Race Equality Charter: Handbook 2021

Contents

About this handbook

This handbook provides detailed information on submitting applications to Advance HE's Race Equality Charter (REC) award from January 2016.

The REC aims to improve the representation, progression and success of minority ethnic staff and students within higher education.

Through undertaking a comprehensive self-assessment and working through each section of the REC, institutions are able to develop specific, targeted actions to advance race equality.

This handbook provides detailed guidance on the requirements of REC and how to apply for an award. It should be read in conjunction with the REC application form and survey.

Benefits of applying for the Race Equality Charter

Advancing race equality has the potential to lead to a range of benefits for your institution:

- Committing to higher degree attainment rates, improved continuation rates and improved employment outcomes for minority ethnic students
- Evidencing your institution's commitment to equality and diversity, as required by research councils
- Working towards improved teaching and learning, linked to the potential expectations of the Teaching Excellence Framework
- Complementing your internationalisation agenda for an improved experience for your international students and staff
- Increasing awareness of globalisation and diversity for all students, which is attractive to prospective employers
- Promoting your plans to attract, utilise and retain talented individuals
- Increasing the potential for innovation and creativity throughout your institution
- Joining up with other shared institutional agendas such as widening participation
- Meeting your legal obligations of the Equality Act 2010

Race Equality Charter Principles

The REC is based on five key principles.

In applying to be part of the REC, your institution is committing to adopting these principles within policies, practices, action plans and culture.

1. **Racial inequalities are a significant issue within higher education. Racial inequalities are not necessarily overt, isolated incidents.** Racism is an everyday facet of UK society and racial inequalities manifest themselves in everyday situations, processes and behaviours. Overt racism evidently still exists. However, focusing on overt racism can sometimes distract from tackling more covert racial inequalities that can be more difficult to identify and address. Subtle differences in actions, decisions and behaviours can build into significant differences in outcome and experience for minority ethnic staff and students. It is these subtle 'micro-inequalities' that need to be addressed, in addition to the overt, macro-inequalities.

2. **UK higher education cannot reach its full potential unless it can benefit from the talents of the whole population and until individuals from all ethnic backgrounds can benefit equally from the opportunities it affords.** Diversity benefits everyone; diverse teams enhance creativity and promote innovation. UK higher education cannot benefit from that unless its staff and student populations reflect the increasingly diverse UK population.

3. **In developing solutions to racial inequalities, it is important that they are aimed at achieving long-term institutional culture change, avoiding a deficit model where solutions are aimed at changing the individual.** A 'deficit' approach refers to actions that focus on changing or adapting minority ethnic individuals to fit in with existing structures, processes and cultures, rather than interrogating the issues within those structures, processes and cultures. Targeted development programmes such as mentoring are useful, but they should be developed and framed carefully and thoughtfully with involvement from minority ethnic staff and students. The focus might be on supporting individuals in overcoming the barriers that are in their way and/or building and maintaining resilience while change is implemented, rather than how they can change to fit in.

4. **Minority ethnic staff and students are not a homogeneous group.** People from different ethnic backgrounds have different experiences of, and outcomes from/within, higher education, and that complexity needs to be considered in analysing data and developing actions. The experiences and outcomes of different minority ethnic groups vary significantly, and actions may need to vary accordingly. In analysing data, care needs to be taken to ensure that ethnicity is properly understood and that the methods of aggregating data avoid misleading any explorations and misdirecting well-intentioned actions.

5. **All individuals have multiple identities, and the intersection of those identities should be considered wherever possible.** Race intersects with other identities in a multitude of ways, and institutions should be mindful of this in exploring issues and developing solutions. For example, the experiences of, and outcomes within, higher education may be very different for a Black woman compared with a Black man. In addition to race, age, disability, gender, gender identity, religion and belief, sexual orientation and socioeconomic background will all impact on an individual's experiences and outcomes. While everything within a REC application should be

considered through the primary lens of race and ethnicity, the interaction with other identities cannot be ignored.

Committing to the Principles of the Race Equality Charter

To join the REC, Advance HE requires a letter of endorsement from the vice-chancellor, principal, director (or equivalent) of your institution.

The letter confirms the institution's acceptance of the REC principles, their commitment to these at the highest level, and how they have consulted key stakeholders on the commitment required from them for a successful submission.

Getting started

In addition to formally signing up to the charter mark principles there are other factors that your institution should consider before applying for the REC.

Which staff and students are included?

