Research Excellence Framework REF2021: Equality Impact Assessment University of Wolverhampton

Approved by:

University of Wolverhampton Academic Board: 16 June 2021

University of Wolverhampton Joint Equality and Diversity Committee: 14 July 2021

CONTENTS

Appendices

1. Introduction

The Research Excellence Framework (REF) is the system for assessing research in UK Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and is conducted by the four UK HE Funding Bodies. The University of Wolverhampton (hereafter "UoW") developed a Code of Practice (hereafter "CoP"), the purpose of which was to ensure that University processes and procedures in relation to REF 2021 supported and promoted equality and diversity in research careers.

The Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) supports the CoP and the University's compliance with the Equality Act and the Public Sector Equality Duty. The EIA was prepared by the University's Dean of Research, and was approved by the University's Academic Board and Joint Equality and Diversity Committee.

2. Background

b. Background. Setting out the wider context, including measures taken to embed E&D in REF processes.

We are proud to be the University of Opportunity, with priorities driven and influenced by our location, and where equality and diversity are placed at the heart of what we are trying to achieve both as an employer and as an educator. We hold an institutional Athena SWAN Bronze award, a Race Equality Charter Bronze award, the HR Excellence in Research award, and we are signatories to the UK's Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers. We have action plans associated with each award, managed by faculty and university-wide EDI committees and overseen by the University's Joint Equality and Diversity Committee.

Our REF 20214 EIA showed that we had made progress in promoting equality and diversity and that our REF 2014 submission was more inclusive than previous ones. Despite this, we found that women were less likely than men to be included, and only constituted 27% of submitted staff. We therefore made improving the number and proportion of female academic staff a priority amongst the range of measures takes to embed Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) in the REF processes. We put in place the following measures:

Gender Equality Action Plans

All Faculties (and their associated Research Centres) and all cross-faculty Research Institutes developed Gender Equality Action Plans (GEAPs) in order to mainstream gender equality and address intersectionality. These are monitored annually for progress and the annual devolved QR allocations and periodic internal Research Investment Funding (RIF) to faculties and Institutes are dependent on progress with GEAPs.

Internal Research Funding

Research Investment Funding (RIF), the University's Early Research Award Scheme (ERAS) and Lord Paul Fellowship (LPF) scheme for early career researchers are monitored for gender and race impact. RIF4 and LPF include EDI as an assessment criterion.

Training

Equality & Diversity and Unconscious Bias Training are mandatory for all staff and must be refreshed every two years. Compliance is monitored by the University's HR Services. Additional tailored training on REF 2021, EDI and our Code of Practice was provided by Advance HE in 2019. We are using the results from the Principal Investigators and Research Leaders Surveys (2015, 2017 and 2019) to identify how to improve skills, knowledge and habits of research leaders to support inclusive practices

Decision-making

Composition of governance committees is reviewed on an annual basis to ensure a gender balance of at least 40/60. Having diverse panels for all stages of the recruitment is part of the University's strategy of creating a diverse workforce and inclusive work environment. All panels must be representative of the University

community and must include gender diversity and in line with our commitment to the Race Equality Charter, a BAME (Black, Asian, or Minority Ethnic) staff member as a minimum standard for all UW8 and above posts.

Leadership

We adopted a shared leadership model for the leadership of the 17 Units of Assessment (UOAs), which resulted in a 45%(F)/55%(M) leadership balance in our UOAs. From 2019 onwards, we have embedded Equality and Diversity objectives into the annual performance review of senior staff.

Consultation

We consulted widely in the development of our CoP to ensure our REF processes are as inclusive as possible. This involved an all-staff consultation (via an online survey), consultation meetings with staff networks and UCU, and a number of workshops delivered by the Dean of Research. We also sought input from Advance HE and professional staff leading on EDI in the University.

3. Scope of the Equality Impact Assessment

The EIA covers three key processes of the REF2021 submission: 1) identification of staff with significant responsibility for research, 2) processes for determining research independence and 3) process of output selection. We considered the protected characteristics covered by the Equalities Act, namely:

- Age;

- Disability;

- Gender reassignment;

- Marriage and civil partnership;

- Pregnancy and maternity;

- Race;

- Religion and belief;

- Sex; and

- Sexual orientation.

We did not proceed with the statistical analysis of gender identity/gender re-assignment, and pregnancy and maternity leave, due to small number of staff declaring in these categories. The former is also in line with best practice guidance from Stonewall regarding demographic analysis of trans people. We received voluntary declarations for individual circumstances related to pregnancy and maternity leave as part of the individual circumstances process, and these are included in the data analysis for the staff circumstances report.

We considered religion, marital status, and sexual orientation in the preliminary EIAs (see below and appendices 1-4) and found these not to have any statistically significant effects. We therefore have not conducted further statistical analyses in this final EIA.

In addition to the protected characteristics, we also considered part-time and full-time workers and fixed-term and open contracts. This is in line with regulations to prevent less favourable treatment for fixed-term employees and part-time workers, and our institutional commitments under the Researcher Development Concordat. Staff groups affected include staff employed by UoW on the census date (REF eligible staff), and former staff whose outputs were included. In line with the CoP, we undertook four interim EIAs:

- Identifying staff with significant responsibility for research: May 2019 (Appendix 1)
- Process for determining research independence: January 2020 (Appendix 2)
- Output selection process: January 2020 (first round Appendix 3) and November 2020 (second round Appendix 4)

To inform the statistical analysis, data on protected characteristics were taken from the University's HR system, Agresso, using July 2020 data.

4. Analyses

4.1. Significant responsibility for research

At UoW, the REF Category A criteria identified both staff who did and who did not have significant responsibility for research. With the agreement of the Union, we used the Wolverhampton Academic Framework to form the Category A submitted pool. The Wolverhampton Academic Framework was introduced in 2017/18 to enable staff to position themselves within a career pathway that best matches their aspirations.

In line with the key principles of transparency, consistency, accountability and inclusivity articulated in our CoP, the Wolverhampton Academic Framework:

• recognises that there are different aspects to an academic role, including research, teaching, scholarship, academic management, business engagement

• seeks to enable academic staff to position themselves within a career path with clear progression and promotion routes, to have flexibility and choices

• recognises that colleagues have different skill mixes and subject areas have their own distinct needs

• ensures that academic enhancement is a key part of all academic roles

• provides clarity, consistency and focus within academic role profiles with regard to research and scholarly activities

• role expectations are clearly outlined in job descriptions and reviewed through appraisal

Staff were invited to formally identify themselves with one of two role profiles and job descriptions: 1) teaching and research, 2) teaching scholarship and professional practice. Role profiles and job descriptions are reviewed annually at appraisal, and staff can elect to change their role profiles.

Table 1 Significant Responsibility for Research and Sex

	REF2021			REF2014	
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff	Category A Staff without SRR	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff
Female	447	120	327	386	52
Male	426	204	222	431	138
Totals	873	324	549	817	190

Our preliminary EIA showed that men were more likely to have significant responsibility for research than women. This is also confirmed in the final EIA (χ(2)=41.379, p =.000). Although we substantially increased the number and percentage of women in our submission – from 52, or 27% in REF 2014, to 120 or 37% in REF2021 (and 39% if we include Category B staff) - our submission is not reflective of the gender composition of our staff

overall. Further analyses showed that women in the Faculty of Education, Health and Wellbeing (FEHW), and the former Faculty of Social Sciences, were less likely than men to have significant responsibility for research.

Table 2 Significant Responsibility for Research and Age

	REF2021			REF2014	
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff	Category A Staff without SRR	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff
24 and under	1	0	1	0	0
25 to 34	71	25	46	50	10
35 to 44	214	93	121	188	48
45-54	271	98	173	325	71
55-64	262	82	180	234	49
65 and over	54	26	28	20	12
Totals	873	324	549	817	190

In REF 2014, we submitted a relatively higher proportion of 'older' staff (>65 years), compared to staff in younger age groups. In REF 2021, the age distribution of submitted staff was much closer to the overall staff profile, but we found that staff in the lower (<45) and higher (>65) were marginally more likely to have significant responsibility for research compared to staff in the mid-range age groups (Fisher's Exact $\chi(2)$=30.306, p < .001). This is partly a legacy trend for older staff, whereas our initiatives to support early career researchers are showing evidence of success.

Table 3 Significant Responsibility for Research and Disability

	REF2021			REF2014	
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff	Category A Staff without SRR	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff
Declared disability	39	17	22	26	5
No known disability	819	304	515	n/a	n/a
Question not answered	15	3	12	n/a	n/a
Totals	873	324	549		

Compared with REF 2014, we increased the number and proportion of staff who declared a disability. There was no statistically significant difference between staff who declared a disability and those that did not in relation to their identification as having significant responsibility for research ($\chi(2)$ = 0.666, p= 0.498).

Table 4 Significant Responsibility for Research and Ethnicity

	REF2021			REF2014	
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff	Category A Staff without SRR	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff
White	665	234	431	694	150
Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic	194	81	113	119	38

Not known/ prefer not to say	14	9	5	4	2
Totals	873	324	549	817	190

Supported by work done as part of our Race Equality Charter, we increased both the number and proportion of staff from Black and Asian Minority Ethnic BAME groups – from 38 staff or 20% of submitted staff in REF 2014 to 81 staff or 25% of submitted staff in REF 2021. We have grouped staff into White and BAME for the purposes of statistical analysis and found that there was no difference in between the two broad groups and having significant responsibility for research ($\chi(2)$=2.787, p < 0.108). In the preliminary EIA on staff with significant responsibility for research, we provided a finer-grained analysis by ethnic group (see appendix 1). This showed that White Other were more likely to be submitted than White British, likely driven by staff from EU countries. We also found that a smaller proportion of Black staff were submitted compared to other BAME groups, although that was not statistically significant.

