Muslim students comprise the largest religious group at 35.4% in 2025-26. Christian students make up 24.2% of the student body, a slight increase in recent years. The proportions of Hindu students and those with no religion beliefs have seen a slight decline over the recent years to 12.2% and 15.1% in 2025-26 respectively. The proportion of students with beliefs amongst other religions have remained relatively low and consistent such as 1.3% Buddhists, 0.3% Jewish students and 1.7% other religions. 7.1% of students preferred not to disclose information regarding religion or belief, while a small percentage, 0.4% had unknown religious affiliations.

Religion	2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25		2025-26	
	No.	%								
Not known / refused	30	0.2%	35	0.2%	-	-	-	-	10	0.1%
Buddhist	185	1.2%	160	1.1%	175	1.3%	160	1.4%	145	1.3%
Christian	3,755	24.2%	3,435	22.9%	3,005	22.2%	2,615	23.5%	2,675	24.3%
Hindu	1,905	12.3%	2,490	16.6%	2,305	17.0%	1,485	13.3%	1,350	12.2%
Jewish	45	0.3%	45	0.3%	30	0.2%	30	0.3%	35	0.3%
Muslim	4,895	31.5%	4,700	31.4%	4,450	32.9%	3,870	34.7%	3,905	35.4%
Other	180	1.2%	190	1.3%	200	1.5%	185	1.7%	190	1.7%
Sikh	425	2.8%	450	3.0%	415	3.1%	270	2.4%	265	2.4%
Spiritual	125	0.8%	85	0.6%	-	-	-	-	-	-
No religion	3,190	20.6%	2,610	17.4%	2,165	16.0%	1,830	16.4%	1,660	15.1%
Prefer not to say	790	5.1%	780	5.2%	775	5.7%	705	6.3%	785	7.1%

Table 64: Student Population by Religion

At sector level, 41.6% of students disclosed that they did not have any religion, 28.9% were Christian, 11.5% were Muslim and 7.3% withheld information with the remaining proportion split between other beliefs in 2022-23. This presents quite a different distribution of religions compared to Brunel's population at the time.

There is some variation amongst the different religions between the home students and the overseas students. In 2025-26, the most significant proportions were 26.2% Christian students, 7.4% Hindu, 38.4% Muslim students and 15.2% amongst the home students compared to 21.0% Christian, 20.7% Hindu, 30.4% Muslim and 14.9% amongst the overseas students.

There is a range of different religious representation across different course groups within the colleges in 2025-29. The proportion of Muslim students amongst the undergraduates vary from 43.9% in CEDPS to 32.8% in CHMLS. The range of

Christian undergraduate students varies from 21.2% in CEDPS to 27.5% in CHMLS. There is a wide disparity between undergraduates who disclose no religious affiliation ranging from 8.5% in BBS to 17.7% in CHMLS, and the number of Hindu students ranges from 13.0% in BBS to 6.0% in CALSS.

At postgraduate taught level, we seem some wide disparities between colleges in the split tables below. The religion that has the highest proportion of students is Hindu in BBS at 42.0% whereas in CHMLS there are only 6.8%. There are 12.7% Christian Students in BBS compared to 35.9% in CHMLS, 17.2% Muslim in CHMLS compared to 33.8% in CALSS. At doctoral researcher level, Christian, Muslim and no religious affiliations have the highest representation across the colleges proportionately. Other religious groups, such as Sikh, Spiritual, and Buddhist students, tend to have smaller proportions across all levels of study. Notably, Jewish students consistently form a very small percentage across all categories, while students preferring not to disclose their religion make up a moderate proportion, across all course types.

College	Course Group	Not known incl refused	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim
BBS	UG	0.1%	0.7%	25.3%	13.0%	0.1%	42.2%
	PGT	0.6%	3.0%	12.7%	42.0%	-	25.7%
	DR	-	-	25.6%	2.9%	-	44.1%
CALSS	UG	-	0.7%	25.7%	6.0%	0.6%	35.9%
	PGT	-	1.0%	24.0%	13.7%	0.2%	33.8%
	DR	-	1.1%	29.1%	3.4%	0.6%	16.8%
CEDPS	UG	0.1%	1.6%	21.2%	10.1%	0.0%	43.9%
	PGT	-	2.4%	18.7%	35.1%	-	25.2%
	DR	-	2.7%	13.4%	6.4%	0.3%	34.9%
CHMLS	UG	0.1%	1.3%	27.5%	9.7%	0.7%	32.8%
	PGT	-	0.9%	35.9%	6.8%	0.7%	17.2%
	DR	0.1%	1.3%	27.5%	9.7%	0.7%	32.8%

Table 65a: % mix of population by religion, by college and course type for 2025-26

College	Course Group	Other	Seikh	Spiritual	No religion	Prefer not to say
BBS	UG	1.8%	3.4%	-	8.5%	4.9%
	PGT	1.5%	2.4%	-	7.5%	4.7%
	DR	2.9%	-	-	20.6%	2.9%
CALSS	UG	2.4%	2.8%	-	17.5%	8.4%
	PGT	1.9%	1.9%	-	15.1%	8.4%
	DR	3.9%	-	-	35.8%	9.5%
CEDPS	UG	1.3%	2.5%	-	11.8%	7.6%
	PGT	0.8%	1.0%	-	9.9%	6.9%
	DR	2.7%	0.3%	-	31.5%	7.7%
CHMLS	UG	1.2%	2.5%	-	17.7%	6.5%
	PGT	3.0%	2.1%	-	23.4%	10.0%
	DR	1.2%	3.5%	-	17.6%	6.5%

Table 66b: % mix of population by religion, by college and course type for 2025-26

Attrition

UG: Attrition rates amongst religious groups across the undergraduate population have decreased since 2022-23 as per the general trend. In 2024-24, Christianity and Islam were the religious groups where we see the highest rates of attrition at 9.9% and 9.8% respectively.