Advance HE refers to minority ethnic staff and students as being anyone from a minority ethnic background, including white minority ethnic backgrounds. We recognise, though, that the experiences of visible minority groups are likely to be different from those of non- visible minority groups. Further, we know that among visible minorities, different ethnic groups can have very different experiences and outcomes within higher education and society in general.

Additionally, the higher education sector employs and admits many international staff and students who may face different issues, barriers and opportunities based on differences in culture, background, language, accent and dialect. Data analysis needs to be able to identify these differences and your institution must differentiate between home and international staff and students to understand any issues and barriers accordingly.

Consequently, REC requires consideration of all staff and students from minority ethnic backgrounds, as set out above. However, consideration should be given to the prioritisation and proportionality of actions: the more significant the issue, the more priority should be attached to the actions.

Intersectionality is a mandatory consideration within Equality Charters (See **Intersectionality** below), and the level of consideration should increase as institutions move towards award renewal and/or Silver level awards. However, your institution may want to specifically consider the intersection between race and religion in your discussions from the start. For example, among Asian staff and students, differences may exist based on their religious belief; Hindu Asian staff and students may have different experiences from Muslim Asian staff and students.

See **Data section** for information on data requirements and presentation.

Intersectionality

Intersectionality means recognising that people's identities and social positions are shaped by several factors, which create unique experiences and perspectives. These factors include, among others: age, disability, gender, gender identity, religion and belief, sexual orientation and socioeconomic background.

Individuals can experience discrimination based on a combination of elements of their identity. It is therefore important that your equality and diversity work is mindful of this complexity when exploring issues and developing solutions. For example, a Black woman and a White British woman may have very different experiences, as may a Black woman and a Black man.

Within your REC application we expect intersectionality to be considered increasingly as you progress your race equality work. For first-time Bronze applicants, this consideration might be aspirational (for example to begin building in mechanisms to understand and explore intersectionality).

As institutions apply to renew their Bronze award and/or move on to a Silver award, this thinking should be respectively more advanced; strategies and actions should be more nuanced, reflecting the complexity of multiple identities.

Commitment from senior management

Race equality is a difficult issue to discuss and manage. One or two staff members cannot tackle it in isolation; it requires commitment from the whole institution. Addressing racial inequalities also requires long-term commitment as culture change is difficult to instigate quickly; actions need time to be implemented and resourcing needs to be sustained over a realistic period.

While it will be possible to see short-term improvements, systemic culture change takes time and tenacity to achieve. Senior managers, including governing bodies, need to take responsibility for advancing race equality and demonstrate and promote commitment by example.

To encourage and persuade busy staff and students to take ownership of actions and commit to the race equality agenda they need to perceive it as high priority and at the centre of the university agenda. They are likely to be involved in difficult, and at times uncomfortable, conversations and their efforts should be acknowledged.

In addition to formally notifying of their commitment to REC principles, vice-chancellors and principals are also required to write a letter to accompany their REC application. The letter is an opportunity to demonstrate their commitment to race equality and to reflect on their institution's REC application and self-assessment journey.

Advance HE requires the REC application process to be led by a senior academic at pro vice-chancellor level (or equivalent) who will chair the self-assessment team (SAT) and report in directly to the senior management team and vice-chancellor. See **Self- assessment team** for further information.

Where data is requested at faculty level, it is likely that the head of each faculty will want to provide a personal comment on the data. See **Guidance on the application questions** for further information.

Time and resource

Applying for the REC, and then fulfilling the commitments within your application, is a significant piece of work requiring sufficient resource to be success

Timeframes

Advance HE estimates that for first-time applicants who are at the early stages of considering their race-specific work, it is likely to take 18 months to apply for an award, from the point at which the SAT has been convened. Institutions need time to assess what issues might exist and to determine what to do in response.

Developing specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART), evidence-based actions takes time, and institutions are likely to need half of their self-assessment time to develop specific actions which will advance race equality over the next three years.

Where institutions are at a more advanced stage in their thinking, it may take less time, and we would recommend reading this handbook in full to understand the requirements before deciding on timeframes

Programme management

It is likely that someone will need to manage the process and support the chair of the SAT. Based on the experiences of previous applicants, it is likely that such a role will require at least half a full-time post (0.5 full-time equivalent [FTE]) for the duration of the self-assessment and application.

Self-assessment team members

SAT members will need to attend meetings and take responsibility for aspects of the application between meetings. This time will need to be included as part of their workload allocation.

