**Leeds Beckett Equality Impact Assessment**

**Section 1: Contact details**

*Please complete your personal details and contact information in the spaces provided.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Impact assessor’s name: | Katrina Tilbrook |
| Job title: | Equality and Diversity Manager |
| Faculty/Service Area: | Human Resources |
| Submission date: | 25 April 2019 |

**Section 2: About the policy, practice or procedure**

*Please describe what you are impact assessing and who it applies to.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title:** | **REF2021 Code of Practice (First Iteration April 2019)** | | | |
| Description/purpose: | To assess the criteria and processes set out in our Draft Code of Practice for:   1. Determining research independence 2. Identifying staff with significant responsibility for research   To review our internal research audit outcomes through the lens of protected characteristics as a baseline indicator for the REF submission process which launches in late Spring 2019. | | | |
| People it applies to: | 🗸 Staff | ☐ Students | ☐ Visitors | ☐ General public |

**Context**

All institutions taking part in REF2021 who are not going to submit 100% of Category A eligible staff are required to develop, document and apply a code of practice which sets out how the institution will determine who is an independent researcher, which staff have significant responsibility for research and how outputs will be selected as part of the submission. We are developing our research culture and activity and so our Code of Practice reflects this journey and acknowledges that not all academic colleagues will be submitted.

This document sets out how equality and diversity issues have been taken into account in determining the decisions we have made about our REF processes and practice and how this has informed our REF policy. Our Code of Practice defines how we intend to develop our submission and this assessment documents why we have chosen develop our processes as we have.

Our conduct in REF2021 is governed by the principles of;

**Equity** – fair and equal assessment of all types of research and forms of research output

**Equality** – promoting equality and diversity in all aspects of the assessment

**Transparency** – clear and open processes through which decisions are made and information is shared

Our equality impact assessment is a living document and will be reviewed throughout the process. Indicative points have been agreed but may be subject to change dependent on outcomes from the equality assessment process. These points are currently as follows:

April 2019 Processes for Determining Research Independence and Identifying Staff with Significant

Responsibility for Research.

Review our internal REF Audit by analysis of individual protected characteristics

July 2019 Compare the pool of staff who meet the independence criteria with our early career

research group

August 2019 Review appeal panel outcomes (grounds for appeal and appellants) through analysis of

personal information

October 2019 Review the pool of agreed Category A staff through analysis of personal information

December 19 Review applications for defined and/or individual circumstances through analysis of

personal information

April 2020 Review the pool of those included in the REF 2021 submission through analysis of personal

information

**Determining Research Independence**

Our institution is working hard to become more research active and we recognise that not all academics will meet the criteria as defined in the REF Guidance. We are keen that our submission reflects who we are and giving people the choice to apply is an important principle in being transparent and equitable. We recognise that not all academics will choose to submit for REF2021 and those who do wish their research work to be considered must first demonstrate they are independent researchers. This is a process whereby colleagues self-select and opt in to the process through the submission of evidence to their Unit of Assessment Panel. Those not meeting the criteria of independence are classified as working towards independence. This provides individuals with the opportunity for conversations around what support is then needed to develop research independence.

For the same reasons of transparency and equity we have given assurances around the selection of outputs from those were made redundant during the REF period. We will only include single author outputs from a previous employee who was made redundant during the current REF period where we have their written permission. This means that we don’t disadvantage those for whom inclusion is part of their career progression and we respect their right to having choice in the matter.

In developing this principle of self-selection we have taken account of the fact that some individuals may self-select out of the process if they don’t equate their research activity with the REF Guidance Criteria. Our Directors of Research (DoRs) and Unit of Assessment Leads have run a number of meetings at Unit of Assessment level to look at how the criteria are met within individual units. DoRs are also encouraging colleagues through 1:1 meetings and research planning discussions to consider how their research interests are best reflected in any submission.