UG attrition	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
By religion										
Buddhist	5	2.3%	15	11.4%	10	11.0%	5	4.8%	5	6.9%
Christian	195	7.0%	325	12.2%	285	11.6%	230	10.6%	200	9.9%
Hindu	40	3.8%	80	8.3%	115	11.9%	85	9.0%	60	7.0%
Jewish	0	3.1%	5	9.1%	0	2.9%	0	3.6%	0	0.0%
Muslim	220	5.9%	450	11.3%	510	13.6%	415	12.1%	310	9.8%
Sikh	20	5.3%	35	10.9%	80	23.8%	35	12.9%	15	7.0%
Spiritual	5	7.6%	15	19.5%	20	37.0%	0	50.0%	0	100.0%
None	175	6.7%	265	11.3%	205	10.5%	160	9.8%	110	8.2%
Unknown	35	5.6%	65	10.7%	60	10.3%	55	10.0%	50	9.0%
Other	10	8.0%	15	9.0%	20	14.2%	15	9.5%	10	7.0%

Table 67: UG attrition by religion

The intersectional data for religion reflects the trends already highlighted in age, ethnicity and gender. The highest rate of undergraduate attrition can be seen amongst Muslim and Christian students under 21 years at 16.6% (160 students) and 17.3% (105) in 2024-25. By intersecting religion with ethnicity data, we see that Muslim students with black, Asian or other ethnicity have the highest attrition at 18.8% (45), 15.7% (85) and 18.4% (40) along with black Christian students at 21.4% (60) in 2024-25. A similar pattern can be seen with the religion and gender intersectional data with highest rates of attrition in male Muslim and Christian undergraduates at 18.9% (130) and 20.6% (90).

PGT: At postgraduate taught level, we see a trend of higher levels of attrition amongst Hindu, Muslim and Christian students at 115, 100 and 70 respectively over recent years. In 2024-25, the intersectional data shows that these three groups have the highest attrition amongst students between the 21-24 years and 25-29 years age groups and that slightly more disabled students will be Muslim or Christian, male students. The highest rates of attrition intersecting ethnicity and religion can be seen amongst Hindu and Muslim Asian postgraduate taught students at 115 and 65 respectively and 40 black Christian students.

Awards

UG: There is a wide variety in the number of 'good degrees' being awarded to undergraduates of different religions and none. Of note, is that Muslim students continue to be awarded the fewest 1st and 2:1 degrees compared to other students, a trend which has persisted over the last five years.

UG awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%								
Religion										
Buddhist	25	82%	30	69%	10	63%	15	70%	20	75%
Christian	590	79%	380	64%	325	53%	330	56%	360	66%
Hindu	250	88%	165	61%	130	53%	135	59%	165	65%
Jewish	10	89%	5	71%	5	70%	5	71%	10	89%
Muslim	630	75%	545	59%	450	48%	460	52%	490	60%
Sikh	85	83%	50	63%	40	51%	35	58%	55	72%
Spiritual	15	81%	15	71%	20	66%	0	0%	-	-

None	555	81%	455	76%	375	67%	325	45%	395	75%
Unknown	100	81%	110	71%	80	71%	95	67%	80	73%
Other	15	80%	30	71%	20	63%	15	68%	25	68%

Table 68: Percentage of 'good' degrees awarded to UG students by religion

At college level, the disparity between undergraduates of different religions or none, is also reflected in the proportion of 'good degrees' being awarded.

College	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim
BBS	82%	73%	80%	0%	62%
CALSS	0%	66%	48%	-	51%
CEDPS	50%	65%	49%	-	61%
CHMLS	100%	63%	69%	100%	63%

Table 69a: % mix of UG good degrees by religion and by college for 2024-25

College	Sikh	Spiritual	None	Unknown	Other
BBS	74%	-	83%	68%	74%
CALSS	87%	-	75%	81%	65%
CEDPS	44%	-	78%	68%	65%
CHMLS	82%	-	75%	72%	69%

Table 69b: % mix of UG good degrees by religion and by college for 2024-25

PGT: There is a variety of distinction and merit awarding to postgraduate taught students by religion to both home and overseas over recent years. In 2024-25, where we see larger numbers of students who have disclosed a particular religion such as Christian, Hindu and Muslim, the proportion of distinction and merit awards are lower.

UG awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Buddhist	35	76%	25	72%	15	59%	25	63%	25	57%
Christian	235	66%	275	64%	315	58%	290	54%	190	54%
Hindu	70	61%	215	59%	270	47%	465	41%	380	46%
Jewish	5	83%	5	100%	0	100%	5	80%	0	100%
Muslim	170	59%	260	61%	275	50%	300	45%	315	50%
Sikh	10	50%	35	78%	20	45%	20	37%	30	45%
Spiritual	15	74%	15	76%	10	40%	10	75%	-	-
None	360	63%	325	70%	245	61%	180	57%	160	64%
Other	10	71%	10	60%	10	55%	15	49%	15	48%
Unknown	55	70%	70	74%	55	56%	80	82%	70	60%

Table 70: Percentage of distinction and merit awards to PGT students by religion

At college level, the diversity of the postgraduate taught students' religions and none, is also reflected in the proportion of distinction and merit awards in 2024-25.