Qualitative data

As part of the self-assessment, you will need to conduct a mandatory staff and student survey. The survey will need to have any additional questions added, be disseminated, communicated and analysed. Analysing the quantitative elements of the survey may be expedited by using an online survey tool. However, the open text boxes will require qualitative data expertise, which can be resource-intensive depending on the number of responses.

Your institution is also likely to want to conduct interviews and focus groups following the survey, which again requires resourcing, especially if outsourcing to an independent third party.

Implementing actions

After the self-assessment, institutions need to progress their identified actions. This is likely to require staff resourcing across the institution and a ring-fenced budget to implement actions and initiatives.

Building stakeholder commitment

Deciding to apply for the REC requires the support and buy-in of the whole institution. Before deciding whether to apply, involve relevant internal groups to ensure they are supportive and committed to the work. Stakeholder engagement and commitment are important and groups you might consider include:

- minority ethnic staff and students
- relevant staff and student networks
- equality and diversity and human resources teams
- heads of faculty

Publication of successful applications

One of the requirements of the charter is that successful applicants must publish their submission on receiving an award.

The publication of the submission adds transparency to the process. It enables staff and students at your institution to understand the programme of work being undertaken, and to get involved wherever relevant. It also allows prospective staff and students to understand the institution's commitment to advancing race equality, which may impact on their decision to apply to your institution.

It is possible that some elements of the quantitative data may need to be removed from the published version to retain anonymity and for data protection, but it is anticipated that the majority of the application will be published in its original form.

Cross-institutional working

As well as identifying new actions and initiatives, REC provides an opportunity to harmonise existing related work.

Widening participation

You may have a widening participation team already looking at issues of retention and degree attainment, linked to your institution's Office for Fair Access (OFFA) access agreements. Where that work is currently race-related, or could be race-related, you could tie it together with your charter work.

Access, retention and success: aligning widening participation and equality strategies

Legal obligations

You may want to tie your charter action plan and analysis with your legal requirements under the Equality Act 2010 and Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) annual reporting statements.

Other relevant work

Existing sources of information may be relevant to your application and help inform your analysis and actions. For example, institutions who have been involved in surveys such as the Careers in research online survey (CROS) and Principal investigators and research leaders survey (PIRLS) may find it useful to look at their own results by ethnicity:

- Careers in research online survey (CROS): https://www.vitae.ac.uk/impact-and-evaluation/cros
- Principal investigators and research leaders survey (PIRLS): https://www.vitae.ac.uk/impact-and-evaluation/pirls
- HESA: https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis

Race-specific impact

It is important that you get credit for any work you have already undertaken, but the race-specific implications of that work must be understood and included.

It is important that any existing work included in your application is viewed through the primary lens of race equality. For example, you may have a women's mentoring scheme. For this to be relevant to your application it is not enough simply to state that minority ethnic women are welcome to attend the mentoring scheme. You would need to have assessed:

- the ethnicity of the women who have accessed the mentoring scheme
- feedback from the scheme analysed by ethnicity to understand any differences in satisfaction
- whether minority ethnic women felt included and considered within the scheme
- how mentors were equipped to consider multiple identities within the scheme

Award levels

Advance HE's equality charters are designed to offer incremental recognition of improvement with different levels of award. Athena SWAN currently has Bronze, Silver and Gold, while REC currently has Bronze and Silver levels.

Advance HE would expect your institution to start with a Bronze application before moving on to a Silver. The application form and process is the same for all levels, but the expectations are different.

Institutions are required to re-apply for the award every three years with additional renewal requirements (please see below). Awards conferred (from February 2022) will be valid for five years from the award submission deadline. Should an applicant be unsuccessful in an award renewal they will be offered a grace period of one year in order to return with an improved submission.

Bronze

A Bronze award recognises that the university has a solid foundation for eliminating racial inequalities and developing an inclusive culture that values all staff and students.

A Bronze award acknowledges commitment and preparation to act. Applications should be candid about any issues identified and state clearly how they plan to address them. Institutions should also acknowledge the scale of what needs to be accomplished and what they hope to have achieved at the end of the five-year period of the award.

Bronze institutions are characterised by:

- their candid understanding of how race equality is perceived within their institution and a thorough acknowledgment of issues that exist for minority ethnic staff and students
- their identification of context-specific priorities for race equality work with a clear understanding of their aims and what success looks like a comprehensive, evidence-based action plan, underpinning the institution's race equality priorities and aims
- having institution-wide senior and middle management commitment to advancing race equality demonstrated through their involvement with this work, ownership of actions and the allocation of adequate resources

Bronze requirements

Bronze institutions will need to have carried out the following.