Table 5 Significant Responsibility for Research and contractual arrangements

	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff	Category A Staff without SRR
Permanent contract	843	303	540
Fixed-term contract	30	21	9
Total	873	324	549
Full-time	754	277	477
Part-time	119	47	72
Total	873	324	549

We do not have comparative data from REF 2014 regarding contractual status of submitted staff compared to the eligible staff pool. In line with our institutional ethos as well as our commitments to the Researcher Development Concordat, we have few staff on fixed-term contract (6% of submitted staff), and these tend to be staff on research-only contracts (see section on research independence for more detail). We find a statistically significant difference ($\chi(2)$=14.397, p=0.000) here, likely driven by the inclusion of fixed term staff on research-only contracts. The proportion of part-time staff we submitted is similar to that of the eligible staff pool (14%), and we found no statistically significant difference ($\chi(2)$=0.335, p=0.610).

Overall, the analysis of the REF 2021 process for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research shows that it was more inclusive than the staff selection process that was used in REF 2014. We had put in place mechanisms to raise concerns and appeal against the outcomes of the process for determining significant responsibility for research, but none were received. We can therefore be confident that the process promoted EDI objectives. However, further work needs to take place to address the continued under-representation of women in research, which we have made a priority in our institutional Athena Swan action plan, as well as in departmental plans that have been submitted or are under preparation. We also need to promote declarations on protected characteristics, where numbers of staff who declared were too small to permit statistical analyses and to support analysis of intersectional dimensions.

4.2. Research Independence
The Guidance on Submission states that staff employed on 'research-only' contracts must be independent researchers to meet the definition of Category A eligibility. An independent researcher is defined as an individual who undertakes self-directed research, rather than carrying out another individual's research programme. The Funding Bodies provided a range of criteria for research independence, and our institutional process for

determining research independence required all staff on research-only contracts to declare against these criteria, and a staff establishment panel reviewed the evidence. We had in place an appeals process against the decisions on research independence, and no appeals were received.

In consultations, a concern was expressed that the criteria for research independence, especially for Main Panels A and B, placed emphasis on external research funding and competitively awarded fellowships when anecdotal evidence suggests that women and ethnic minorities are less likely to be awarded such funding. Recently published UKRI data indeed support this concern[1]. However, our preliminary EIA did not suggest that women or staff from ethnic minorities were less likely to be independent researchers, but this may be due to the small numbers of research-only staff that we employ. We did find that research-only staff in main panels A and B were less likely to be meeting the independence criteria than researchers in main panels C and D.

In our analysis, we compare staff on research-only contracts who met the criteria of research independence, with those that did not. Further, we compared both groups with staff on T&R contracts, who had significant responsibility for research and who are on the Lecturer scale. This is in line with the CoP Guidance by the Funding Bodies to consider an appropriate comparator pool for junior academic staff. Unlike significant responsibility for research, we do not have comparator data from REF 2014.

Table 6: Research independence and sex

	Research-only Independent	Research-only Not independent	Lecturer with SIG RES (comparator)	Totals
Male	6	10	35	51
Female	10	13	24	47
Totals	16	23	59	98

The analysis suggests that there is no significant difference between men and women on research-only contracts and whether they were deemed to be independent researchers, and these results hold also when the comparator group is included (Fisher's Exact $\chi(2)$= 3.251, p=0.218).

We do not provided cross tabulations for research independence by <u>age group</u> due to low numbers (<5) in age categories >45 years. We found a relatively greater proportion of older staff who met the research independence criteria (38% of research independent staff were aged >45 years) compared to those staff who were not independent (13% aged >45 years) and the comparator group (8% aged >45 years). However, the analysis by age showed that there are no statistically significant differences between staff who are research independent, those who are not and the comparator group (Fisher's Exact $\chi(2)$= 12.485, p=0.078).

We do not provide cross tabulations for research independence by <u>ethnicity</u> due low numbers (<5) for staff who identify as Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) and also staff who did not wish to declare against this protected characteristic. We found the greatest number (n=13) and proportion (33%) of BAME staff in the comparator group but tests showed that there is no statistically significant difference between research independent, staff who are not research independent and the comparator group based on ethnicity (Fisher's Exact $\chi(2)$= 7.657, p=0.080).

Similarly, we found no statistically significant difference between the three groups based on the protected characteristic of <u>disability</u> (Fisher's Exact $\chi(2)$= 5.999, p=0.152). The data showed that staff on research-only contracts (whether meeting the independence criteria or not) tended to declare whether or not they had a disability (only 5% chose not to declare), whereas in the comparator group we found a much greater number and

[1] See https://www.ukri.org/our-work/supporting-healthy-research-and-innovation-culture/equality-diversity-and-inclusion/diversity-data/

proportion of staff who did not disclose (20% chose not to declare). As noted in the action plan, we need to understand better the reasons behind the low levels of disclosure against certain protected characteristics.

When analysing data by contract type, we found that staff on research-only contracts were more likely to be on temporary rather than permanent contracts (77% of research-only staff compared to 15% of the comparator group were on temporary contracts), and more likely to be part-time rather than full-time (30% of research-only staff compared to 7% of the comparator group were part-time). This is reflected in the statistical analysis which showed that there is a statistically significant difference between the three groups and contractual status (Fisher's Exact $\chi(2)$= 38.159, p=0.000 for open-ended vs fixed term contracts; Fisher's Exact $\chi(2)$= 12.097, p=0.002 for full-time versus part-time status). We did not see any difference amongst the research-only staff who were meeting the independence criteria and those that did not. As part of our commitments under the Researcher Development Concordat, we are regularly monitoring contractual status of research-only staff and seek to offer, where possible, permanent contracts.

4.3. Output selection

Our process for selecting outputs is described in section 4 of our institutional Code of Practice. As this was a new process in REF 2021, paid considerable attention to design it as inclusively as possible. Specifically:

1. We made it clear in consultations and briefing meetings that we recognise a range of reasons why excellent researchers publish at different rates. We did not expect staff to make a uniform contribution to the outputs pool, or require a minimum number of outputs to be nominated for review, or require that staff are submitted with the same number of outputs attributed to them.

2. We have in place a *Policy on the Responsible Use of Research Indicators*, which stipulates that we will permit but never require those being evaluated to present indicators in support of any claims of the quality of their work. We do not use journal impact factors or similar, and never use career-based publication and citation counts, or h-indices, as these are more likely to be biased against women, people with disabilities or illnesses, and staff who had career breaks.

3. We included narrative feedback against the REF ORS criteria as well as ratings of outputs in recognition that narrative feedback is a mechanism to mitigate for unconscious bias. Each output was reviewed by two staff.

4. All UOA coordinators received bespoke training by Advance HE before the process for output selection commenced.

5. The process for disclosing individual circumstances took place in parallel. Where applicable, staff and UOA coordinators where notified to clarify expectations of waiving the minimum 1 output requirement, and providing support for staff concerned. We received declarations of individual circumstances from 47 staff, who declared in total 60 circumstances. This was substantially lower than in REF 2014 where we received declarations from 105 staff. This indicates that our approach of not expecting or requiring a uniform contribution as part of the decoupling of staff from outputs already took into account equality-related circumstances.

We conducted two preliminary EIAs, one after each round of output selections. We included in the preliminary EIAs data from former staff where the outputs were reviewed for possible inclusion in the unit output pools. In this final EIA, we only consider former staff whose outputs were selected.

Table 7 Cross-tabulation: Number of outputs nominated *sex and Number of outputs selected * sex

Number of outputs nominated	Male	Female	Total	Number of outputs selected	Male	Female	Total
0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
1	16	15	31	1	90	81	171
2	27	25	52	2	57	27	84
3	21	23	44	3	33	19	52
4	27	11	38	4	29	7	36
5	32	22	54	5	13	7	20
6	70	35	105				
7	11	5	16				
8	10	3	13				
9	3	0	3				
10	2	2	4				
11	3	0	3				
Total	223	141	364		223	141	364

As noted in section 4.1., women were under-represented in the submission and accounted for 39% of the staff contributing to the output pool. Women tended to nominate fewer outputs and had fewer outputs selected and a Kruskal-Wallis test showed this to be statistically significant (χ^2=7.892, p=0.005, and χ^2=9.048, p=0.003 respectively). We found no difference in the quality of outputs nominated by men and women (χ^2=2.258, p=0.133) but the quality of outputs selected tended to be marginally different (χ^2=4.233, p=0.040). This may be related to the greater number of outputs by men in the pool, which increased in the later review stages. Men were more likely to nominate additional outputs in the second output review – 29 men elected to nominate in addition to the maximum 6 from Phase 1, whereas only 10 women did so.

We expected that young staff nominate fewer outputs than older staff in recognition that they are more likely to be early career researchers with a smaller pool of publications to nominate. However, we found no statistically significant difference between staff of different age groups and the number of outputs nominated and selected (χ^2=6.261, p=0.181; χ^2=3.248, p=0.517), or in the quality of outputs nominated and selected (χ^2= 7.517, p=0.111; χ^2=5.747, p=0.219).

We also found no statistically significant difference in the number of outputs nominated and number of outputs selected based on disability (respectively χ^2=0.847, p=0.655; χ^2=3.264, p=0.196). We found a statistically significant difference in the quality rating of nominated and selected outputs by disabled staff, but this result appears to be driven by variances in ratings between the UOAs (disabled staff were present in 7 of the 17 UOAs) rather than differences in ratings between staff who declared a disability and those who did not (see Appendices 3 and 4).

When analysing data by ethnicity, we found no statistical differences between white and BAME staff in either the quantity of outputs nominated and selected (χ^2=3.573, p=0.059; χ^2=0.044, p=0.834) or the quality of outputs nominated and selected (χ^2=0.307, p=0.580; χ^2=1.264, p=0.261).

We also checked if part-time status and fixed-term contracts made a difference. Only 14.6% of Category A submitted and Category B staff are on part-time contracts, and 7.1% are on fixed-term contracts. We expected that part-time staff would nominate fewer outputs than full-time staff but that was not the case (χ^2=0.247; p=0.620). However, part-time staff tended to have fewer outputs selected. We found no difference in the quality of outputs between part-time and full-time staff. Fixed-term staff tended to nominate fewer outputs than

permanent staff (χ^2=4.021, p=0.045), but those tended to be higher ranked than outputs from permanent staff (χ^2=9.205, p=0.002). This meant that fixed-term staff were as likely as permanent staff to have their outputs included in the final output pools.