College	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim
BBS	68%	69%	55%		62%
CALSS	38%	40%	33%	-	40%
CEDPS	47%	55%	41%	-	45%
CHMLS	75%	48%	22%	100%	50%

Table 71a: % mix of PGT distinction and merit awards by religion and by college for 2024-25

College	Sikh	Spiritual	None	Unknown	Other
BBS	56%	-	76%	60%	70%
CALSS	17%	-	64%	64%	56%
CEDPS	40%	-	57%	22%	56%

CHMLS	14%	-	66%	33%	52%
-------	-----	---	-----	-----	-----

Table 71b: % mix of PGT distinction and merit awards by religion and by college for 2024-25

Sexual Orientation

Population

In the 2025-26 census, we see that 87.7% of the student population at Brunel self-identify as heterosexual compared to other sexualities with little change over the last 5 years and there is little disparity between home and overseas students. There has been a slight decrease in those who identify as bisexual and of other sexual orientations since 2023-24 and a slight increase in the proportion of gay women but the numbers are very small. The percentage of students choosing not to disclose their sexual orientation has remained consistent since 2023-24.

Sexual orientation	2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25		2025-26	
	No.	%								
Not known / refused	995	6.4%	1,030	6.9%	1,040	7.7%	815	7.3%	835	7.6%
Bisexual	475	3.1%	465	3.1%	415	3.1%	310	2.8%	270	2.4%
Gay man	105	0.7%	95	0.6%	75	0.5%	55	0.5%	60	0.5%
Gay woman / lesbian	75	0.5%	55	0.4%	55	0.4%	55	0.5%	70	0.6%
Hetero-sexual	13,535	87.2%	12,895	86.1%	11,675	86.4%	9,750	87.4%	9,660	87.7%
Other sexual orientation	340	2.2%	440	2.9%	255	1.9%	160	1.5%	130	1.2%

Table 72: Student Population by sexual orientation

At sector level, 72.6% of students self-identified as heterosexual in 2022-23 with 6.0% bisexual, 2.4% identifying as gay or lesbian and 10.2 preferring not to disclose.

We see some further variation by college and course type. In 2025-26, at undergraduate level there are higher proportions of students who do not declare their sexual orientation as heterosexual whilst at doctoral researcher level this shifts to CALSS. There are also higher levels of disclosure within the postgraduate population of more diverse sexual orientation.

College	Course Group	Hetero-sexual	Other Sexual Orientation	Bi-sexual	Gay man	Gay woman / Lesbian	Not known incl refused
BBS	UG	92.9%	0.7%	1.0%	0.2%	0.1%	5.0%
	PGT	85.8%	0.9%	2.1%	0.7%	0.2%	10.3%
	DR	86.3%	2.0%	2.9%	-	-	8.8%
CALSS	UG	81.9%	2.4%	5.0%	1.1%	1.4%	8.2%
	PGT	81.1%	1.4%	3.6%	0.5%	1.1%	12.5%
	DR	72.6%	3.4%	8.4%	2.2%	-	13.4%
CEDPS	UG	90.7%	0.9%	1.5%	0.3%	0.3%	6.2%
	PGT	83.5%	1.0%	2.0%	0.4%	0.6%	12.5%
	DR	82.9%	1.7%	3.0%	0.7%	0.7%	11.1%
CHMLS	UG	88.8%	1.1%	2.4%	0.5%	0.8%	6.4%

	PGT	86.7%	0.3%	2.7%	0.5%	1.0%	8.7%
	DR	76.9%	1.1%	4.4%	1.1%	3.3%	13.2%

Table 73: % mix of population by sexual orientation, by college and course type for 2025-26

Attrition

UG: The attrition rates amongst undergraduate and postgraduate taught students who do not disclose as heterosexual are slightly higher than those who do but the number of students concerned is relatively small.

UG attrition	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
By sexual orientation										
Bisexual	25	7.5%	40	12.2%	45	15.2%	35	13.3%	20	9.1%
Gay man	5	5.3%	5	9.1%	10	15.9%	10	16.1%	5	10.0%
Gay woman / lesbian	0	3.0%	10	13.6%	10	16.0%	5	11.4%	5	6.3%
Heterosexual / straight	610	6.0%	1,135	11%	1,125	12.3%	870	10.6%	670	9.0%
Unknown incl refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
Other sexual orientation	15	7.8%	20	10.9%	35	19.6%	20	14.0%	15	13.1%
Preferred not to say	40	7.0%	60	9.3%	75	12.3%	65	10.5%	45	8.5%

Table 74: UG attrition by sexual orientation

None of the intersectional data for sexual orientation with other protected characteristics such as age, disability, ethnicity or gender/sex show any significant information as the data numbers are so small.

PGT: In 2024-25 we see low attrition amongst postgraduate taught students who do not identify as heterosexual but the number of students concerned is very small with 20 bisexual students and 5 who express their sexual orientation as other. 45 have not shared information regarding their sexual orientation. Because of the low numbers it is not possible to conduct any intersectional data analysis.

Awards

UG: There is some variation between undergraduate students' sexual orientation and the awarding of 1st and 2:1 classifications over recent years although the number of 'good awards' being made have increased across all sexualities in the last 12 months.

UG awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%								
Sexual Orientation										
Bisexual	50	74%	65	79%	45	71%	50	74%	55	76%
Gay man	10	80%	15	81%	15	78%	15	83%	5	78%
Gay woman / lesbian	15	72%	10	79%	10	71%	5	50%	5	57%
Heterosexual / straight	2,080	80%	1,555	64%	1,290	55%	1,235	57%	1,310	65%

Information refused	90	79%	100	63%	65	54%	90	59%	95	69%
Other sexual orientation	25	64%	30	65%	25	64%	15	52%	25	55%

Table 75: Percentage of 'good' degrees awarded to UG students by sexual orientation

At college level, we can also see the variation of different sexual orientation of undergraduate students and the proportion of 'good degrees' being awarded. It should be noted that the number of disclosures by students with other sexualities not including heterosexual are low.

College	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman / lesbian	Hetero-sexual	Information refused	Other sexual orientation
BBS	88%	-	-	69%	76%	64%
CALSS	93%	100%	25%	61%	72%	55%
CEDPS	56%	100%	-	62%	63%	36%
CHMLS	67%	50%	100%	67%	68%	67%

Table 76: % mix of UG good degrees by sexual orientation and by college for 2024-25

PGT: We have seen a variety of distinction and merit awarding to postgraduate taught students by sexual orientation over recent years. Given the very small numbers of students who disclose their sexuality as non-heterosexual, it is currently not possible to identify any trends in the data.