- Established a SAT. Advance HE recommends that the team is chaired by a senior academic leader at least pro-vice chancellor level (or equivalent).
- Conducted a survey of minority ethnic staff and students to gain insight into the culture of the institution.
- Interrogated qualitative and quantitative data on the experiences and outcomes for minority ethnic staff and students.
- Consulted with minority ethnic staff and students on existing issues and the development of actions and initiatives.
- Completed a REC application form which presents the results of all of the above with in-depth analyses and commentary providing the reader with a clear sense of the institution's race-specific issues, aims and priorities.
- Created a comprehensive, evidence-based action plan, with SMART actions. Actions should be owned by people who have adequate influence and seniority to complete them. Accountability should be built into existing institutional reporting mechanisms.

Institutional context

Different Bronze institutions may not be alike. Two institutions may be at quite different points in progressing race equality, but they can potentially both gain a Bronze award.

For example, one institution may be based in a metropolitan area with a significant minority ethnic population where race and ethnicity have been discussed for some time, albeit without prior actions or progress having been made. The institution may have data identifying differences in outcome for recruitment, selection, promotion and degree attainment and target actions in those areas.

Another institution may be based in a less diverse area with very small minority ethnic populations and with very limited history of discussing ethnicity and race. The institution may decide to prioritise work on tackling the isolation felt by minority ethnic individuals, potential conflicts within the local community and appropriate methods of raising awareness of race equality within the institution.

Bronze renewal

In addition to the requirements of a Bronze award, for a renewal institutions will need to demonstrate progress against their previous action plan. Bronze renewals demonstrate ongoing commitment to tackling racial inequalities, and can provide evidence of actions having been completed, but the institution is not yet ready for a Silver award.

Institutions applying for a Bronze renewal will have to provide further evidence of faculty involvement and increased local accountability since the last application. This might be evidenced, for example, through an increase in actions owned by individual faculties, ownership of data by individual faculties, or public commitment by faculties.

Bronze renewals are still focused on preparation to change, with actions having been taken since the last award, but without the necessary progress for a Silver award.

Silver awards

It is anticipated that institutions will apply first for a Bronze award, and then either a Bronze renewal or a Silver level award, depending on the level of progress that has been measured.

In addition to the requirements for a Bronze award, a Silver award recognises a significant record of activity and achievement by the institution in promoting race equality and in addressing challenges across the whole institution. Applications should demonstrate that equality is well embedded within the institution with strong leadership in promoting the charter principles, and evidence of the impact of race equality activities.

Crucially, where progress has been made, the institution should be able to trace the cause.

Building on the requirements for Bronze/Bronze renewal above, a Silver level award demonstrates even more local accountability. Applications will evidence strong local ownership of actions, perhaps through specific faculty action plans. Faculties will be able to evidence the progress they have individually made to create an inclusive culture for their minority ethnic staff and students.

Additionally, there is an expectation at Silver level for actions to reflect the learning that has taken place and the progress that has been made. Institutions are likely to have thought further about the impact of multiple identities and their intersection with ethnicity, and this should be reflected in the application.

Gold awards

As the charter mark progresses we will establish what is needed for a Gold award over the REC's development and enhancement between 2021-2022.

Faculty submissions

Institutions that have previously been involved with Athena SWAN will be aware that following institutional awards, academic departments are expected to work towards their own individual applications.

At this point departmental awards are not being considered for REC, but Advance HE is pursuing the possibility of faculty level submissions. Faculty submissions will be developed and trialed over the next 18 months and are not expected to be formally launched (if any trial is a success) until 2021/22.

Award validity

The period of award validity will be stated in the letter announcing your results. If you are unsure of your award validity, please contact Advance HE's Race Equality Charter team.

Awards conferred (from February 2022) will be valid for five -years from the award submission deadline. Should an applicant be unsuccessful in an award renewal they will be offered a grace period of one year in order to return with an improved submission.

Award outcomes

An award can be conferred if the application has met the criteria for either a Bronze, Bronze Renewal or Silver. An application can be further awarded as a borderline or strong application.

An award outcome may remain pending if the panel decide that further information is required. The further information request must only be used in exceptional circumstances, which can be found in <u>Section 2.3.1 Additional Information</u> (page 13).

Conferring an award

- An institution can be awarded a Bronze, Renewal or Silver
- Institutions will received an award letter within 6 weeks and feedback within 12 weeks.
- A member of the REC team will meet the institution to discuss the feedback and support the institution in their next steps.