5. Conclusions

The EIA showed that whilst increasing the number of staff submitted to REF 2021 compared to previous research assessments, the University also had a more inclusive submission with the number and proportion of women, BAME staff, and disabled staff increasing, and the age profile less skewed towards older staff. We consulted extensively on our Code of Practice to ensure that our processes for determining significant responsibility for research, determining research independence and selecting outputs are as inclusive as possible. We received no complaints through our CoP complaints process.

The analysis also showed that women continue to be under-represented in the submission, which requires further action going forward. It suggests that women continue to perceive barriers in choosing a research role profile and job description. The process for declaring individual circumstances was less used than in REF 2014, which suggests that staff found the process onerous in comparison to the benefits it yielded. However, we have since adopted a process for confidentially declaring individual circumstances in promotion and annual evaluations, which is showing a better take-up. The output selection process showed that not all staff were familiar with our *Policy on Responsible Use of Research Indicators*. We have subsequently decided to become institutional signatories to DORA and have put in place a range of communications and development sessions to help raise awareness of the shortcomings of journal-based and other metrics.

6. Action Plan

No.	Objective/Target	How/Initiative	Timeframe	Responsibility
1.	Number and proportion of women with significant responsibility for research is reflective of the overall staff profile	For full details of initiatives, see institutional and departmental Athena SWAN action plans Work with Women Staff Network to identify and implement innovative solutions	By next REF (REF2027)	Dean of Research
2.	Improved reporting across protected characteristics	Investigate ease of reporting on protected characteristics Raise awareness through staff networks	Within 2 years	Head of EDI
3.	Embed responsible and inclusive research practices	Membership of UKRN and DORA; Support for grassroots initiatives on training and awareness raising for responsible research	Within 2 years	Dean of Research, UoW Strategic lead and membership leads for UKRN
4.	Inclusive support for research funding	EIA on newly established peer review college; collect, analyse and action data on gender, age and ethnicity for funding bids	Within 2 years	Head of Research Services & Head of Pre-award Team

5.	Embed EDI in new Vision 2030: Research and Innovation sub-strategy	All subject areas address EDI aspects in their research as part of 'addressing societal challenges'; impact case studies take account of effect on people with protected characteristics; research centres and institutes have developmental support for staff wishing to develop a research role profile; we have no leaky pipeline for BAME students between ug, pg and pgr	By 2030	Dean of Research and heads of research centres and institutes

Appendix 1

Equality Impact Assessment Form

Contact Details

Impact Assessor's Full Name: Silke Machold

Job Title: Dean of Research

Faculty / Service Area: Research Policy Unit

Email: S.Machold@wlv.ac.uk

Submission Date: 22.5.19

About the policy/ service/ change

REF2021 Institutional Code of Practice

All institutions making a submission to the Research Excellence Framework (REF2021) are required to develop, document and apply an institutional Code of Practice (CoP) on 1) the fair and transparent identification of staff with significant responsibility for research (where less than 100% of Category A eligible staff are submitted); 2) determining who is an independent researcher (mandatory for staff on research-only contracts) and 3) the selection of outputs. We will also conduct an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) on our process for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research (SRR), determining research independence, and selecting outputs (section 8 of the CoP).

Since February 2019, we have consulted with staff on our institutional Code of Practice (see section 1.12). This is a preliminary EIA on our process for identifying staff with SRR. There will be a follow-up iteration of the EIA on identification of staff with SRR once the CoP has been approved by Academic Board, and checks for contractual eligibility completed. Further EIAs will be completed on research independence and output selection in line with the schedule identified in the CoP.

Applicable to: Staff X☐ Students ☐ Visitors ☐ General Public ☐

Data and Evidence

a.   Have you identified relevant evidence (qualitative and quantitative) to establish whether this policy/ service could potentially affect some equality groups more than others?
Please attach any evidence to this Equality Impact Assessment.

We have used both quantitative and qualitative evidence. Quantitatively, we have compared the characteristics of staff who have been identified as having SRR with those that do not, and checked whether these differences were statistically significant. We have used staff data held by HR services (in aggregated counts) to conduct the analysis (see attached).

Qualitatively, we have used feedback from staff through a range of mechanisms, including an online consultation (questionnaire with comments sections), meetings with staff networks, briefing sessions for staff

on CoP and professoriate meeting. The qualitative evidence has helped explain and contextualise the findings from the quantitative analysis.

b.   Have you analysed equality data for each of the groups identified below?

We have analysed equality data for all but the following groups:

1) Caring responsibility –Following our CoP, we will be asking staff to voluntarily declare individual circumstances including caring responsibility to take account of this in output selection. An EIA will at this point be conducted, as described above.

2) Gender identity – due to the small number of staff (6 in the Category A eligible pool), we have not been able to conduct a statistical analysis, and no issues were raised at the staff network meeting with the LGBT network.

The analysis related to socio-economic groups is not required for this process as it affects staff only.

c.Have you identified / researched anecdotal or alternative evidence?

Yes, via discussions with external reviewers in our mock REF.

d.   Have you attached the evidence to this impact assessment?

Yes.

e.   Based on your research / evidence, which equality groups might this policy or service affect more or less than others (if any)?

- Age x ☐
- Caring Responsibility *Not available* ☐
- Disability (including mental health)x ☐
- Gender Reassignment /Transgender ☐
- Sex x ☐
- Marriage and Civil Partnership ☐
- Part Time Workers x ☐
- Pregnancy and maternity ☐

- Race/ Ethnicity x ☐
- Religion and belief (including no belief) ☐
- Sexual Orientation ☐
- Socio Economic Groups (students only) ☐

Describe the Potential Impact

Age: Compared to REF2014, we will be submitting more younger staff to REF2021. That is statistically significant for staff aged <45 but especially evident for staff <34. This is partly a reflection of initiatives such as ERAS to support and develop Early Career Researchers. Staff aged over 65 are also more likely to be submitted (compared to staff aged 45-64) but the proportion has somewhat declined compared to REF2014.

Disability: Although disabled staff are as a likely as those without a disability to have significant responsibility for research; we will increase the number (and proportion) of disabled staff submitted to REF2021, compared to REF2014.

Sex: Although men are more likely to have significant responsibility for research compared to women, we will increase the number and proportion of women submitted to REF2021 (27% of submitted staff in REF2014 and 40% of submitted staff projected for REF2021).

Part-time workers and fixed term contract staff: The data here have to be interpreted cautiously as we have not completed all eligibility checks for these staff groups. Initial results indicated that fixed-term staff are more likely to be submitted compared to permanent staff, but that part-time staff are less likely to be submitted than full-time staff.

Race/ Ethnicity: Although there are no statistical differences between staff who identify as White and BAME staff, we will increase the number (and proportion) of BAME staff to REF2021 (25% of submitted staff compared to 21% in REF2014)

Progressing the Equality Duty

a. Is there an opportunity to use this policy/ service to advance the core aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty at our University? *Yes*

b. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, and victimisation. *Yes*

c. Advance quality of opportunity between different protected groups. *Yes*

d. Foster good relations between different protected groups. *Yes*

EIA Outcome and Action Planning

Please describe the outcome of your EIA.

The evidence from the EIA suggests that our proposed process for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research in relation to REF2021 submission advances equality. However, we are aware that there remains scope for further improving EDI objectives.

What actions you will take as a result of undertaking this impact assessment, please include timescales and who is responsible.

- Action 1 Complete Actions identified in REF2021 CoP including additional EIAs

   - Timescale 1 see REF2021 CoP Appendix 10

- o   Responsibility 1 see REF2021 CoP Appendix 10

- Action 2 Progress and complete Athena Swan Action Plan

  - o   Timescale 2 as identified in Athena SWAN Action Plan

  - o   Responsibility 2 Dean of Research

- Action 3 Progress work on Race Equality Charter self-assessment and continue to participate on the Stonewall Equality Index

  - o   Timescale 3 ongoing

  - o   Responsibility 3 Head of EDU

- Action 4 Continue to improve data collection on protected characteristics

  - o   Timescale 4 ongoing

  - o   Responsibility 4 Director of HR

7. EIA Review Date

Please stipulate a review date for your EIA.

December 2019

Assessor Signature: Silke Machold

Senior Manager Signature: Geoff Layer
(Vice Chancellor)

REF2021 Code of Practice Equality Impact Assessment

May 2019

Background

Following the publication of the Funding Bodies' Guidance on REF2021 and the associated Guidance on Codes of Practice in January 2019, the University of Wolverhampton has developed and consulted on its Code of Practice for REF2021. This is the first iteration of the Equality Impact Assessment of the Code, focusing on identification of staff with significant responsibility for research, in order to assess the impact of our proposed process.

Data on protected characteristics are taken from the University's HR system (Agresso), using April 2019 data and full person equivalent (headcount). We compare the protected characteristics of the

identified pool (staff with significant responsibility for research and staff on research-only contracts[2]) with those staff that do not have significant responsibility for research. Where available, we make comparisons to our REF2014 submission. We have analysed data for all protected characteristics except for gender identity. Our data show that there are six (6) staff in the Category A eligible pool who declared as either trans or non-binary, and these small numbers did not allow for meaningful analysis. This is also in line with the best practice guidance from Stonewall regarding demographic analysis of trans people. Finally, we have analysed data for part-time and fixed-term contract staff, in line with regulations to prevent less favourable treatment for fixed-term employees and part-tome workers.

Gender

	REF2021			REF2014	
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Identified Staff (SRR and Research-only)	Category A Staff without SRR	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff
Female	450	161	289	386	52
Male	422	240	182	431	138
Totals	872	401	471	817	190

- Compared to REF2014, the number and proportion of female academic staff to be submitted to REF2021 has increased (from 27% of submitted staff to 40% of submitted staff)
- Across the whole institution, men are statistically more likely to have significant responsibility for research than women ($\chi(2)$=39.013, p < .001).
- Further analysis by faculty shows that these statistically significant differences in men and women having significant responsibility for research are only evident in the Faculty of Education, Health and Wellbeing and the Faculty of Social Sciences (p < .05), with no differences found in the other units (p > .5).

