REF 2014 - EQUALITY ANALYSIS

Under the University’s Code of Practice for the REF 2014, the University committed to producing an equality profile in relation to ethnicity, disability, gender, age and employment status, for all academic staff who were eligible for inclusion in the REF on the census date together with the same analysis for those submitted and not submitted. The equality profile would be considered by the REF Steering Group, and thereafter by the Vice-Chancellor’s Executive Group (VCEG) together with any recommendations arising from the REF Steering Group’s review of information. This paper sets out a summary of the relevant information that was considered in relation to the University’s decision-making on its REF 2014 submission.

As a starting point, the University conducted an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) which was subject to continual review by the REF Steering Group. The EIA included an Action Plan with specific tasks to be undertaken in order to ensure the promotion of equality, fostering good relations and the elimination of possible discrimination in relation to decision-making on the University’s REF 2014 submission.

As an early action arising from the EIA, and in order to assess whether any noticeable imbalances or anomalies were present in terms of proportions of staff in the above equality categories who would or would not be included in the REF submission, an initial working profile of eligible staff was produced in March 2013 to act as a reference point. This was updated in June 2013 and finalised in November 2013. The REF Steering Group considered this equality information at each of these three stages.

The finding of the initial assessment of equalities data was that the REF Code did not introduce unequal opportunities across the equality characteristics of staff. In particular, the University’s design and operation of a confidential mechanism for disclosure of individual circumstances and the provision of equality training for those involved in decision-making would enable equality of treatment. The analysis at the subsequent two stages showed that the initial assessment remained valid and that the University’s actions to promote equality, foster good relations and eliminate discrimination did ensure equal opportunities for staff.

Five of the seven members of VCEG also considered the equalities analysis in detail before the University’s provisional decision was made on whom to include and not include in the University’s submission. The University then ran its appeal process, the panel for which included the two members of VCEG who had not formed part of the provisional decision-making process on whom to include and not include. The process for considering individual circumstances was re-opened during the appeal process where appropriate so that new information disclosed by an appellant could be considered.

A summary of the final equality profile of staff submitted to REF 2014 is set out below:

- The proportion of female staff submitted was slightly higher (1.4 percentage points) than that for males and for the University as a whole (0.9 percentage points).
- Although the total number of staff with a declared disability is small, all staff with a disability, whether declared or not, had the opportunity to raise individual circumstances through the confidential process set up for this purpose. All those involved in decision-making received equality training which included case studies in relation to disability and complex circumstances.
- The proportion of part-time staff submitted was higher (by 6.9 percentage points) than that for full-time staff and higher (by 6.4 percentage points) than that for the University as a whole.
• The highest submission rate in relation to age range was for those staff under age thirty, although the sample size was small and the lowest submission rate was for those staff aged over age fifty.

• The proportion of BME staff submitted was slightly lower (2.3 percentage points) than that for non-BME staff but the proportions were close and no particular concern was raised. The figure for staff whose ethnicity was not declared was 6.6 percentage points higher than for the University as a whole, but accounts for a relatively small number of staff.

• The proportion of staff on fixed-term contracts who were submitted was higher (by 16.4 percentage points) than those on indefinite contracts and also higher (by 15.1 percentage points) than for the University as a whole. The eligible population of staff on fixed-term contracts is not large, which contributes to the volatility of these figures.

• There were fifteen staff who raised an appeal against their provisional non-inclusion, of whom five were successful in their appeals and included in the final submission. There was a higher number of male than female appellants although female appellants were more successful in their appeals. One person with a declared disability appealed and three BME staff appealed, one of whom was successful. No part-time or fixed-term staff appealed. As a result of considering additional complex circumstances information, one appellant was granted a reduction in outputs and thereby included in the final submission, which demonstrates the way in which the process to enable equality of opportunity remained an active process until the final decision was made on whom to submit and not submit to REF 2014.

The EIA and Action Plan are attached for completeness.

Jane Summerville
Director of Human Resources

Dr Ian Carter
Director of Research & Enterprise

19 February 2014
New policies / proposals

Equality analysis - staff

1. Give the name of the policy/proposals being analysed, and a brief description of its/their aim or purpose.

Submission to Research Excellence Framework (REF).

2. Give the person or group with authority to make changes to the policy/proposals

VCEG

3. Who is affected by or associated with the policy/proposals, and in what ways?

Academic staff who are eligible for submission to the REF.

4. What are the equality risks (possible negative impacts) and opportunities (to promote equality/foster good relations) associated with this policy/proposals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability, Gender, Race, Age and Contract status</td>
<td>Staff may be excluded from the REF due to circumstances related to a protected characteristic that has affected their research productivity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How will the risks and opportunities that have been identified impact on the development/implementation of this policy/proposals?

- REF Code of Practice to be drawn up and implemented.
- Fair, transparent and consistent selection for the REF to be applied, in accord with the Code of Practice and University Equality and Diversity Policy.
- Staff involved in making recommendations and/or decisions for the REF need to be equality aware.
- All staff eligible for inclusion in the REF will need to understand that personal and special circumstances may be disclosed for consideration relative to their research productivity.
6. What evidence will be required to establish the actual impact of this policy / proposals?

1. Statistics of all staff eligible for submission to the REF will be monitored by gender, disability, ethnicity, age and contract status.

2. Statistics of the staff proposed for submission will be monitored by gender, disability, ethnicity, age and contract status.

3. Statistics of the staff proposed for exclusion will be monitored by gender, disability, ethnicity, age and contract status.

4. Statistics of staff from the appeals process (applications and outcomes) will be monitored by gender, disability, ethnicity, age and contract status.

5. Statistics of staff: (i) submitted to and (ii) excluded from the REF will be monitored by gender, disability, ethnicity, age and contract status.

7. How will members of equality target groups be able to be involved in this equality analysis?

   Through the confidential disclosure process for disclosing individual or special circumstances.

8. This equality analysis was carried out by:

   Jane Summerville, Director of HR.

9. This equality analysis was approved by:

   Ian Carter, Director of Research and Enterprise Services.

Date: 27 July 2012

Also see Action Plan attached.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan developed from the EA</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Draw up REF Code of Practice for approval by HEFCE, to include a confidential disclosure procedure for individual or special circumstances.</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>HEFCE approval received 2.1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Draw up relevant documents and timetable for implementing the confidential disclosure process.</td>
<td>IC/JS</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide equality training to SMG, the REF Steering Group, Unit of Assessment Leaders and the REF Team.</td>
<td>JS/HR</td>
<td>Carried out by Chris Mordue, Pinsent Masons &amp; HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Carry out mop-up equality training session.</td>
<td>JS/HR &amp; IC</td>
<td>Done on 3 occasions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Establish list of eligible staff denoting contract status and early career status.</td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Establish list of staff on sick leave, maternity leave etc.</td>
<td>HOS</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Invite all eligible staff to make a confidential disclosure for consideration by the REF Team with support from HR, in relation to individual or special circumstances.</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prepare and review equality profile of all eligible staff by proposed and actual inclusion/exclusion:</td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• March 2013 (initial working profile);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• June 2013;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• November 2013 (final submission and exclusions).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Revise action plan throughout process.</td>
<td>JS &amp; IC</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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