Conferring an award at a lower level (Silver award applications only)

This can only be in the case for an institution applying for a Silver level award. If a Silver award application does not meet the criteria for Silver, the panel will then need to consider whether the application meets the criteria for Bronze renewal.

If the panel find when assessing a Silver submission that it does not meet the Silver or Bronze renewal criteria, it will be given no award.

Conferring an award: Strong application

- An institution can be awarded a Bronze, Renewal or Silver with a Strong status.
- Institutions will received an award letter within 6 weeks and feedback within 12 weeks.
- A member of the REC team will meet the institution to discuss the feedback, support the institution in their next steps, and invite the institution to participate in a case study to share best practice, reflections and learnings.

Conferring an award: Borderline application

- An institution can be awarded a Bronze, Renewal or Silver with a Borderline status.
- Institutions will received an award letter within 6 weeks and feedback within 12 weeks.
- A member of the REC team will meet the institution to discuss the feedback and will include 1-2 coaching sessions with the key contacts and/or wider team to discuss and clarify feedback and work together on next steps.

- The applicant will address particular areas of feedback highlighted by the panel.

No award

- Institutions will received both the award letter and feedback within 12 weeks of the panel.
- A member of the REC team will meet the institution to discuss the feedback and will include up to 4 coaching sessions with the key contacts and/or wider team to incorporate feedback and work together on next steps.
- The applicant will address particular areas of feedback highlighted by the panel.
- The applicant will have the opportunity to resubmit their application within a year of the award outcome, depending on the nature of the feedback; this could be within 6 months.

Submitting an application

See **Application submission process** in **Equality Charters: guide to processes** for more details.

Submission deadlines

Institutions that are preparing submissions should notify Equality charters team of their intention to apply two months in advance of the submission deadline. This enables panels to be scheduled in advance of the deadline. The deadlines for the next three rounds are listed below.

An email reminder will be sent to the named key contact for each member institution and the REC Contact list. Please ensure that a representative from the SAT joins the mailing list, details of which can be found on the Advance HE website.

Application forms should be submitted through the [My Advance HE portal](#) by 5pm on the deadline date specified for the preferred award round.

Application forms should be consolidated as one PDF file and should include:

- cover page including contact details
- a copy of the original letter of endorsement from the head of institution (we do not require this as a separate original)
- completed application form
- action plan

Receipt of applications will be acknowledged by Advance HE within five working days. Please allow this time to elapse before contacting Advance HE.

Requests for additional information

If a panel is not able to reach a decision based on the information in the application, in exceptional circumstances they may seek additional information from the applicant.

Applicants should be prepared for such requests, which could be made up to three months after the submission deadline. The applicant will be given ten working days to provide the additional information.

Appeals

For information on appeals and processes more broadly, please refer to the [Equality Charters Guide to Processes](#) document.

Submission Timeline

The timeline given above is indicative and subject to change.

Timescale (+/- deadline)	Action required
2 months prior to deadline	Applicants should inform Advance HE's Equality Charters team of their intention to submit in this round. An email reminder will be sent out to key
5pm, on deadline date	Submissions should be submitted through the My Advance HE portal. Late submissions that are not already agreed with Advance HE will not be considered.
Within 10 working days after the deadline	Advance HE will confirm receipt of the application.
Up to 3 months after the deadline	Awards panels take place. Supplementary information may be requested.
Up to 5 months after the deadline	Results and feedback are sent to applicants. Applicants that receive awards should publish their submission on their website and supply a link to the REC team. Any personal or confidential information may be removed from the submission prior to publication.

Submitting institutions who have any queries are advised to contact the REC team: racecharter@advance-he.ac.uk

Assessing applications

See Peer review processes **and** Section 2 **in** Equality Charters: guide to processes for more details.

Awards panels

Advance HE's REC award applications are assessed by peer review panels convened by Advance HE. The panel recommends decisions on awards to Advance HE. An Advance HE staff will be present on the panel to moderate.

The moderator will assist the panel by providing guidance on the application and assessment process and ensure that the panel complies with the requirements and guidance set out in the panellist role description.

To ensure consistency of panel assessment, if required, the moderator will provide guidance on whether the application meets the requirements of the award level applied for.

The panel will review up to three submissions in advance of the meeting.

Panellists will discuss each application and make a decision on whether to recommend to Advance HE that an award is conferred. The panel have a number of options when making a decision about each application.

The panel may recommend to Advance HE that they:

- confer or renew the award at the level sought;
- confer or renew the award as a strong application
- confer or renew the award as a borderline application;
- do not confer an award.