**Section 3: Data and evidence**

*a) Have you identified relevant evidence (qualitative and quantitative) to establish whether this policy,**practice or procedure could potentially affect some equality groups more than others?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Have you analysed equality data for each of the groups identified in Section 2? | 🗸 Yes | ☐ No |
| Have you identified/researched anecdotal or alternative evidence? | 🗸 Yes | ☐ No |
| Have you attached the evidence to this impact assessment? | 🗸 Yes | ☐ No |

Data and information used to inform this first assessment has been taken from a number of sources and includes; feedback from staff consultations (online survey and UoA meetings x A), data from the annual research audit, minutes from the Code of Practice working group.

**Research Audit Data**

An audit of research activity and engagement is undertaken each year and the outcomes from this have been used to inform the data analysis used for this first iteration of our equality assessment. Data for the research audit included all academic colleagues at 1 October 2018 and excluded teaching only staff (Part-Time Lecturers and Graduate Teaching Assistants) and anyone with an FTE of less than 0.2. The audit is an assessment of which academic colleagues meet our REF criteria and gives an indication of who we might expect to be included in REF2021. The actual pool of those who self-select and put themselves forward for submission to REF will differ and will be reflected in the next iteration of this document.

b) *Based on your research/evidence, which equality groups might this policy, practice or procedure affect more or less than others (if any)?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age | ☐ | Religion and belief (including no belief) | ☐ |
| Disability | ☐ | Sex (Gender) | 🗸 |
| Gender reassignment (Gender Identity) | ☐ | Sexual orientation | 🗸 |
| Pregnancy, maternity and adoption | ☐ | Working Pattern (part-time/full-time) | 🗸 |
| Race | 🗸 | Contract Type (fixed-term/open) | ☐ |

Data around Gender reassignment/identity has not yet been included pending clarification of the data set. Data around pregnancy, maternity and adoption will be added and the University does not maintain records of individual marital status so this has not been included.

To protect the identity of individuals we do not publish data classifications of less than 5 and these will be redacted in any published data set.

**Data Summary**

The following data is taken from the internal research audit and can only be indicative at this point. The data is a comparison of those individuals in the Unit population as compared with those included in the Audit population. Most of the information is provided at Unit of Assessment level except in the case of sexual orientation and religion and belief. This data is provided on an aggregated basis to protect identities.

The table below shows the total headcount for each Unit of Assessment (UoA) and the headcount total derived from the research audit.



Data from the audit has been analysed in relation to Age, Disability, Gender, Race, Religion and Belief, Sexual Orientation, Working pattern and Contract Type. Based on this first analysis there is no evidence of disproportionality with regard to age, disability or religion and belief. The aggregated audit population is broadly in line with the aggregated unit population.

There is disproportional impact in respect of Race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender (sex), working pattern and contract type.

The following tables provide fuller details in relation to the characteristics detailed above and in table 3b.

* Grey shading has been used to indicate those Units where the audit population is within 2% of the total unit population and is regarded as similar enough not to indicate any disproportionality.
* Blue shading indicates over-representation
* Orange shading indicates under-representation

**Age**



The distribution across age bands is broadly comparable at institution level i.e. comparing the aggregated unit total against the aggregated audit total.

At Unit level the variation in age profiles between the total unit population and the audit group is more pronounced.

**Disability**



The majority of colleagues have stated they identify as not disabled and a significant proportion of the populations (11.2% and 9.5%) have opted not to disclose or share this information. Only 4.3% of all academic colleagues identify as disabled compared with an Audit population of 3.3%. The number of individuals who have shared their information and who identify as disabled is very small and one individual can significantly alter the proportion indicated at unit level. On this basis there is a level of disproportionality in impact – both positive and negative in relation to declared disability status at Unit level. There are issues associated with focussing on individual disability and much more to be gained from encouraging and promoting inclusive practice.

**Religion and Belief**



The academic staff profile in relation to religion and belief is broadly comparable at institution level i.e. comparing the aggregated unit total against the aggregated audit total.

**Gender / Sex**



On an aggregated basis women are slightly under-represented within the Audit population (44.4% compared with 46.3% in the Unit total). At UoA level there is greater disproportionality both positive and negative, again affected more obviously by the smaller numbers.

In units 3, 11, 19 and 28 the audit population is proportional to the unit population and any impact is minimal.