UG awards	2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24		2024-25	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Sexual Orientation										
Other	25	60%	40	63%	55	50%	70	39%	15	53%
Bisexual	30	65%	35	71%	35	56%	50	55%	35	49%
Gay man	5	75%	15	93%	5	54%	5	40%	5	57%
Gay woman / lesbian	5	67%	10	100%	5	67%	5	83%	5	83%
Heterosexual / straight	800	64%	1,045	55%	1,025	54%	1,145	48%	1,025	52%
Information refused	95	61%	95	58%	95	48%	115	47%	105	44%

Table 77: Percentage of distinction and merit awards to PGT students by sexual orientation

Because of the low numbers, it is not possible to conduct any analysis at domicile or college level, or to provide a narrative on the intersectional data.

Key Reflections from the Equality Data Analysis

This equality analysis has been focused on highlighting the distribution of different protected characteristics across the core Brunel student population and student attrition and award outcomes for undergraduate and postgraduate taught core students, to foster an improved understanding of inequity impacting our community. The key findings can be summarised as follows:

Population

- *The proportion of students under 21 years of age across all types has increased by 9.2% from 2022-23 to 2025-26 with 26.8% more home students than overseas students*
- *The total proportion of students disclosing disabilities is 15.2% in 2025-26 with 19.7% home students disclosing compared with 7.4% overseas. The highest proportions of disability are disclosed by students under 21 years of age at 9.2%*
- *Brunel continues to have one of the most ethnically diverse student populations in the UK across all course types. In 2025-26, Asian students make up the largest group, at 42.1% while white students account for 19.3% and black students represent 17.3%. There are 51.2% Asian overseas students compared to 36.8% home students, 13.2% white overseas compared to 22.8% home students and 8.9% black overseas students compared to 22.1% home students*
- *15% of white students disclose a disability compared to 4.1% Asian students which is disproportionately low given their high representation in the population*
- *Brunel continues to have a gender/sex imbalance with 44.9% female students compared to 54.8% male students largely attributable to the University's technical subject mix though it does vary by college and department*
- *There is a higher disclosure of disability by female students at 8.3% compared to male students at 6.7% proportionately significant given that the whole population has a disparity of 10% more male students*
- *There is a significant disparity between the proportions of male and female Asian students at 24.4% and 17.7% respectively*
- *Brunel continues to be richly diverse in terms of the range of religion and belief, or none disclosed by the student population with 35.4% Muslim students and 24.2% Christian comprising the largest groups.*

Attrition

- *Overarching attrition gaps between undergraduates of under 21 years of age decreased over the last three years from 12.3% to 8.4%*
- *Attrition rates for undergraduate students with declared disabilities has risen from 5.2% to 9.9% and unlike non-disabled students, has continued to rise. Rates are particularly high amongst students under 21 years of age at 8.6% compared to non-disabled students. They are also higher within the postgraduate taught population at 17.7%*
- *Attrition amongst black students in 2024-25 was 12.3%. It was also particularly high within students under 21 years of age at 10.6% but across all age groups*

- *There are high rates of attrition for black, mixed race and students from other ethnic groups amongst the undergraduates at 12.9%, 13.0% and 11.0% respectively who have disclosed a disability. Whilst the attrition rate for disabled Asian students seems lower, it is important to note that disclosure rates are lower amongst Asian disabled students. Amongst the postgraduate taught community, the highest rates are the Asian students at 12.0% and black students 19.6% in 2024-25*
- *There continues to be a higher attrition rate for male undergraduate students compared to female although it has decreased over the last two years. In 2024-25, it was 10.9% and it was higher within the lower age groups amongst the male undergraduates, and those who disclose disability. There are higher levels of attrition amongst male students across all ethnicities particularly those students of black, mixed and other ethnicities*
- *There continues to be a higher trend rate of attrition also amongst male postgraduate taught students compared to female, in 2024-25 at 14.7% compared to 10.7% respectively. This tends to be mainly within the lower age groups. There was a higher proportion amongst male students who disclosed a disability compared to female at 27.0% to 13.8% respectively in 2024-25. By ethnicity the higher rates amongst male students are particularly of black, mixed or other ethnicities*
- *In 2024-25, Christianity and Islam were the religious groups where we see the highest rates of attrition at 9.9% and 9.8% respectively. The highest rate of undergraduate attrition can be seen amongst Muslim and Christian students under 21 years of age at 16.6% and 17.3% in 2024-25. We also note that Muslim students with black, Asian or other ethnicity have the highest attrition at 18.8%, 15.7% and 18.4% along with black Christian students at 21.4% in the same academic year. The highest rates of attrition by gender/sex and religion are seen in male Muslim and Christian undergraduates at 18.9% and 20.6%*
- *At postgraduate taught level, there are higher levels of attrition amongst Hindu, Muslim and Christian students particularly amongst students between the 21-24 years and 25-29 years age groups. There is a slightly higher proportion of those who are Muslim or Christian and who disclose a disability. The highest rates of attrition can be seen with Hindu and Muslim Asian postgraduate taught students and black Christian students.*