Consistency of decisions

The panel is run by a chair appointed by Advance HE. The chair is a panellist and is involved in the decision-making process.

The chair will have experience of participating in previous panels and will have normally undertaken Advance HE's panellist chair training. The training includes information on:

- the panel review process;
- possible decisions;
- the roles of the panellists, the Advance HE moderator and secretariat;
- the role of the chair;
- challenges the chair may face and advice on how they may be overcome;
- biases and conflicts, including information on unconscious bias.

Feedback

The award panel gives developmental and critical feedback on all submissions to provide encouragement and support. The feedback highlights effective practice the panel would like to commend as well as areas in which the panel considers that improvements could be made.

Assessment criteria

Communication	How well are the policies and plans communicated to staff?
Senior or high- level commitment	Is there commitment from senior staff? How is it communicated?
Effective analysis of the data	What does the data show, and which actions are being taken to address the issues identified? How will impact be measured?
Self-reflection and honesty	The panel accepts that challenges may be faced and mistakes may be made, but these need to be recognised openly together with the steps taken to address them.
Engagement	Are staff at every level involved in the development, implementation and evaluation of policies?

When assessing submissions, the panel expect to see evidence of a rigorous evaluation process. It will consider the following themes at all levels of award.

In reaching a decision on the appropriate level of award, panels will consider:

- the clarity of the evidence provided of what has been done and what is planned
- the rationale for what has been done and what is planned, and how they link to the organisation's strategic mission and goals
- how successful the actions taken have been, how that success was measured and evaluated and how the institution and its staff and students have benefited the link between the data and the action plans
- the understanding of the geographical local circumstances and related implications for race equality

- the significance of any activities, programmes or initiatives in terms of their anticipated outcomes, their sustainability and the likely longer-term impact on the organisation, its processes and its culture
- the level of input, investment, involvement, commitment and support from senior management, heads of departments and senior academics
- involvement of minority ethnic staff and students
- the extent to which activities, programmes or initiatives developed were different, innovative or particularly challenging
- the suitability and sustainability of what has been developed and the ease with which changes have been, or are likely to become, embedded in the institutional culture
- the extent to which activities, programmes and initiatives have successfully addressed perceptions and expectations that shape or constrain outcomes for minority ethnic staff and students
- the extent to which the activities are recognised, welcomed and valued by staff generally.

Additional information

In addition to the application, where institutions have previously applied for an award (regardless of whether the award was conferred) an overview of the feedback provided to the institution will be shared with panellists. This provides further context to the application and enables panellists to ascertain if the institution has addressed any issues that were raised.

Formatting

Please ensure you use a clear font (e.g. Arial, Calibri) and suitable font size (minimum 12 point size) to ensure reviewers can read the submission clearly.

We recommend submitting your submission as either a PDF or Word Document.

Please include page numbers in your submission.

Self-assessment team

To participate in equality charters, your institution will need to establish a strong, effective SAT.

The SAT is responsible for undertaking a full evaluation of race equality across the institution, developing appropriate actions in response, and leading the institution's application for the REC. The SAT may also be responsible for ensuring that the action plan is fulfilled. See **Action Plan** for further information.

Having an effective SAT will be key to the success of an application to the REC.

To be effective your SAT will need a senior chair, this should be an academic at pro vice-chancellor level or equivalent. We would also recommend that there is a senior representative from each of the institution's academic faculties and any relevant central departments.

The SAT will lead your institution through the charter process by:

- reviewing a range of quantitative and qualitative data and identifying racial inequalities in the representation, progression and success of minority ethnic staff and students;
- reviewing the impact of relevant institutional policies and practices;
- responding to the results of the above and establishing institutional priority areas and appropriate aspirations and success criteria;
- developing an evidence-based, comprehensive action plan to underpin the agreed priorities and advance race equality over the subsequent three years (after which time the institution will renew their award by repeating the self-assessment process).

The SAT must meet at least three times over the course of the self-assessment processes leading up to the application. How the SAT is structured will depend on your institution; you may have one large SAT with smaller sub-groups for specific actions, or one SAT which undertakes everything together.

A SAT can be a committee in its own right or it can operate under the umbrella of another group. Where a SAT operates under the umbrella of another group it must follow the charter framework, and reflect the expected composition given below.