Faculty[3]	All Category A Eligible Staff		Category A Identified Staff		Category A Staff without SRR	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
FEHW	243	112	50	40	193	72
FOA	49	66	26	38	23	28
FSE	66	145	43	94	23	51
FOSS	81	83	32	53	49	30
Other	11	16	10	15	1	1

Age

	REF2021	REF2014

---

[2] At the time of writing, the Code Of Practice is awaiting approval via the University governance structure and we have not completed the processes for verifying substantive connection (9 staff on contracts requiring verification), research independence for staff on research-only contracts (40 staff), and significant responsibility for research for senior staff on eligible contracts. These staff are currently included under 'Category A Identified Staff' in the analysis. Further EIAs will be conducted in accordance with section 8 of the Code of Practice.
[3] FEHW – Faculty of Education, Health and Well-being; FOA – Faculty of Arts; FSE – Faculty of Science and Engineering; FOSS – Faculty of Social Sciences; Other – eligible staff employed in departments outside faculty structure

	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Identified Staff (SRR and Research-only)	Category A Staff without SRR	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff
24 and under	2	0	2	0	0
25 to 34	89	51	38	50	10
35 to 44	210	111	99	188	48
45-54	301	131	170	325	71
55-64	239	92	147	234	49
65 and over	31	16	15	20	12
Totals	872	401	471	817	190

- In REF2014, we submitted a relatively higher proportion of 'older' staff (>65) compared to staff in younger age groups.
- In REF2021, the distribution is more uneven with younger staff (<45) and older staff (>65) marginally more likely to be identified as having significant responsibility for research ($\chi(2)$=15.104, p < .01). This is partly explained by the legacy trend for older staff, whereas our initiatives to support early career researchers are showing evidence of success.

Disability

	REF2021			REF2014	
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Identified Staff (SRR and Research-only)	Category A Staff without SRR	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff
Declared disability	44	22	22	26	5
No known disability	753	336	417	n/a	n/a
No disability declared	75	43	32	n/a	n/a
Totals	872	401	471		

- Compared to REF2014, we will increase both the number and proportion of staff with disabilities submitted to REF2021.
- There is, however, no statistical difference between staff who have a disability and those that do not in relation to their identification as having significant responsibility for research (p=0.486).

Ethnicity

Ethnicity 1: White British and other ethnic groups

	REF2021			REF2014	
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Identified Staff (SRR and Research-only)	Category A Staff without SRR	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff
White British	596	234	362	637	121

Other Ethnic Group	265	161	104	180	69
Not known/ prefer not to say	11	6	5	n/a	n/a
Totals	872	401	471	817	190

Ethnicity 2: Breakdown of ethnic groups

	REF2021			REF2014	
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Identified Staff (SRR and Research-only)	Category A Staff without SRR	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Submitted Staff
Arab	5	4	1	0	0
Asian or Asian British[4]	58	32	26	35	8
Black or Black British[5]	53	21	32	44	12
Chinese	11	8	3	13	8
Mixed[6]	10	5	5	4	0
Other Ethnic and Mixed Background[7]	38	24	14	27	12
White British	596	234	362	637	121
Other White Background[8]	90	67	23	57	29
Not known/ prefer not to say	11	6	5	n/a	n/a
Totals	872	401	471	817	190

- The trend from REF2014 in respect of a proportionately higher submission of ethnic groups other than White British continues to be observed in REF2021 (White British staff are statistically less likely to be submitted than other ethnic groups ($\chi(2)$=34.128, p < .001).
- When comparing staff who identify as White (White British, White Irish and White Other) with other ethnic groups, there is no statistical difference at the 5% level (p>0.05).
- Further breakdown of ethnic groups suggests that among BAME groups, a smaller percentage of Black or Black British staff are submitted compared to Arab, Asian, Chinese and mixed ethnic backgrounds, however, the small number of values for each category do not permit a more detailed statistical analysis.

Religion/ Belief

---

[4] Bangladeshi, Indian and Pakistani

[5] African and Caribbean

[6] Mixed White and Asian, Mixed White and Black African, Mixed White and Black Caribbean

[7] Other Asian, Other Black, Other Ethnic, Other Mixed Background

[8] White Irish and Other White

	REF2021		
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Identified Staff (SRR and Research-only)	Category A Staff without SRR
Buddhist	5	2	3
Christian	267	101	166
Hindu	12	7	5
Jewish	3	1	2
Muslim	37	22	15
Sikh	8	4	4
Spiritual	7	3	4
Other	13	7	6
No Religion	148	81	67
No data supplied	372	173	199
Totals	872	401	471

- We did not analyse religion/belief in our REF2014 equality impact assessment due to the small number of responses.
- 43% of eligible staff for REF2021 have not supplied data on religion/belief. When comparing staff with a declared religion/belief with those who declare as 'no religion', and those who have not responded, and significant responsibility for research, the statistical difference is very small ($\chi(2)$= 7.125, $p < .05$).

Sexual Orientation

	REF2021		
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Identified Staff (SRR and Research-only)	Category A Staff without SRR
LGB	39	22	17
Heterosexual	502	225	277
Unknown	331	154	177
Totals	872	401	471

- We did not analyse sexual orientation in our REF2014 equality impact assessment due to small number of responses.
- 38% of eligible staff for REF2021 have not supplied data on sexual orientation. Although a greater proportion of LBG staff have significant responsibility for research compared to heterosexual staff, the differences are not statistically significant (p=.364)

Maternity and pregnancy

	REF2021		
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Identified Staff (SRR and Research-only)	Category A Staff without SRR
No Leave taken	825	374	451

Maternity or adoption leave	31	17	12
Paternity leave	16	10	6
Totals	872	401	471

- Similar to religion/belief and sexual orientation, we did not include data on maternity leave in our REF2014 EIA due to the small number of cases observed.
- In REF2021[9], we continue to have only a small number of cases of staff on maternity leave, but staff who have taken maternity leave are proportionally higher represented amongst those with significant responsibility for research compared to staff who have taken paternity leave or no leave. The differences are not statistically significant.

Marital Status

	REF2021		
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Identified Staff (SRR and Research-only)	Category A Staff without SRR
Married/ Civil partnership	347	151	196
Cohabiting	26	10	16
Divorced and/or separated	11	3	9
Single	44	25	19
Unknown	444	212	231
Totals	872	401	471

- 51% of all eligible staff have not provided data on their marital status (blank field and/or 'prefer not to answer). A relatively smaller proportion of staff who are married, co-habiting or divorced are identified as have significant responsibility for research compared with staff who are single. These differences are not statistically significant (p=0.109).

Part-time and fixed term contracts

	REF2021		
	All Category A Eligible Staff	Category A Identified Staff (SRR and Research-only)	Category A Staff without SRR
Permanent full-time	710	325	385
Permanent part-time	85	21	64
Fixed term full-time	49	36	13
Fixed term part-time	28	19	9
Totals	872	401	471

- We do not have comparative data for part-time and fixed-term contracts staff from REF2014.

---

[9] Includes all staff who have taken maternity, adoption and paternity leave since 1 January 2014.

- Part-time workers only marginally are less likely to be identified as having significant responsibility for research compared to full-time workers ($\chi(2)$= 5.9, p < .05). Fixed-term staff are more likely to be identified to have significant responsibility for research ($\chi(2)$= 22.0, p < .001). However, these results must be interpreted very cautiously as we have not yet completed processes for identifying substantive connection (affecting part-time staff) and research independence.

REF2021: Equality Impact Assessment on Research Independence

Equality Impact Assessment

Recording EIA Findings

Title of Proposal: REF2021 Equality Impact Assessment on Research Independence   **Person Responsible for Proposal:** Silke Machold, Dean of Research   **Author of Assessment:**   Silke Machold, Dean of Research   **Date Completed:**   28 January 2020, updated 18 February 2020

Q1. Please briefly outline the policy or action that you are proposing, including details of who will implement it

Following the publication of the Funding Bodies' Guidance on REF2021 and the associated Guidance on Codes of Practice, the University of Wolverhampton developed its Code of Practice (CoP), which was approved by Academic Board (June 2019) and the Funding Bodies (August 2019). A requirement of the CoP is to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) on the process for determining research independence for research-only staff. This is the first EIA on our process for determining research independence, following the first round of decisions and the end of the appeals period. The EIA enables us to identify where discrimination in output selection can inadvertently occur, where our processes have a positive impact on the advancement of equality and/or where there are opportunities to take steps that will have a positive impact. See attached for more details on the process.

Q2. Please outline who you believe this proposal will affect, and how you have considered what their reaction to the proposal will be (i.e. through bespoke consultation or research)

The process for determining research independence is required for all staff on research-only contracts, in line with the REF2021 Guidance. Our process for determining whether a researcher is independent is documented in the REF2021 CoP, and we have extensively consulted on the CoP in 2019 (see section 1 of CoP). In addition to the protected characteristics, we have also considered part-time and full-time workers and fixed-term and open-ended contracts, in line with regulations to prevent less favourable treatment for fixed-term employees and part-time workers. In line with the recommendations on EIAs in the REF2021 Code of Practice Guidance, we have used staff in T&R contracts with significant responsibility for research and who are on the Lecturer grade as the comparator group.

Q3. Please indicate against each protected characteristic the potential impact categorised by:

- Potential Positive Impact (P)
- No Impact(N/A)
- Unknown Impact(U)
- Potential Negative Impact (N)

PSED needs	Age	Disability	Race (including ethnicity and nationality)	Religion or belief	Sex	Gender identity/ reassignment	Sexual orientation	Pregnancy & Maternity (including parental leave & adoption)	Marriage or civil partnership
Eliminate Unlawful discrimination or other conduct unlawful under the Act	P	P	P	P	P	U	P	U	P
Advance equality between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not	P	P	P	P	P	U	P	U	P
Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	U	n/a	U	n/a

Q4. Please explain how you reached your conclusions and outline what changes you are making/action you are taking to address negative/promote positive impact, including any gaps in evidence. In developing your answer please consider the following:

- For **Potential Positive Impact** explain what this positive impact is and how you will monitor/evaluate it
- For **No Impact** explain why you weren't able to amend your proposal so that it has a **Potential Positive Impact**
- For **Unknown Impact** explain what evidence you require to better understand the impact, why you don't have it, and how you intend to collect it
- For **Potential Negative Impact** explain what this negative impact is, and how you intend to address this

Please see attached analysis.