Awarding

- *Whilst the awarding of 1st and 2:1 degrees has increased across the age groups since 2022-23 and the lower age groups, under 21 and 21-24 years have consistently been awarded a lower proportion at 65% and 62% respectively. At postgraduate taught level there has been a fairly even distribution of distinction and merit classifications being awarded across the different age groups in recent years. There is a discrepancy between distinction and merit awards made to home postgraduate taught students compared to overseas. In 2024-25, we see 59% of 21- 24 home compared to 49% and 68% of 25-29 compared to 50% overseas*
- *The combined proportion of 1st and 2:1 awards was 68% for disabled students compared to 65% for non-disabled students in 2024-25 which reflects the general rise in awards. A higher proportion of non-disabled overseas being awarded 1st or 2:1 at 67% compared to 61% of disabled students. In the under 21 age group, disabled students are being awarded slightly fewer proportion of 1st and 2:1 classification compared to non-disabled students in 2024-25, At postgraduate taught level there has been only a small variation between students who disclose a disability and non-disabled being awarded a distinction or a merit. However, there is some disparity between home and overseas at 55% compared to 49%*
- *The awarding gap between students of different ethnicities being awarded a 'good degree' continues to be an issue at Brunel. The gap between white and black undergraduate students was 18% and 13% and between white and Asian students respectively in 2024-25. The gaps widen between home and overseas domiciled students with 81% white, 74% black and 60% Asian overseas students being awarded a 1st or 2:1 compared to 76% white, 64% Asian and 55% black undergraduates. There are 9% fewer black students being awarded 1st and 2:1 degrees within the lowest group and then Asian students amongst the 21-24 age group. Black disabled students receive the lowest proportion of undergraduate 1st and 2:1 classifications and in 2024-25 there was a 19% gap compared to disabled white students*
- *There continues to be an ethnic awarding gap between white postgraduate taught students and those from other ethnic minorities. In 2024-25, the gap between white and black students was 18% and between white and Asian students was 22% respectively. There are also disparities between home and overseas postgraduate taught students with 66% white, 55% black and 48% Asian overseas students being awarded a distinction or merit compared to 74% white, 66% Asian and 49% black home students. White students receive the higher number of awards and students from different racially minoritised groups receive fewer. Disabled students generally receive fewer awards ranging from a gap of 21% amongst the white students to 12% amongst the black students but the Asian*

disabled student receive more distinction and merit classifications compared to their non-disabled counterparts

- In 2024-5, 71% of female students were awarded a 1st or 2:1 degree compared to 61% male students. There is a greater gender/sex disparity between home and overseas students with 69% female and 62% home undergraduates being awarded 'good degrees' compared to 76% and 60%. in the two younger age groups, male students are awarded a lower proportion of 1st and 2:1 classifications in 2024-25. There is little disparity between gender/sex and disability. It is the black male students who are awarded the lowest proportion of 1st and 2:1 classification in 2024-25 compared to other ethnicities, and 21% lower than white male students.*
- There is an 8% gender/sex gap between female and male postgraduate taught students being awarded a distinction or merit at 55% and 47% respectively in 2024-25. There is a disparity between the home and overseas postgraduate taught students by gender/sex. In 2024-25, 61% female and 66% male home students compared with 54% female and 46% male overseas students were awarded a distinction or merit. The gap is also reflected amongst most of the age groups with the widest gap amongst the under 21 and 25-29 age groups in 2024-25 between female and male students of 11%. We see 12% more female students who disclose a disability receive a higher proportion of distinctions and merit compared to male students who disclose. The gap is reflected across all ethnicities with the widest in mixed race backgrounds at 23% and other ethnicities at 23%.*
- Muslim undergraduate students continue to be awarded the fewest 1st and 2:1 classifications compared to other students, a trend which has persisted over the last five years. At postgraduate taught level lower numbers of distinction and merit awards are made to the higher proportion of students who have disclosed a particular religion such as Christian, Hindu and Muslim.*

Recommendations for Further Investigation

There are several areas where the student equity work would benefit from a deeper understanding of the equality data and student experience to address the inequities that students face:

- Applicants' pipeline analysis by protected characteristic where available
- Qualitative data to understand the experiences of students at Brunel particularly with respect to equity and inclusion
- A deeper review of the inequalities associated with the ethnicity gap particularly the University's black students. It is recommended that information regarding entry qualifications, religion and belief, commuter and social-economic status including whether the students have part-time jobs would be very useful. Both quantitative and qualitative data would be useful

- More in-depth analysis of the types of disabilities that impact the attrition and awarding data at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels
- Further comparisons against sector averages and benchmarks drawing from OfS and HESA data
- Further understanding with respect to any structural barriers within the University's education provision which disproportionately disadvantage minoritised groups within the teaching design and delivery, and assessment procedures and communications such as the final year project
- Analysis of the graduate progression data including securing of graduate level jobs and entry into postgraduate education
- Further intersectional analysis to develop a more detailed understanding of how the different aspects of identity potentially face additional disadvantage and inequity within higher education and the student journey.

Addressing Student Inequities

The University is committed to providing a fair, equitable and inclusive learning and research environment for the whole community and ensuring that every student has a positive student experience and reach their full potential. The data analysis of the population, attrition and awarding data above reveals the breadth of the diversity of the student demographics, the five-year trends and where current inequities lie. Action is required to redress these disparities and a comprehensive programme of improvement is set out in the University's institution wide four-year Equity Strategy and Delivery Plan, [Equity Strategy 2025-2029](#). The focus of Pillar 2 is to foster and deliver social justice-driven education, research and outcomes: a University that foregrounds curriculum design and delivery that is representative of our communities, decolonises our education provision and assessment methods, diversifies teaching, learning and research materials. Priority areas which require development are:

- To address student outcomes by protected characteristic
- To cultivate disability and neurodivergence affirmative culture and support the reduction of attrition and awarding gaps and improve student experience and a sense of belonging
- To create a safe student experience and prevent sexual violence and harassment
- To enhance and uplift black student belonging
- To create a positive and equitable student experience for ensuring minoritised students' needs are foregrounded
- To uplift the student voice facilitating their contribution to decision-making, influence policy and shape a more inclusive student experience and campus culture

The Delivery Plan reviewed on an annual basis by the University Education and Student Experience Committee and the University's Executive Board.

