

Equality Analysis (EA)

Research Development & Support Office

Recruitment of partners

A. Policy/practice details

1. The title of the policy being analysed.

Facilitation of collaborative projects and programmes between businesses and academics.

2. Please explain the main purpose of the policy being analysed.

RDSO's role is in facilitating and managing the bringing together of business representatives and academic staff at Bath and at other universities to bid for collaborative projects. The business representative and the academic staff develop and deliver industry collaboration proposals including technology transfer, Knowledge Transfer Partnerships, Licence agreements, proof of concept, Collaborative Research & Development projects (including Industrial Fellowships, Partnership development awards and publicly funded programmes), and mentoring. We also have a role in managing the project and relationships once a project/programme is up and running.

The programmes above along with other individual schemes enable companies and the public sector to access knowledge, skills and technology from the UK Universities. The arrangements above can cover any important area where there is a need for additional expertise and resources, for dynamic organisation to improve their competitiveness, productivity and performance.

3. Who will be affected?

The main stakeholders internally are academics of the University of Bath and externally, representatives of companies and public sector bodies. It could also be argued that the sponsors of the schemes, in some cases the Technology and Strategy Board (TSB) and the Research Councils are also a stakeholder organisations. However, they have not been considered as a 'main' stakeholder for the purposes of this EIA.

Whilst basic statistics are kept by individual programme (e.g. the KTP office or the KTA project team) there are no formal mechanisms to know who is affected across the equality strands / protected characteristics. It is also

difficult to obtain information with respect to individuals within external organisations.

4. Aspects of the policy that particularly impact on equality and diversity.

RDSO's role is to help with the bidding to a public or private funder of projects. Public funders have publically available criteria which, in general, is to ensure the proposal fits within the agreed mission and objectives of the funders. These criteria are externally applied by the funders (e.g., by the TSB see; <http://www.ktponline.org.uk/strategy>). Therefore, the facilitation of projects and programmes is in part driven by external factors. For example, KTP applications have to map onto the TSB's strategy in terms of their 'Innovation Platforms' and 'Key Technology Areas'.

For some activities there are inbuilt pre-conditions which could affect EIA, for example:

1. The majority of posts on offer go to recent graduates of early career academics and this is a clear objective of most programmes where change and technology is targeted but clearly implies an age factored bias in any teaching facility.
2. The Engineering Doctorate and Doctoral Training programmes funded by the Research Councils only fund UK and EU student stipends.
3. The short KTP for Industrial Mathematics can only fund extensions for 6 month for student funded through EPSRC (i.e. not overseas self-funded students).
4. The skewing of recruitment from industry to employment regarding pregnancy and maternity on short term contracts (and what SME Industry sometimes see as generous university benefits)

RDSO activity at the University of Bath has always been undertaken within the externally imposed constraints of funding. So whilst these external constraints are outside the control of RDSO, there is a degree of control in respect of to whom the service is provided. In the particular case of the short KTPs in Industrial Maths the University was able to support this with an overseas candidate by making special arrangements.

With regard to academic participation in industrial collaboration indication is that the participation rates of females in KTP are less than could reasonably be expected from internal academic complements but significantly higher than females in for example engineering industries.

In the area of race, RDSO does not measure the participation of different races but we would still rate the risk of potential differential impact initially

assessed as medium and the more open recruitment market would accentuate the risk and this therefore should remain as medium.

In consideration of the disability status of academics participating in KTP, the percentage is almost zero providing low absolute figures. We also comply with the University of Bath's double tick procedure. The risk of potential differential impact which was initially assessed as medium should remain as medium.

Considering the participation rates in KTPs of external clients, this is more problematic to make judgements on. Those who are put forward to engage in industrial collaboration on behalf of client companies are largely outside the control of RDSO and therefore the University. Nonetheless the figures show that there is a bias towards white, non-disabled males. This does not reflect the UK population as a whole and therefore highlights a high possible risk of potential differential impact across the equality strands that are being assessed.

The University advertisement, application process and recruitment are all areas where policy on protected groups can be most effective and this is adhered to in all dealings with business.

B. Analysis

5. Please indicate evidence used and the process by which you have arrived at your conclusions.

Current KTP Programmes – KTP Office

Current KTA projects – KTA project team

Human Resources Report 2011 / 12

(<http://www.bath.ac.uk/equalities/annualreports/pdf/EDPerformanceIndicatorsforStaff2011-12.pdf>)

Labour Market Statistics (<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/pdfdir/lmsuk0211.pdf>)

Incomes Data Services (<http://www.incomesdata.co.uk/>)

Given the figures reported in the past, the concern is that there may be barriers preventing academics in certain groups from participating in collaborative projects. For example, female academics may assume that "Industry Collaboration isn't for me." The same may apply to those from Black Asian Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups and those reporting a disability.

However, this is not the case, as the facilitation of collaborative project applications requires good quality leads which almost exclusively come from

academics and their industry contacts. It makes no business sense to exclude any groups from participation.

In terms of gender bias, one possible explanation could be that the subject areas which are more conducive in all areas are the more 'male dominated' departments, such as Engineering. This would not, however, explain the differences in respect of BAME academics.

It is more difficult to address the potential for differential impact in respect of the facilitation of programmes with external companies. It seems likely from undertaking this EIA that we are not collaborating with client companies across the spectrum of the different equality strands. There could be whole populations of business people who do not know about the possibilities for University / Industry collaboration.

6. Risk of adverse impact on protected groups.

	High impact	Medium impact	Low impact
Age		X	
Disability		X	
Gender		X	
Pregnancy/Maternity		X	
Race/ethnicity		X	
Religion/belief			X
Sexual Orientation			X
Transgender			X
Marriage/civil partnership			X

C. Mitigating potential adverse impact

7. Conclusions and recommendations for amendments to the policy/practice. *Please give an outline of the key actions based on any gaps, challenges, priorities and opportunities you have identified.*

In respect of academic collaboration in industrial partnerships it is essential that those facilitating proposals firstly **examine what the possible barriers** are. Why are women / BAME / disabled academics not participating in programmes? Is it lack of awareness or are there some other factors at play.

The senior RDSO managers regularly give presentations to departments about programmes, so we would expect to now be bringing forward equal

proportions from the academic community? **New data is now needed to explore possible barriers** – this should be an RDSO wide activity.

In respect of external companies, the RDSO managers could be **making contact with specialist groups** such as the Black Business Initiative and Equality B&NES to explore ways that they can engage and promote.

KTP is one area where short interactions with companies involving recent graduates where the University maintains a vigorous monitor on equality being applied effectively and be proactive in delivery equality in action and not allowing business to divert policy. **Individual programmes have continued to deliver new diversity and fresh attitudes into business.**

A similarly vigorous policy to **engage with a broader range of academics** internally could provide a proactive route to increasing tolerance in business engagement to wider diversity.

Many of our staff has completed the new online training on E & D relating to protected groups.

8. Timescale for implementation of changes or introduction of new policy.

To implement the following five areas:

1. Examine what the possible barriers are
2. New data is now needed to explore possible barriers.
3. Make contact with specialist groups
4. Individual programmes have continued to deliver new diversity and fresh attitudes into business
5. Engage with a broader range of academics

We propose the following timescales:

- Discuss at RDSO Management meetings to identify RDSO lead (June 2012)
- Amend RDSO's policies in relation to facilitating collaborative projects and programmes (January 2013)

D. Publication

9. Final reporter:

Rob Head

10. Date:

June 2012

11. Review date:

March 2015