Q5. When will the Equality Impact Assessment be reviewed?				
				v Within Twenty-Four Months

Q6. A copy of your EIA must be forwarded to the Head of Equality and Diversity once the proposal (the subject of the EIA) has been considered by the relevant decision making body. This should indicate whether:

- ☐ Proposal was accepted without amendments due to issues identified in the Equality Impact Assessment
- ☐ Proposal was amended due to issues identified in the Equality Impact Assessment
- ☐ Proposal was accepted with awareness of adverse impact and procedures put in place to monitor
- ☐ Proposal was rejected due to issues identified in the Equality Impact Assessment

REF2021 Code of Practice Equality Impact Assessment

Research Independence

Background

Following the publication of the Funding Bodies' Guidance on REF2021 and the associated Guidance on Codes of Practice, the University of Wolverhampton developed its Code of Practice (CoP), which was approved by Academic Board (June 2019) and the Funding Bodies (August 2019). A requirement of the CoP is to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) on the processes for determining research independence for staff on research-only contracts. This is the first EIA on our processes for determining research independence, following the first iteration of our processes in summer/autumn 2019 (see CoP section 3). The EIA enables us to identify where discrimination in determining research independence can inadvertently occur, where our processes have a positive impact on the advancement of equality and/or where there are opportunities to take steps that will have a positive impact.

Data on protected characteristics were taken from the University's HR system (Agresso), using January 2020 data. We included staff who have joined us since August 2019 (and for whom no decision on research independence has yet been made) and excluded staff whose contracts finished before January 2020 as they are no longer able to be included for consideration as Category A eligible staff.

We compare the profile of research-only staff with staff on T&R contracts who have significant responsibility for research and who are on the Lecturer scale[10]. We analysed data for all protected characteristics except for gender identity and parental leave as none of the staff in the research-only pool declared against these fields in Agresso.

Prior to initiating the process for determining research independence, we took the following steps to mitigate any biases:

1. We consulted extensively with staff in the development phase of our Code of Practice, including consultations with the staff networks (see section 1.12 of the CoP)
2. Staff involved in the decision-making on research independence received bespoke training on REF and EDI, designed and delivered by Advance HE.
3. We have two rounds for running the process for determining research independence (in summer 2019 and in summer 2020), in recognition that research independence as defined by the funding bodies may change over time.

In line with the CoP, staff may appeal against the decision regarding their research independence status, and were notified of this in the outcome letter following the first round of research independence decisions. To date, no appeals have been received.

---

[10] This is in line with the CoP Guidelines by the Funding Bodies to consider an appropriate comparator pool for junior academic staff (paragraph 65).

Sex

Although women are marginally under-represented in our REF submission (see EIA on determining staff with SRR and EIA on output selection, they have greater representation among research-only staff and more women than men were found to be research independent. However, there is no statistical difference between men and women in the categories we analysed, i.e. those found to be research independent, those who were not, those who are yet to be decided and the comparator pool of teaching and research staff who have SRR and are on a lecturer grade (Fisher's Exact test p=0.501).

Research Independence * Sex Crosstabulation
Count

		Sex Male	Female	Total
Research Independence	research only - independent	6	10	16
	research-only - not independent	4	5	9
	research-only - To be decided	5	4	9
	teaching and research	38	28	66
Total		53	47	100

Age

As expected, we find that research-only staff and staff on a Lecturer grade are typically in the younger age groups (84% of staff). We do not, however, find a statistically significant difference between different age groups and whether they were considered to be research independent and the comparator group (Fisher's Exact test p=0.182).

Research Independence * Age Bracket Crosstabulation

Count

		Age Bracket 25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	over 65	Total
Research Independence	research only - independent	2	9	2	1	2	16
	research-only - not independent	3	5	1	0	0	9
	research-only - To be decided	4	3	2	0	0	9

	teaching and research	26	32	7	1	0	66
Total		35	49	12	2	2	100

Disability

In the staff pool under consideration, only 4 staff declared a disability, 80 staff declared that they had no disability and 15 staff did not answer or opted out of this field on Agresso. Of these, only 1 member of research-only staff (determined to be research independent) declared disability, which is lower than the proportion declared by Lecturer grade staff (3% compared to 5%). Nonparametric statistical tests show that there is no difference between staff who have a declare disability or not and whether they were considered to be research independent and the comparator group (Fisher's Exact test p=0.827).

Ethnicity

As there are only small numbers of staff in different ethnic minority groups, we have grouped staff into either White or Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) for the purposes of analysis. The data show that the proportion of BAME staff considered research-independent is very similar to the proportion of BAME staff in the comparator staff pool (19% and 20% respectively). We find no statistically significant difference between BAME and White staff (and those that did not declare) and whether they were considered to be research independent and the comparator group (Fisher's Exact test p=0.221).

Research Independence * Ethnicity Crosstabulation

Count

		Ethnicity			
		White	BAME	did not disclose	Total
Research Independence	research only - independent	13	3	0	16
	research-only - not independent	4	5	0	9
	research-only - To be decided	5	3	1	9
	teaching and research	47	13	6	66
Total		69	24	7	100

Religion and Belief

Compared to other staff groups, a greater proportion of research-only staff and Lecturer-grade staff have declared in the Agresso field on whether they had a religion/belief or not (only 32% of research-only staff and 17% of Lecturer staff did not declare compared to 46% of staff considered in the output pool). We found no statistically significant difference between religion/belief of staff, and whether they were considered to be research independent and the comparator group (Fisher's Exact test p=0.405).

Research Independence * Religion and belief Crosstabulation

Count

		Religion and belief			
		religious	no religion	did not disclose	Total
Research Independence	research only - independent	4	8	4	16
	research-only - not independent	3	2	4	9
	research-only - To be decided	3	3	3	9
	teaching and research	29	26	11	66
Total		39	39	22	100

Sexual Orientation

As in other EIAs, we have a proportion of staff that do not declare against this protected characteristic, but this is a smaller proportion than in other assessments. Of research-only staff, 29% did not declare, 3% declared as LGB and 68% declared as heterosexual (the comparator group of Lecturer-grade staff had 14% not declared, 11% LGB and 75% heterosexual). There was no statistical difference between sexual orientation of staff, and whether they were considered to be research independent and the comparator group (Fisher's Exact p=0.198).

Marital Status

A high proportion of staff in the pool under consideration did not declare their marital status (68% of research-only staff and 68% of Lecturers). A non-parametric test showed that there was no difference between marital status and whether they were considered to be research independent and the comparator group (Fisher's Exact test p=0.781).

Contractual status

There is a greater prevalence of fractional (part-time) contracts among research-only staff compared to Lecturer staff (26% compared to 14%). This may partly be explained by initiatives of RIILP that created flexible working arrangements to attract more under-represented groups. We also find here

a statistically significant difference (Fisher's Exact test p=0.006) which is driven by the difference between the research-only staff and the comparator group.

Similarly, we find a greater prevalence of temporary fixed-term contracts amongst research-only staff compared to Lecturer staff (79% of research-only staff are on fixed-term contracts compared to 20% of Lecturers). The statistical test shows a significant difference (Fisher's Exact test p=0.000) and again this is driven by the comparator group rather than decisions on research independence amongst the group of research-only staff.

Research Independence * Type of contract Crosstabulation

Count

		Type of contract		
		Full-time	Part-time	Total
Research Independence	research only - independent	8	8	16
	research-only - not independent	8	1	9
	research-only - To be decided	9	0	9
	teaching and research	57	9	66
Total		82	18	100

Research Independence * Length of contract Crosstabulation

Count

		Length of contract		
		permanent	temporary	Total
Research Independence	research only - independent	4	12	16
	research-only - not independent	3	6	9
	research-only - To be decided	0	9	9
	teaching and research	53	13	66
Total		60	40	100

REF2021: Equality Impact Assessment on Output Review and Selection

Equality Impact Assessment

Recording EIA Findings

Title of Proposal: REF2021 Equality Impact Assessment on Output Review and Selection **Person Responsible for Proposal:** Silke Machold, Dean of Research **Author of Assessment:** Silke Machold, Dean of Research **Date Completed:** 22 January 2020, updated 18 February 2020

Q1. Please briefly outline the policy or action that you are proposing, including details of who will implement it

Following the publication of the Funding Bodies' Guidance on REF2021 and the associated Guidance on Codes of Practice, the University of Wolverhampton developed its Code of Practice (CoP), which was approved by Academic Board (June 2019) and the Funding Bodies (August 2019). A requirement of the CoP is to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) on the output selection process. This is the first EIA on our process for selecting outputs, following the first output review period (August 2019 to January 2020). The EIA enables us to identify where discrimination in output selection can inadvertently occur, where our processes have a positive impact on the advancement of equality and/or where there are opportunities to take steps that will have a positive impact. See attached for more details on the process.

Q2. Please outline who you believe this proposal will affect, and how you have considered what their reaction to the proposal will be (i.e. through bespoke consultation or research)

The process of output selection affects staff submitted to REF2021 (Category A staff) and former staff whose eligible outputs are considered for inclusion in the unit output pool. Our process for selecting outputs is documented in the REF2021 CoP, and we have extensively consulted on the CoP in 2019 (see section 1 of CoP). In addition to the protected characteristics, we have also considered part-time and full-time workers and fixed-term and open-ended contracts, in line with regulations to prevent less favourable treatment for fixed-term employees and part-time workers.