Composition

In addition to the chair, the team should include:

- people from a variety of ethnic backgrounds
- individuals with knowledge, skills and experience in advancing race equality
- representatives from each of the institution's academic faculties and relevant central departments

- a balance of professional and support staff and academics, and people at different grades within the institution
- full-time and part-time staff, and staff on open-ended and fixed-term contracts
- representatives from any minority ethnic staff and student groups
- student representation
- a data expert

The REC application requires extensive quantitative and qualitative data, in-depth analysis and good presentation. You may want to include someone on your SAT who can take the lead on generating and analysing relevant data.

- If you have previously applied for an Athena SWAN award you may want to include someone from that self-assessment team on your REC SAT. Although the subject matter is different, the processes are similar and their perspective will be useful.
- If you decide to specifically examine the intersection with religion and belief, you may find that having your institution's chaplain on your SAT helps with connecting with different groups of staff and students.

Ultimately, you need the SAT to include people with authority, in addition to the chair. Once the SAT has reflected on the institution's progress and identified challenges, they need to decide how to get things done. In three years' time, your institution will be applying again for the charter and you need to demonstrate progress. Your SAT needs to have agreed actions which are ambitious but also realistic, with clear ownership for completion.

Consideration is needed to ensure you have the right balance of people on the team. Those with authority may not necessarily cover the areas of representation outlined above, and you will need to consider how to balance the two. You are likely to want senior involvement from each faculty and relevant central department to ensure actions are embedded at the local level.

Please use the relevant section in your REC application to describe your SAT composition and the skills and experience each member contributes.

Chair

The chair's role is crucial as they are publicly stating their commitment to race equality, and have overall responsibility for the success of the application. Their role in SAT meetings will ensure:

- the power balance within the SAT is maintained, that everyone is able to have their say and that stronger voices and hierarchy do not overpower discussions and decisions.
- all members of the SAT take responsibility for completing tasks and the charter mark process.

- that equality and diversity/human resources SAT members are not overloaded with tasks or assumed to take responsibility for the ultimate submission

There are also logistical issues for the chair to consider:

- how many meetings to have, when will they be and for how long?
- who will decide on the agenda for SAT meetings, especially the first meeting
- will SAT meetings be minuted? Who will have responsibility for that? How will the secretariat of the meetings be supported?
- how to communicate the work and progress of the SAT to senior management teams and committees and the rest of the institution?
- how will the chair ensure the success of the SAT and the charter mark process?

Size

As with any committee or team it can be difficult to know how the optimal number of members for effective discussions and decision-making. Finding enough people to meet the requirements set out above may also be challenging and difficult to balance with size. For example, ensuring ethnic diversity within the SAT may not correlate with including senior managers and/or staff across each faculty and central department.

Large groups may provide an element of 'safety in numbers' whereby people feel more comfortable taking part and contributing and you will have a good variety of opinions, backgrounds and ideas. On the other hand, it is easy for voices to be lost in big meetings, especially where people may be expressing something quite challenging or personal.

Large groups can also become difficult to manage as there are more diaries to coordinate for meetings and more personalities to manage during discussions. As an approximate guide 14–15 is a rough average for SATs, but as institutions vary so much in size, you may not feel this number is appropriate.

Volunteers and/or nominees

People who volunteer are likely to be very committed to the aims of the SAT and keen to contribute and get involved, but they may not fit the requirements above and/or have the appropriate authority within their area. In contrast, nominees may feel like participation is another thing they do not have time for, and need a bit more encouragement to get fully involved.

Participating in the SAT is a big commitment, and should be reflected in the workload of members. People need to be given the time to attend meetings and take responsibility for tasks. As it is being chaired by a pro vice-chancellor or above, it should have some traction, and if senior managers can communicate the SAT as an institutional priority with ultimate oversight at senior management level, then people may be more likely and willing to engage.

Future proofing

Think ahead and decide what happens once you have submitted your application for the charter:

- how will senior managers monitor progress against actions?
- who will 'own' the action plan?
- how will the institution ensure that actions are owned and implemented at faculty level?

If an existing committee structure will be absorbing the work of the SAT, you may want to ensure that the chair of that committee, or another representative is on the SAT so there is some continuity.

Training

While some SAT members will be involved because of their experience and knowledge of race equality, others will be there because of their experience and knowledge in other areas. It may be useful for the SAT to undertake some initial training or facilitated discussions around race equality so that all members feel comfortable and confident in having potentially difficult conversations.

In addition to ensuring all SAT members are able to talk openly about race and ethnicity, such discussions at the beginning of the process can help the group to clarify what it is they are trying to achieve and to define and unpack some of the high-level issues which are likely to exist.