Review of Current Student Equity Activity to Give Due Regard to the General Duty under the Equality Act 2010

The second section of the Student Equity Annual Report 2025-26 reviews the University's current work in the exercise of their functions, to have due regard to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other unlawful conduct prohibited by the act
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share and people who do not share a relevant protected characteristic
- foster good relations between people who share and people who do not share a relevant protected characteristic

The review in this annual report will focus on three key areas which the University has prioritised through its equity considerations under the general duties in 2025 to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct that is prohibited, to promote equality of opportunities between different protected characteristics and to foster good relations. They are as follows:

1. To Prevent Sexual Misconduct and Harassment

The University has centred its work to eliminate unlawful conduct over the last 12 months on the new framework established by the Office for Students with its introduction of the new Condition of Registration E6 on Sexual Misconduct and Harassment [Condition E6: Harassment and sexual misconduct - Office for Students](#). The fundamental aims are two-fold: to protect students from abuses of power and have the information to recognise and be able to report harassment and sexual misconduct, and to ensure the appropriate mechanisms are in place to respond effectively to incidents of harassment and sexual misconduct, including investigating such incidents and providing support to those involved.

A Working Group was established to plan, implement and monitor the University's work to ensure compliance comprising key staff from across the University and representation from the Union of Brunel Students lead by the Head of Student Affairs and Casework. Most of the requirements came into force on 1st August, 2025. One obligation – in relation to non-disclosure agreements with students – was introduced on 1st September, 2024. The University already had a policy of not requiring students to execute non-disclosure agreements prior to 1st September, 2024.

Activity has centred on the following key areas

- To provide a Single Comprehensive Source of Information (SCSI) to ensure that all relevant policies, procedures, mechanisms of support and reporting are readily accessible and prominent on the University's external website under the heading "Harassment & Sexual Misconduct Support," with links also via the staff and student intranets and the policies and documents repository. This was developed and published in early July 2025 prior to the

1st August 2025 compliance deadline. For full details see, [Harassment and sexual misconduct support | Brunel University of London](#). The SCSi will be communicated to students each year at registration via the Student Contract and to staff at least annually via, for example, the staff newsletter. This will ensure any updates to the SCSi can be highlighted.

- To ensure University Policies and Procedures for addressing harassment and sexual misconduct are up to date, published and easily accessible. This has involved conducting comprehensive reviews of key policies to ensure that they reflect the current regulatory and legal definitions of harassment and sexual misconduct, and freedom of speech and academic freedom including the following:
 - The Student Bullying and Harassment Policy to ensure the definitions of harassment and sexual misconduct are in line with our legal obligations and regulatory duties, including those related to Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom
 - Key updates to Senate Regulation 6; the Non-Academic Misconduct Procedure, Student Code of Conduct, Senate Regulation 14; Fitness to Practice Procedure and Senate Regulation 16: Amendments have been made in the light of Condition E6 and the 2024 UUK guidance on [How to handle alleged student misconduct: case studies](#) to provide clarity specifically in relation to the new condition and guidance, but also more generally given experience of using these procedures over the last year.
 - Relationships Policy which clarifies that staff members must not enter into an intimate personal relationship with a student for whom they have direct academic responsibilities or other direct professional responsibilities except for excluded relationships as defined in the policy which must in any event be declared to the university.
 - The Dignity at Work Policy and Staff Disciplinary Policy & Procedure
 - Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy, and Online Harassment Policy
- Mandatory staff and student training have been introduced to ensure an understanding of what constitutes harassment and sexual misconduct and how to respond appropriately.
 - Two bespoke E6 compliant training modules for staff on Harassment & Sexual Violence and Freedom of Speech have been developed via the University's subscription package with Brunel's current training partner and are hosted on Brightspace [Freedom of Speech - Staff Compliance Training](#) [Harassment and Sexual Misconduct - Staff Compliance Training](#). They have been added to the 'all staff' compliance training monitored by the Organisational Development Team via the Compliance Dashboard and should be re-taken every two years to ensure knowledge is kept up to date. Contractors are

asked to read the Compliance Booklet (as they currently do for other compliance training areas) which includes a section on Condition E6, including highlighting the SCSi, Relationships Policy, key definitions and policies and procedures. Work is ongoing to determine the feasibility, appropriateness and proportionality of requiring staff at partner institutions and organisations to undertake the full 'all staff' compliance training, taking into account potential cultural differences and sensitivities where relevant, as well as differing legal frameworks. Both formal in-house investigator training and bespoke trauma informed training has been delivered to OSCCA Case Managers, the latter of which will be rolled out to Panel members and Panel Chairs shortly. Organisational Development are continuing to work on in-house Investigator and Panel training for staff investigations with imminent roll out. The 'trauma informed' aspect of both in-house training offerings will be delivered by a current staff member with expertise in this area.

- A bespoke E6 compliant training module for all Brunel registered students has been developed via the University's subscription package with Brunel's current training partner and this is to be hosted on Brightspace. [Homepage - Preventing Harassment & Sexual Misconduct Training](#) and comprises of three units: preventing Harassment and Sexual Harassment, Consent on Campus and Active Bystander. There is an opt out option for those students who may find some of the content triggering with alternative content being made available. This will be a one-off training requirement which should be completed as close to enrolment as possible. Compliance is being monitored by Student Support Services with a whole institution approach lead by the Student Engagement & Success Team to ensure completion.
- A comprehensive communications plan has been developed with staff in the Marketing & Communications Team to ensure timely, effective, and relevant promotion to staff and students of the SCSi, Report & Support and other reporting channels, staff and student training requirements, and key policies and procedures, including the Relationships Policy. The communications plan covers the cycle of the whole academic year and will be reviewed and rolled out annually to capture new students and staff, as well as acting as a reminder to returners and current staff.
- It is planned that an ongoing prevention programme is to be developed by a new sub group lead by the Wellbeing, Inclusion and Support Manager and the Equity Lead - Students to promote the institution's zero tolerance approach to sexual misconduct and harassment, develop campaigns and other awareness activities to educate the student community on what constitutes acceptable behaviour, how to seek support when necessary and how to report incidences to create a safe and respectful student experience.