Q3. Please indicate against each protected characteristic the potential impact categorised by:

- Potential Positive Impact (P)
- No Impact(N/A)
- Unknown Impact(U)
- Potential Negative Impact (N)

PSED needs	Age	Disability	Race (including ethnicity and nationality)	Religion or belief	Sex	Gender identity/ reassignment	Sexual orientation	Pregnancy & Maternity (including parental leave & adoption)	Marriage or civil partnership
Eliminate Unlawful discrimination or other conduct unlawful under the Act	n/a	P	P	P	P	U	n/a	U	P
Advance equality between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not	P	P	P	P	P	U	n/a	U	P
Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	U	n/a	U	n/a

Q4. Please explain how you reached your conclusions and outline what changes you are making/action you are taking to address negative/promote positive impact, including any gaps in evidence. In developing your answer please consider the following:

- For **Potential Positive Impact** explain what this positive impact is and how you will monitor/evaluate it
- For **No Impact** explain why you weren't able to amend your proposal so that it has a **Potential Positive Impact**
- For **Unknown Impact** explain what evidence you require to better understand the impact, why you don't have it, and how you intend to collect it
- For **Potential Negative Impact** explain what this negative impact is, and how you intend to address this

Please see attached analysis.

Q5. When will the Equality Impact Assessment be reviewed?				
				v Within Twenty-Four Months

Q6. A copy of your EIA must be forwarded to the Head of Equality and Diversity once the proposal (the subject of the EIA) has been considered by the relevant decision making body. This should indicate whether:

- ☐ Proposal was accepted without amendments due to issues identified in the Equality Impact Assessment
- ☐ Proposal was amended due to issues identified in the Equality Impact Assessment
- ☐ Proposal was accepted with awareness of adverse impact and procedures put in place to monitor
- ☐ Proposal was rejected due to issues identified in the Equality Impact Assessment

REF2021 Code of Practice Equality Impact Assessment

Output Selection Process

January 2020

Background

Following the publication of the Funding Bodies' Guidance on REF2021 and the associated Guidance on Codes of Practice, the University of Wolverhampton developed its Code of Practice (CoP), which was approved by Academic Board (June 2019) and the Funding Bodies (August 2019). A requirement of the CoP is to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) on the output selection process. This is the first EIA on our process for selecting outputs, following the first output review period (August 2019 to January 2020). The EIA enables us to identify where discrimination in output selection can inadvertently occur, where our processes have a positive impact on the advancement of equality and/or where there are opportunities to take steps that will have a positive impact.

Data on protected characteristics were taken from the University's HR system (Agresso), using January 2020 data. We included data from former staff where their outputs were reviewed for inclusion in the unit output pools[11]. We excluded data on staff who joined the University post August 2019, as they did not participate in the first round of the output review and selection. We also excluded staff who were in a small unit, where we were granted an exemption from submission. Data on output review and selection were taken from the University's Current Research Information System (Symplectic Elements), through which we manage the output review and selection. We took data on the number of outputs nominated by each member of staff and their Grade Point Average (GPA), and data on the number of outputs selected for the output pool and their GPA. A number of additional steps were taken to mitigate biases in the process of selecting outputs:

1. All Unit of Assessment (UoA) Coordinators completed bespoke training on REF, EDI and Unconscious Bias, designed and delivered by Advance HE[12], in advance of decision-making on output selection for the unit level pool.
2. We have in place a Policy on the Responsible Use of Research Indicators (Metrics), to mitigate biases arising from the inappropriate use of metrics.
3. Each output was reviewed by a minimum of 2 assessors, who provided narrative feedback on the output as well as rating the output[13].
4. The process for disclosing individual circumstances took place in parallel. Where applicable, staff and UoA coordinators were notified to clarify expectations on the basis of equality-related circumstances, including the waiving of the minimum 1 output requirement, and providing support for staff concerned.

We analysed data for all protected characteristics, except for gender identity and parental and adoption leave. This was due to the small number of staff in these categories[14], and is also in line with best practice guidance from Stonewall regarding demographic analysis of trans people. We also analysed data for contractual status, in line with regulations to prevent less favourable treatment for fixed-term and part-time workers.

---

[11] In line with our CoP, this excluded staff and their outputs who were made compulsorily redundant.

[12] CoP, paragraph 1.15

[13] We used the REF criteria but a more granular scale, e.g. low, mid and high three star, to aid output review and selection. Narrative feedback was one of the recommended mitigations for unconscious bias.

[14] See EIA on the identification of staff with significant responsibility for research, Appendix 8 of CoP.

Sex

Women are marginally under-represented in our submission, accounting for 41% of the staff contributing to the output pool, and tended to nominate fewer outputs. A Kruskal-Wallis test showed that there is a statistically significant difference in the number of outputs nominated by men and women (χ^2=11.309, p=0.001), and also a statistically significant difference in the number of outputs selected (χ^2= 7.854, p=0.005).

Cross-tabulation: Number of outputs nominated *sex and Number of outputs selected * sex

Number of outputs nominated	Male	Female	Total	Number of outputs selected	Male	Female	Total
0	0	1	1	0	8	4	12[15]
1	18	26	44	1	74	71	145
2	28	25	53	2	47	33	80
3	27	22	49	3	28	19	47
4	28	16	44	4	26	13	39
5	31	20	51	5	24	4	28
6	75	34	109				
Total	207	144	351		207	144	351

This is likely related to individual circumstances that have been shown to more likely affect women compared to men (e.g. absence due to maternity leave or caring responsibilities). We have made adjustments for this through a) our process for declaring individual circumstances (section 5 of the CoP) and b) not having specified a minimum requirement above 1[16] for contribution to the output pool.

When analysing the output quality, however, we find that there is no statistically significant difference in the quality of outputs nominated by men and women (χ^2=0.450, p=0.502), and the quality of outputs selected (χ^2=1.436, p=0.231).

Age

Younger staff (<45 years) and older staff (>65 years) were marginally more likely to have significant responsibility for research. There was no particular pattern in relation to the number of outputs by younger staff, likely driven by many of them being early-career researchers. Older staff tended to nominate more outputs compared to younger age groups. However, a Kruskal-Wallis test showed no statistical significance in the number of outputs nominated by different age groups (χ^2=9.213, p=0.056) or the number of outputs selected (χ^2=1.966, p=0.742).

Cross-tabulation Number of outputs nominated * Age

Number of outputs nominated	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	Over 65	Total
0	0	1	0	0	0	1
1	5	16	12	10	1	44
2	7	19	13	11	3	53

---

[15] With one exception, these are former staff where the decision was taken not to include their outputs in the unit pools.

[16] Except cases where an exemption on the grounds of equality-related circumstances applies.

3	5	18	14	9	3	49
4	3	12	13	13	3	44
5	2	13	20	10	6	51
6	8	27	33	31	10	109
Total	30	106	106	84	26	351

Cross-tabulation Number of outputs selected * Age

Number of outputs selected	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	Over 65	Total
0	0	3	4	2	3	12
1	16	46	39	38	6	145
2	5	27	23	18	7	80
3	2	17	17	7	4	47
4	3	9	14	11	2	39
5	4	4	8	8	4	28
Total	30	106	105	84	26	351

Further, there was no statistical difference in the quality of outputs nominated by staff of different ages (χ^2=3.852, p=0.426) nor in the quality of outputs selected by age group (χ^2=5.171, p=0.270).

Disability

As noted in our initial EIA on identification of staff with significant responsibility for research, we have relatively small numbers of staff who have declared a disability. A Kruskal-Wallis test showed no statistically significant difference in the number of outputs nominated or selected by staff with declared disabilities compared to those that declared no known disability or chose not respond (χ^2= 0.863, p=0.649; χ^2=0.810, p=0.667 respectively). The results are similarly not significant when checking for the quality of outputs nominated or selected (χ^2=3.115, p=0.211; χ^2=3.776, p=0.151 respectively).

Cross-tabulation: Number of outputs nominated *disability and Number of outputs selected * disability

Number of outputs nominated	Declared disability	No known disability	No response	Total	Number of outputs selected	Declared disability	No known disability	No response	Total
0	0	1	0	1	0	0	12	0	12
1	3	38	3	44	1	9	130	6	145
2	2	49	2	53	2	5	72	3	80
3	4	43	2	49	3	4	40	3	47
4	3	39	2	44	4	1	37	1	39
5	2	45	4	51	5	1	25	2	28
6	6	106	2	109					
Total	20	316	15	351	Total	20	316	15	351

Ethnicity

Since we have only small numbers of staff in individual ethnic groups[17], we have grouped staff into either white or Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) for the purposes of analysis.

Cross-tabulation: Number of outputs nominated * ethnicity and Number of outputs selected * ethnicity

Number of outputs nominated	White	BAME	Did not declare	Total	Number of outputs selected	White	BAME	Did not declare	Total
0	1	0	0	1	0	11	1	0	12
1	36	8	0	44	1	112	32	1	145
2	40	11	2	53	2	63	14	3	80
3	43	5	1	49	3	34	12	1	47
4	35	8	1	44	4	28	10	1	39
5	42	9	0	51	5	23	5	0	28
6	74	33	2	109					
Total	271	74	6	351	Total	271	74	6	351

A Kruskal-Wallis test showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the number of outputs nominated (χ^2=4.913, p=0.086), outputs selected (χ^2=0.874, p=0.646), nor in the quality of outputs nominated or selected (χ^2=3.277, p=0.194 and χ^2=1.218, p=0.544 respectively) between white, BAME staff and those who did not declare.

Religion and Belief

A large number of staff (46% of the pool under consideration) have chosen not to declare their religion or belief. Of those that declared a religion/belief, the numbers were too small in each category of religion/belief to allow for a meaningful analysis, and we have therefore grouped staff into those that declared a religion/belief, those that declared not to have a religion/belief, and those that either left the field blank or did not want to declare.

Cross-tabulation: Number of outputs nominated * religion/belief and Number of outputs selected * religion/belief

Number of outputs nominated	Religious	Not religious	Not declared	Totals	Number of outputs selected	Religious	Not religious	Not declared	Totals
0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	12
1	17	11	16	4	1	46	34	65	145
2	15	15	23	53	2	29	16	35	80
3	13	16	20	49	3	16	14	17	47
4	11	8	25	44	4	9	9	21	39
5	12	14	25	51	5	8	6	14	28
6	40	16	53	109					
Total	109	80	162	351	Total	109	80	162	351

---

[17] See REF2021 EIA on identification of staff with significant responsibility for research

There was no statistical difference in either the numbers nominated and selected, or the quality of the outputs nominated and selected between the different groups.