In units 4, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24 and 32 women are slightly under-represented in the audit population

In units 13, 27, 33 and 34 women are slightly over-represented in the audit population

The level of disproportionality is slight and is also affected by the overall Unit size and the proportion of the Unit likely to be included.

It would be useful to review the original assessments and establish whether there are any underlying reasons for the disproportionality and report back through the CoP Working Group. If the impact can be linked to particular instances/initiatives and is positive these may benefit other areas and could be shared.

The audit data is indicative only however these results could inform discussions with colleagues at Unit level to ensure that all understand how the self-selection process will work.

**Sexual Orientation**

For the purposes of this analysis LGBT+ includes anyone who identifies as Lesbian or Gay, Bisexual or who selects other sexual orientation.



There is a slight over-representation of LGBT+ colleagues within the Audit population. Analysis at UoA level indicates there are only two units where there is a degree of under-representation and in both cases this is because of the very low numbers involved.

The degree of disproportionality is so low that further analysis is not advised.

**Race (Ethnicity)**



On an aggregated basis BAME colleagues are slightly over-represented within the Audit population (12.8% compared with 11.8% in the Unit total).

In units 4, 19, 23, 24, 28 and 34 the audit population is proportional to the unit population and any impact is minimal. It should be noted that Units 19 and 34 have no BAME representation and this lack of diversity is an issue which is reflected in the ongoing work around the Race Equality Charter.

In units 18, and 32 BAME colleagues are under-represented in the audit population but the number of BAME individuals is very low (1 and 3 respectively)

In units 3, 11, 13, 17, 20, 27 and 32 BAME colleagues are slightly over-represented in the audit population. Again the smaller numbers skew the percentages but the trend is clear that BAME colleagues have significant representation within the audit population.

As with gender it would be beneficial to understand more about the data generally and whether or not this reflects other trends within the University e.g. the increased representation of BAME colleagues within the professoriate or any correlation with academic promotion rounds.

**Contract Type**

For the purpose of this analysis the 7 individuals on temporary contracts have been included within the fixed-term group as the contract is time dependent.



The number of colleagues on a fixed-term contract is very low at 55 individuals (5.9%). It is therefore difficult to make any meaningful comment on the numbers beyond the fact that our Audit population numbers 17 and at 4.4% is broadly comparable with the lower starting base.

**Working Pattern**



On an aggregated basis part-time colleagues are under-represented within the Audit population (16.7% compared with 18.8% in the Unit total). This is amplified at Unit of Assessment level with the exception of Unit 32 where part-time colleagues are significantly over-represented. The unit is a reasonable size (54) of whom 35 are included in the audit. Given the overall trend it would be useful to understand what the underlying reasons are for this and whether this might benefit other areas

**Section 4: Progressing the Equality Duty**

*Is there an opportunity to use this policy, practice or procedure to advance the core aims of the Equality Act at our University?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation | ☒ Yes | ☐ No |
|  |  |  |
| Advance equality of opportunity between different protected groups | ☒ Yes | ☐ No |
|  |  |  |
| Foster good relations between different protected groups | ☒ Yes | ☐ No |

**Section 5: Action planning**

*Please describe what actions you will take as a result of undertaking this impact assessment – what is the timescale for each and who is responsible (add more rows if necessary).*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Action** | **Timescale** | **Responsibility** |
| 1 | Review the original audit assessments and establish whether there are any underlying reasons for the disproportionality and report back through the CoP Working Group. If the impact can be linked to particular instances/initiatives and is positive these may benefit other areas and could be shared. | 31 May 2019 | Directors of Research |
| 2 | Ensure that DoRs receive the equality impact assessment outcomes and are aware of these in their discussions with colleagues at Unit level, ensuring that all understand how the self-selection process will work. | 30 June 2019 | Directors of Research |
| 3 | As with gender it would be beneficial to understand more about the data generally and whether or not this reflects other trends within the University e.g. the increased representation of BAME colleagues within the professoriate or any correlation with academic promotion rounds. | 31 May 2019 | E&D Manager |