- The Working Group will continue to oversee the implementation of the OfS requirements for the condition of Registration E6, monitoring the compliance with the mandatory staff and student training, amendments to the SCSi and relevant policies as required and lead the work to address unlawful conduct such as harassment under the equality duties and foster good relations amongst the student community. One main area of focus for the Working Group moving forward is to ensure trends, peaks and concerns are monitored and appropriate follow up action taken, by reviewing the effectiveness of the University's work in relation to Condition E6, including via:
 - Reports and analysis of reporting data (Report & Support / Security reports / Student Complaints / other reports)
 - Formal data reports on student and staff case work.

2. To Address the Ethnicity Awarding Gap

A primary priority for the University currently is to reduce the inequities in the student outcomes particularly by the protected characteristic of ethnicity as demonstrated in the data analysis above. In the cohorts of students of black ethnicity and mixed race, there are concerning high levels of attrition by these students and lower awards outcome which have persisted over several years as demonstrated in the equality data analysis above. This has significant implications for the students' future reducing the possibilities of securing graduate level careers or entering into further education.

This academic year has seen the publication of a new Anti-Racism Strategy <https://students.brunel.ac.uk/documents/Policies/anti-racism-strategy-2025-2029.pdf> which frames the development of key university wide activities to support the institution's effort to tackle the inequity in student outcomes and advance equality of opportunity for all protected groups.

- The Associate Pro Vice Chancellor for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion and the Associate Pro Vice Chancellor – Education, Quality Assurance have set up an informal community of interest with the College Education Deans, Associate Deans for Equity and Inclusion and Equity Lead (Students) to share work underway across the University to understand the barriers that face students from minoritised groups in their learning, the development of interventions by staff to address the awarding gaps and the sharing of good practice, case studies and lessons learnt. Several key principles were agreed:
 - The awarding gap effort should not be seen in isolation - and needs to be considered within the larger picture of structural barriers, questions of belonging, and anti-racist efforts on Brunel's part
 - Education awareness raising and reassurance is necessary amongst colleagues that this effort is primarily about addressing structural racism in the university's education provision and student experience - and is not necessarily about experiences of inter-personal racism (although this can surface in particular ways and compound students' journeys at the university)
 - Students need to be engaged as part of all awarding gap efforts in departments, colleges and professional services

- Decolonising the curriculum efforts involve critical questions about who has been historically excluded from student learning and knowledge production and the impacts of these exclusions on their learning and the wider field of studies
 - The University's demographics are so specific at solutions and actions need to be localised and tailored to our communities.
- The Associate Dean for Equity and Inclusion for Brunel Business School developed a comprehensive guide for Staff and Students to close the awarding gap to support the School's local efforts to tackle the ethnicity disparities. It provides a practical and evolving resource for enhancing inclusive teaching, learning, and assessment and is designed to promote critical reflection, foster dialogue, and empower action across our community of educators and learners. It is currently being disseminated across the colleges.
 - The University provided a workshop organised for senior managers on 'Eliminating the Awarding Gap and Affirming Black Students Belonging at Brunel' sponsored by the Deputy Vice Chancellor and organised by the Associate Pro Vice Chancellor for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in October 2025, delivered by Christine Kinnear of the charity With Insight. The workshop presented research undertaken by With Insight to demonstrate how university systems and structures can feel exclusionary and hostile to Black communities – covering multi dimensions from curriculum, social networks, classroom interactions, commuter student experience, assessments, role models, and much more. The workshop called for a need to urgently shift our approach from a deficit model to an institutional debt model and concluded with a Brunel specific set of actions to start the process of culture-change with identifying achievable goals. It provided a useful opportunity to share good practice across the university and to learn from colleagues, and further opportunities will need to be planned. The natural progression of this critical and empowering conversation will be to cascade this to departmental levels across the University. In addition, a university wide awarding gap strategy is required and will be developed during this academic year.
 - A new Access and Participation initiative to 'Decolonise the Curriculum' is in early development and early scoping work at College level is being conducted to gather examples of past initiatives and activities. A new working group will be set up to oversee the work which will be co-chaired by the Associate Deans for Equity and Inclusion for CALSS and CHMLS. It will aim to produce 'decolonising the curriculum' materials and resources for academics in dialogue with student communities, the Library and Archive Collection, and the Academic Professional Development Unit on how to develop and deliver a diverse, inclusive, equitable and repaired curriculum with culturally sensitive and relevant methodology, teaching approach, reading list, case studies, assessment strategy etc.
 - Training and guidance continue to be provided to academics to embed equity and inclusion into their teaching and learning in a range of formats including workshops, CPD sessions, information exchanges and online modules. The

existing Inclusive Teaching Toolkit is currently being updated and will be launched on a new 'Embedding Equity into Teaching and Learning' space on Brightspace for academics. These efforts aim to develop content, case studies and guidance for colleagues on applying a universal design approach to teaching, tutoring, supervision and assessments embedding accessibility and inclusion to ensure that the pedagogy, teaching practice, curriculum design and assessment practices need to be culturally and socially relevant to our diverse student population. Working closely with the Associate Pro Vice Chancellor for Quality Assurance and the Academic Professional Development Unit, academics are supported to take a proactive approach to identify any potential negative impacts on students who have protected characteristics or come from deprived or marginalised backgrounds in general and racially minoritised groups in particular and taking action to address these.