Sexual Orientation

As in the previous categories, 41% of staff in the pool under consideration did not declare against this category, 6% declared as LGB and 53% as heterosexual. Given the small numbers involved we have not provided cross tabs, but we have run non-parametric tests (independent samples Kruskal Wallis). The results showed that there was no statistically significant different between the three groups (LGB, heterosexual and did not declare) in relation to number of outputs nominated or selected (χ^2=1.123, p=0.570 and χ^2=2.538, p=0.281). However, we found a statistically significant difference in the quality of outputs nominated (χ^2=8.1418, p=0.015) and the quality of outputs selected (χ^2=16.494, p=0.000).

It is difficult to see this result being due to any biases in the assessment process since sexual orientation is not an identifiable category in the review process. Instead, this is most likely to be driven by differences in the output scoring by UoA, where we find a statistically significant difference χ^2=84.976, p=0.000 for quality of nominated outputs; χ^2=120.028, p=0.000 for quality of selected outputs, along with a statistically significant difference in sexual orientation of staff between the UoAs (χ^2=48.646, p=0.030).

Furthermore, as there was no effect on the number of outputs selected, we can have confidence that the final output pool is not detrimentally affected.

Marital Status

56% of staff in the pool did not declare or did not want to declare their marital status. For the purposes of analysis, we have grouped staff into a) married and/or cohabiting, b) single and/or divorced and c) not declared/ did not want to declare.

Cross-tabulation: Number of outputs nominated * marital status and Number of outputs selected * marital status

Number of outputs nominated	Married/ cohabiting	Single/ divorced	Not declared	Totals	Number of outputs selected	Married/ cohabiting	Single/ divorced	Not declared	Totals
0	1	0	0	1	0	4	0	8	12
1	16	2	26	4	1	54	10	81	145
2	14	4	35	53	2	25	7	48	80
3	16	5	28	49	3	21	1	25	47
4	15	2	27	44	4	15	2	22	39
5	19	1	31	51	5	12	3	13	28
6	50	9	50	109					
Total	131	23	197	351	Total	131	23	197	351

We found no statistical difference between the groups in either the number of outputs nominated or selected, or the quality of outputs nominated or selected (p values ranged from 0.102 to 0.929).

Fractional contracts

Only 11% of the staff in the pool under consideration were staff on part-time contracts[18], and we would have expected part-time staff to nominate fewer outputs than full-time staff. However, a Kruskal-Wallis test showed that there was no significant difference in the number of outputs nominated by part-time staff compared to full-time staff (χ^2=1.695, p=0.193) nor in the number of outputs selected (χ^2=3.251, p=0.071).

Cross-tabulation: Number of outputs nominated * contract fraction and Number of outputs selected * contract fraction

Number of outputs nominated	Full-time staff	Part-time staff	Totals	Number of outputs selected	Full-time staff	Part-time staff	Totals
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
1	30	7	37	1	104	19	123
2	37	6	43	2	54	7	61
3	36	3	39	3	40	5	45
4	30	6	36	4	36	2	38
5	38	4	42	5	25	2	27
6	87	9	96				
Total	259	35	294	Total	259	35	294

We found no statistically significant difference in the quality of outputs nominated or selected between part-time and full-time staff (χ^2=0.150, p=0.699 and χ^2=0.025 and p=0.875 respectively).

Fixed-term and permanent contracts

We have few staff on fixed-term contracts – in our sample only 22 staff (7.5%) were on fixed term contracts. These tend to be research fellows associated with specific projects, for example our Marie Sklodowska-Curie fellows, and we would therefore expect staff on fixed term contracts to nominate fewer outputs.

Cross-tabulation: Number of outputs nominated * contract duration and Number of outputs selected * contract duration

Number of outputs nominated	Open-ended contracts	Fixed-term contracts	Totals	Number of outputs selected	Open-ended contracts	Fixed-term contracts	Totals
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
1	32	5	37	1	113	10	123
2	37	6	43	2	55	6	61
3	37	2	39	3	43	2	45
4	33	3	36	4	37	1	38
5	40	2	42	5	24	3	27
6	92	4	96				
Total	272	22	294	Total	272	33	294

The analysis showed that fixed-term staff nominated fewer outputs compared to staff on permanent contracts (χ^2=4.873, p=0.027), but also that the quality of nominated outputs by fixed-term contract staff was marginally higher than outputs nominated by permanent contract staff (χ^2=4.377, p=0.036,

---

[18] The total staff numbers are different compared to the other sections as we have missing data on former staff.

mean rank 183.34 for fixed-term staff and mean rank 144.05 for permanent staff). In the selected output pool, we find then no statistically significant differences in the number of outputs selected, and the quality of outputs selected, between these two groups of staff (χ^2=0.285, p=0.593 and χ^2=2.777, p=0.96 respectively).

REF2021: Equality Impact Assessment on Output Review and Selection

Equality Impact Assessment

Recording EIA Findings

Title of Proposal: REF2021 Equality Impact Assessment on Output Review and Selection   **Person Responsible for Proposal:** Silke Machold, Dean of Research   **Author of Assessment:**   Silke Machold, Dean of Research   **Date Completed:**   25 November 2020

Q1. Please briefly outline the policy or action that you are proposing, including details of who will implement it

> Following the publication of the Funding Bodies' Guidance on REF2021 and the associated Guidance on Codes of Practice, the University of Wolverhampton developed its Code of Practice (CoP), which was approved by Academic Board (June 2019) and the Funding Bodies (August 2019). The CoP was revised in September 2020 following revised Guidance from the Funding Bodies regarding COVID-19. A requirement of the CoP is to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) on the output selection process. In line with our CoP, this is the second EIA on our process for selecting outputs, following the second output review period (August 2020 to November 2020). The EIA enables us to identify where discrimination in output selection can inadvertently occur, where our processes have a positive impact on the advancement of equality and/or where there are opportunities to take steps that will have a positive impact. See attached for more details on the process.

Q2. Please outline who you believe this proposal will affect, and how you have considered what their reaction to the proposal will be (i.e. through bespoke consultation or research)

> The process of output selection affects staff submitted to REF2021 (Category A staff) and former staff whose eligible outputs are considered for inclusion in the unit output pool. Our process for selecting outputs is documented in the REF2021 CoP, and we have extensively consulted on the CoP in 2019 (see section 1 of CoP), and discussed the 2020 amendments with staff. In addition to the protected characteristics, we have also considered part-time and full-time workers and fixed-term and open-ended contracts, in line with regulations to prevent less favourable treatment for fixed-term employees and part-time workers. We have not included output selection for UoA3 due to COVID-19 related delays. However, we have compared the January 2020 assessment (which included UoA3) with this one and there were no significant differences.

Q3. Please indicate against each protected characteristic the potential impact categorised by:

- Potential Positive Impact (P)
- No Impact(N/A)
- Unknown Impact(U)
- Potential Negative Impact (N)

PSED needs	Age	Disability	Race (including ethnicity and nationality)	Religion or belief	Sex	Gender identity/ reassignment	Sexual orientation	Pregnancy & Maternity (including parental leave & adoption)	Marriage or civil partnership
Eliminate Unlawful discrimination or other conduct unlawful under the Act	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	U	n/a	U	n/a
Advance equality between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	U	n/a	U	n/a
Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	U	n/a	U	n/a

Q4. Please explain how you reached your conclusions and outline what changes you are making/action you are taking to address negative/promote positive impact, including any gaps in evidence. In developing your answer please consider the following:

- For **Potential Positive Impact** explain what this positive impact is and how you will monitor/evaluate it
- For **No Impact** explain why you weren't able to amend your proposal so that it has a **Potential Positive Impact**
- For **Unknown Impact** explain what evidence you require to better understand the impact, why you don't have it, and how you intend to collect it
- For **Potential Negative Impact** explain what this negative impact is, and how you intend to address this

Please see attached analysis.

Q5. When will the Equality Impact Assessment be reviewed?				
				v Within 12 months

Q6. A copy of your EIA must be forwarded to the Head of Equality and Diversity once the proposal (the subject of the EIA) has been considered by the relevant decision making body. This should indicate whether:

- ☐ **Proposal was accepted without amendments due to issues identified in the Equality Impact Assessment**
- ☐ Proposal was amended due to issues identified in the Equality Impact Assessment
- ☐ Proposal was accepted with awareness of adverse impact and procedures put in place to monitor
- ☐ Proposal was rejected due to issues identified in the Equality Impact Assessment

REF2021 Code of Practice Equality Impact Assessment

Output Selection Process, Phase 2

November 2020

Background

Following the publication of the Funding Bodies' Guidance on REF2021 and the associated Guidance on Codes of Practice, the University of Wolverhampton developed its Code of Practice (CoP), which was approved by Academic Board (June 2019) and the Funding Bodies (August 2019). In September 2020, we updated the CoP with the revised COVID-19 Guidance issued by the Funding Bodies.

A requirement of the CoP is to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) on the output selection process. We conducted an initial EIA in December 2019 and January 2020 following the first output review period. This is the second EIA following on from the second output review period August-November 2020. The EIA enables us to identify where discrimination in output selection can inadvertently occur, where our processes have a positive impact on the advancement of equality and/or where there are opportunities to take steps that will have a positive impact. The EIA may also inform selection decisions where it is possible to make the submission more inclusive without a diminution in quality.

Data on protected characteristics were taken from the University's HR system (Agresso). We included data from former staff where their outputs were reviewed and selected for inclusion in the unit output pools[19]. We excluded staff in UoA3 as selection decisions were delayed due to COVID-related reasons. We also excluded staff who were in a small unit, where we were granted an exemption from submission. Data on output review and selection were taken from the University's Current Research Information System (Symplectic Elements), through which we manage the output review and selection. We took data on the number of outputs nominated by each member of staff and their Grade Point Average (GPA), and data on the number of outputs selected for the output pool and their GPA. We analysed data for all protected characteristics, except for gender identity and parental and adoption leave. This was due to the small number of staff in these categories[20], and is also in line with best practice guidance from Stonewall regarding demographic analysis of trans people. We also analysed data for contractual status, in line with regulations to prevent less favourable treatment for fixed-term and part-time workers.

Before presenting the quantitative analysis, we outline the measures we took to minimise biases in output selection.

Inclusive output selection processes

In the development of the CoP, we consulted widely with staff, including staff networks, to mitigate biases and make output selections as inclusive as possible. We also received feedback from

---

[19] In line with our CoP, this excluded staff and their outputs who were made compulsorily redundant.

[20] See EIA on the identification of staff with significant responsibility for research, Appendix 8 of CoP.

AdvanceHE as part of the bespoke training on REF and the CoP. Below is a summary of the measures we put in place:

1. We recognise that a range of circumstances affect a staff member's ability to contribute to the output pool. We have therefore no set expectation from staff to contribute to the output pool, beyond the minimum 1 output requirement which can be exempted on the basis of equality-related circumstances.

2. The process for voluntarily disclosing individual equality-related circumstances was completed before the second output review period. The revised COVID-19 Guidance and associated additional call for voluntary declarations did not result in further declarations. Based on the declarations received in the first rounds, we submitted 1 unit level reduction request and 2 exemptions from the minimum 1 output requirement to REF EDAP, which were approved. We also notified Unit of Assessment (UoA) coordinators of outcomes[21] of individual staff declarations so that additional support for staff could be provided as appropriate.

3. All UoA Coordinators completed bespoke training on REF, EDI and Unconscious Bias, designed and delivered by Advance HE[22], in advance of decision-making on output selection for the unit level pool.

4. We have in place a Policy on the Responsible Use of Research Indicators (Metrics), to mitigate biases arising from the inappropriate use of metrics. Where reviewers made inappropriate reference to use of metrics, we returned the reviews to the UoA and asked for revisions. In the second output review, we provided

5. Each output was reviewed by a minimum of 2 assessors, who provided narrative feedback on the output as well as rating the output[23].

Sex

As noted in the first output review, there are fewer women than men in our submission, and women tended to nominate fewer outputs. A Kruskal-Wallis test showed that there is a statistically significant difference in the number of outputs nominated by men and women (χ^2 =6.147, p=0.013), and in the number of outputs selected (χ^2= 4.595, p=0.032). As noted in the first output EIA, this result is not unexpected.

Cross-tabulation: Number of outputs nominated *sex and Number of outputs selected * sex

Number of outputs nominated	Male	Female	Total	Number of outputs selected	Male	Female	Total
0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
1	15	13	28	1	80	67	147
2	27	24	51	2	45	21	66

---

[21] In line with the CoP, only where staff had declared that they were happy for the outcomes to be shared.

[22] CoP, paragraph 1.15

[23] We used the REF criteria but a more granular scale, e.g. low, mid and high three star, to aid output review and selection. Narrative feedback was one of the recommended mitigations for unconscious bias.

3	16	18	34	3	28	17	45
4	25	10	35	4	22	5	27
5	28	20	48	5	12	8	20
6	54	26	80				
7	6	3	9				
8	8	2	10				
9	3	0	3				
10	2	2	4				
11	3	0	3				
Total	188	118	306		188	118	306

When analysing the output quality, however, we find once again that there is no statistically significant difference in the quality of outputs nominated by men and women (χ^2=0.617, p=0.432), and the quality of outputs selected (χ^2=0.743, p=0.389).

Age

Younger staff (<45 years) and older staff (>65 years) were marginally more likely to have significant responsibility for research. There was no particular pattern in relation to the number of outputs nominated and selected by age group, which was confirmed by a Kruskal-Wallis test that showed no statistical significance (number of outputs nominated χ^2=4.568, p=0.335, the number of outputs selected χ^2=6.373, p=0.173).

Cross-tabulation Number of outputs nominated * Age

Number of outputs nominated	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	Over 65	Total
0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1	4	11	5	6	2	28
2	5	21	13	11	1	51
3	4	11	12	5	2	34
4	3	11	12	7	2	35
5	2	14	19	10	3	48
6	7	23	23	21	6	80
7	2	4	2	1	0	9
8	2	0	4	2	2	10
9	0	1	1	0	1	3
10	0	2	0	2	0	4
11	1	0	1	1	0	3
Total	31	98	92	66	19	306

Cross-tabulation Number of outputs selected * Age

Number of outputs selected	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	Over 65	Total
0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1	13	54	41	33	6	147
2	6	19	24	14	3	66
3	8	15	12	6	4	45
4	2	5	8	9	3	27
5	1	5	7	4	3	20
Total	31	98	92	66	19	306

Further analysis showed that there was a statistical difference in the quality of outputs nominated by staff of different ages (χ^2=12.937, p=0.012), and this appeared to be driven by higher scoring outputs being nominated by staff in the youngest and oldest age groups. However, there was no statistical difference in the quality of outputs selected by age group (χ^2=6.754, p=0.146).

Disability

As noted in our initial EIA on identification of staff with significant responsibility for research and the previous EIA on output selection, we have relatively small numbers of staff who have declared a disability. A Kruskal-Wallis test showed no statistically significant difference in the number of outputs nominated or selected by staff with declared disabilities compared to those that declared no known disability or chose not respond (χ^2= 0.957, p=0.620; χ^2=3.054, p=0.217 respectively). However, the results showed that the GPA of outputs nominated and selected was different between staff who declared a disability and those who declared no disability or chose not to answer similarly not significant when checking for the quality of outputs nominated or selected (χ^2=3.115, p=0.211; χ^2=3.776, p=0.151 respectively). As we have only a small number of staff who declared a disability, this result may well be driven by unit-level differences in output scoring. Checks confirm that a) there is a statistical difference in outputs scores between UoAs (χ^2=93.787, and χ^2=117.761, p=0.000 for outputs nominated and selected) and b) units with high percentages of disabled staff tended to have lower GPAs (e.g. UoAs 4, 20, 23 and 33 account for 78% of disabled staff and have the lowest average GPA).

Ethnicity

Since we have only small numbers of staff in individual ethnic groups[24], we have grouped staff into either white or Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) for the purposes of analysis.

Cross-tabulation: Number of outputs nominated * ethnicity and Number of outputs selected * ethnicity

Number of outputs nominated	White	BAME	Did not declare	Total	Number of outputs selected	White	BAME	Did not declare	Total
0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1

---

[24] See REF2021 EIA on identification of staff with significant responsibility for research

1	20	8	0	28	1	118	29	0	147
2	43	7	1	51	2	46	18	2	66
3	29	5	0	34	3	35	6	4	45
4	27	7	1	35	4	18	7	2	27
5	38	10	0	48	5	15	5	0	20
6	59	16	5	80					
7	4	5	0	9					
8	7	2	1	10					
9	2	1	0	3					
10	1	2	0	4					
11	2	1	0	3					
Total	232	66	8	306	Total	232	66	8	306

A Kruskal-Wallis test showed that there are differences between White, BAME and those staff who did not declare regarding the number of outputs selected (χ^2=7.616, p=0.022) and the GPA of the nominated outputs (χ^2=6.157, p=0.046). However, this affect appears to be due to outliers in the staff group who did not declare their ethnicity. The tests on comparing two groups (white and BAME staff) show no statistical significant difference in relation to either volume or quality measures.

Religion and Belief

There was no statistical difference in either the numbers nominated and selected, or the quality of the outputs nominated and selected between staff who declared a religion, those that declared not to be religious and those that chose not to declare.

Sexual Orientation

38% of staff in the pool under consideration did not declare against this category, 6% declared as LGB and 56% as heterosexual. Given the small numbers involved we have not provided cross tabs, but we have run non-parametric tests (independent samples Kruskal Wallis). The results showed that there was no statistically significant different between the three groups (LGB, heterosexual and did not declare) in relation to number of outputs nominated or selected (χ^2=0.430, p=0.807 and χ^2=0.148, p=0.929). However, we found a statistically significant difference in the quality of outputs nominated (χ^2=6.378, p=0.041) and the quality of outputs selected (χ^2=9.603, p=0.08). As discussed in the earlier EIA on output selection, and similar to what we observed in relation to disability, additional checks show that this is driven by differences in output scoring by UoA rather than any bias in the assessment processes.

As there was no effect on the number of outputs selected, we can have confidence that the final output pool is not detrimentally affected.

Marital Status

57.5% of staff in the pool did not declare or did not want to declare their marital status. For the purposes of analysis, we have grouped staff into a) married and/or cohabiting, b) single and/or divorced and c) not declared/ did not want to declare. We found no statistically significant difference between these groups and the volume or quality of outputs nominated or selected.

Fractional contracts

Only 13% of the staff in the pool under consideration were staff on part-time contracts[25], and we would have expected part-time staff to nominate fewer outputs than full-time staff. However, a Kruskal-Wallis test showed that there was no significant difference in the number of outputs nominated by part-time staff compared to full-time staff (χ^2=0.346, p=0.556) nor in the number of outputs selected (χ^2=3.654, p=0.056). We also did not find any difference in the quality of outputs between full-time and part-time staff.

Fixed-term and permanent contracts

We have few staff on fixed-term contracts – in our sample only 21 staff (6.9%) were on fixed term contracts. These tend to be research fellows associated with specific projects, for example our Marie Sklodowska-Curie fellows. A Kruskal-Wallis test showed that there were differences in the number of outputs nominated (χ^2=4.738, p=0.029) but not in the number of outputs selected (χ^2=0.007, p=0.935). As in the previous EIA, we found that the quality of nominated and selected outputs from fixed term staff was different (χ^2=9.248, p=0.002 for GPA of nominated and χ^2=0.5.982, p=0.014), which explains why despite fewer outputs being nominated by this staff group, there is no overall effect on the inclusion of outputs by fixed-term staff.

Summary and conclusion

In line with our Code of Practice, we have conducted two Equality Impact Assessments on our processes for selecting research outputs, using both qualitative and quantitative data. The assessment shows that our processes are inclusive and do not inadvertently discriminate against a group of staff,

---

[25] The total staff numbers are different compared to the other sections as we have missing data on former staff.