- Ongoing work continues to embed accessibility and inclusion principles into relevant university quality assurance teaching and learning policy and procedures to ensure equity and consistency across the University. These include:
 - the Programme Approval Process
 - Programme Design Guidance
 - Recognised Programme Developers Guidance and Training
 - Reasonable adjustments to assessments procedure
 - Competence Standards Guidance
 - Board of Studies action log
 - The Student Engagement and Success Team provide an essential function to support students whose engagement may be affected by various inequities or barriers. These could include non-attendance of lectures or tutorials, or non-submission of assessment or attendance at exams. The equality data analysis shows that high attrition rates are amongst students from racially minoritised groups and this early intervention aims to support students who might be struggling, disengaging and at risk of non-continuation. Through their interactions, they work with the student to identify what the students need to re-engage, maintain active participation to gain the best out of the university's education provision and succeed.
 - New Student Voice Action Committees have been created within departments in each college to capture the student experience in their teaching and learning provision. Equity considerations are being embedded into this process and a proactive solutions focussed approach is being encouraged to address any concerns regarding dissatisfaction, inequity and poor student experience. A key function of the revised Student Experience sub Committee is to ensure the monitoring and oversight of reducing these inequities.
3. To Reduce the Differences Between the Experiences of Disabled Students with Non-Disabled Students Including the Attrition and Awarding Gaps

Removing any disadvantage that a disabled student may face in their teaching and learning, and general student experience has been a key student priority for several years and since the decline in the disabled students' outcome, the need for further measures to address this has been highlighted. The ongoing work is framed within the current context following the discrimination case of University of Bristol vs Abrahart after the tragic suicide of a student before an oral examination. It was found that the university had not taken adequate steps to make a reasonable adjustment to an assessment method. If there is evidence of a student having a disability such as through behaviour or language, then the University has an anticipatory duty to consider how all students with disabilities could be affected. The Equality and Human Rights Commission published an advice note in July 2024 setting out what compliance with the equality duty comprises for disabled students [Advice note for the higher education sector from the legal case of University of Bristol vs Abrahart | EHRC](#) It is the responsibility of staff to consider reasonable adjustments in a timely way to ensure that a disabled student is not placed at a disadvantage even if the Student Profile has not been generated. A comprehensive review of the EHRC recommendations has been conducted in Summer 2025 and identified where further work is required to bolster the University's knowledge of disability and its anticipatory duties under the Equality Act 2010. In consultation with the Associate Pro Vice Chancellors for Quality Assurance and Student Experience and the new Inclusive Support Team, an Improvement Plan has been developed and implementation is underway where the main focus has been on the building of knowledge and understanding of disability and reasonable adjustments amongst colleagues and updating quality assurance protocols to capture the requirement to clarify the setting of competence standards and how to apply reasonable adjustments.

Aligned closely with the Improvement Plan work is the University's work towards the sector initiative, [The Disabled Student Commitment 1681910327.pdf](#), to which Brunel was an early signee. The Commitment aims to 'secure an enhanced and improved experience for disabled students within higher education' and comprises a self-regulatory tool. Institutions are encouraged to develop an implementation plan to meet its commitments working in close collaboration with their disabled students. Co-chaired by the Associate Pro Vice Chancellors f- Education – Quality Assurance and Student Experience, a working group has been established this academic year comprising memberships across the University and the Student's Union. The group's remit is to plan, implement, oversee and monitor appropriate, necessary and effective action towards the Disabled Students' Commitment. The experiences of the disabled student community will be vital to understanding the barriers and obstacles that they currently encounter.

Following an informal assessment of the University's current provision towards the Commitment, the group has identified several areas which need urgent attention including the following:

- Research students and support provision following the strategic change programme in 2025 is recognised as requiring attention. Anecdotally there are reports of lack of clarity re reasonable adjustments for supervision, abeyance processes, access to facilities, vivas, oral presentations etc

- Issues of inaccessible facilities as a result of broken lifts and long wait times for repairs limiting access to students with mobility issues such as teaching rooms in the Lecture Centre and the ARC in the Bannerman are a key priority
- There are major challenges with the sharing of disabled student information in the student profiles provided by the Inclusive Support Team to relevant colleagues across the University. Students report a range of frustrations as once their needs have been assessed and recommendations uploaded; their expectation is that any reasonable adjustments will be and should be implemented. There is a lack of confidence and awareness on the part of some academics on how to access the student profiles or how to apply the adjustments to their specific student environments, and a lack of capacity and resource to do so. Some support services do not even have access to the student profiles which makes it very challenging to meet the student needs
- There are varying levels of understanding of the legal duties including the anticipatory duty and how to make reasonable adjustments to teaching, assessments, support etc. Training and awareness are critical and whilst there is ongoing training provided through Organisational Development, there needs to be further prioritised and boosted. The whole university is responsible for making reasonable adjustments where required. A compliance module was suggested
- There is an ongoing discussion around whether wider university staff could potentially add comments to student profiles – currently only the Inclusive Support Team can amend which causes delays, duplication of effort and impacts students learning. Staff need to be able to access information easily and in a timely manner making updates as required
- Further Information, Advice and Guidance is needed for prospective applicants: currently there is very little information available on the external website.

The next step will be to develop a comprehensive action plan which the Disabled Students Commission encourages institutions to publish externally. The continuation of this work will endeavour to reduce the lack of access and inequities faced by our disabled students, promote equalities of opportunity and foster belonging and inclusion.

Conclusion

Brunel University of London continues to have one of the most diverse student populations within higher education in the UK which it proudly locates within the institution's strategy, powered by diversity <https://www.staff.brunel.ac.uk/university-information/strategy/wielding-brunels-world-class-difference/powered-by-diversity> And yet some long-standing inequities prevail within our student outcomes. It is imperative that we redouble our efforts to tackle these disparities, developing targeted proactive interventions, colleagues' knowledge and confidence on working with diverse communities and routinely build in equitable and inclusive practice and culture institutionally, systemically and operationally so all our students can flourish and reach their full potential.