Staff and student surveys and engagement

Undertaking a staff and student survey is a mandatory part of a REC application, along with wider involvement with minority ethnic staff and students.

Advance HE provides some prescribed questions which must be included but institutions are encouraged to add their own additional institution-specific areas.

Rationale for the survey

As set out in the REC guiding principles, racial inequalities are not necessarily overt, quantifiable incidents which are recordable and straightforward to address. Racial inequalities might manifest as a series of micro-inequalities against minority ethnic individuals; they can be difficult to describe and in isolation may seem insignificant. At the same time, White British staff and students will have their own views on the institution's race equality priorities, and understanding their appetite for this work can be useful for developing and communicating any actions and priorities.

Advance HE recognises the limitations of a survey, and we do not anticipate the survey being your only form of capturing staff and student views, but it can be a useful starting point. As well as providing some quantitative markers of progress (for example, identifying changes in the way people have answered questions over time), the open text boxes allow for issues to be understood in more depth, and for solutions to be suggested.

Advance HE recommends the survey results are used to provide a basis for any follow-up interviews and focus groups which might be conducted.

Timing of the survey

The timing of the survey is an important consideration and institutions are advised to think carefully about when to distribute their survey to achieve the best possible response.

It is worth considering the impact of the survey on minority ethnic staff and students. First-year students may be surprised at receiving a race-specific survey in their first few weeks, and may need time to settle into the institution before being able to have an opinion. There is also the possibility of making staff and students feel more aware of racial inequalities, and therefore avoid key times when it could have a detrimental impact by increasing stereotype threat, for example, close to examination periods or internal promotions rounds.

You may choose to add the mandatory questions to an existing survey and there are potential positives and negatives in doing so. Keeping the survey as a discreet exercise prioritises race equality. It keeps the survey focused in its aims and ensures that analyses can be undertaken immediately, without waiting for another project's completion.

On the other hand, staff and students receive a lot of surveys, and survey fatigue can reduce response rates. If the REC survey would be conducted alongside a similar survey it may be worth combining them, but your institution will need to manage the perception of how the race questions are being prioritised. Your approach to this should be included within your REC application.

Wherever possible you should provide detailed ethnicity analysis by specific ethnic group rather than by an aggregated Black, Asian and ethnic minority. In addition, differentiate between international and home staff and students.

Data

Examples at the institutional level for providing data are illustrated below:

1. In undertaking your analysis, you may notice that some groups are larger than others and would benefit from further disaggregation. For example, within the White Other group, you may notice significant numbers of staff or students of a particular White minority group which it would be helpful to disaggregate.

UK		
White	*Black, Asian and ethnic minority*	*Other/unknown*
White	Black	Other
White (Other)	Asian	Unknown
	Caribbean	
	African	
	Black (Other)	
	Asian	
	Indian	
	Pakistani	
	Bangladeshi	
	Asian (Other)	

Non-UK		
White	*Black, Asian and ethnic minority*	*Other/unknown*
White	Black	Other
White (Other)	Asian	Unknown
	Caribbean	
	African	
	Black (Other)	
	Asian	
	Indian	
	Pakistani	
	Bangladeshi	
	Asian (Other)	

2. How you classify your White international staff will be institution-specific, depending on your demographics. You may want to differentiate between White European, North American and Australian.

These are examples only. The way you present your data will depend on your local context and populations.

UK

White	Black	Asian	Chinese	Mixed	Other	Unknown

Non-UK

White	Black	Asian	Chinese	Mixed	Other	Unknown

Or if this is not possible, and combining three years of data is not possible either:

UK			Non-UK		
White	White (Other)	Black, Asian and ethnic minority	White	White (Other)	Black, Asian and ethnic minority

3. This distinguishes a difference between visible minority ethnic staff and students and those from minority ethnic White groups. We recognise that this is not perfect, but it allows for the differences in experience to be considered, without losing the consideration of those from White minority ethnic groups.

Quantitative data

- You are encouraged to compare the styles of presentation of data used by award holders as a useful source of ideas and options. Successful submissions can be accessed on our website.
- The panel will not analyse or interpret the data. You should provide the interpretation for them within your commentary.
- Data should correspond to the section heading and should cover the three years preceding the submission. Reasons should be provided where data is unavailable, and, in most cases, a relevant action included.
- Do not feel the need to present all the data that has been collected. Carefully consider which data is relevant to the application, while ensuring full transparency.
- Provide both percentages and numbers.
- Use a mix of graphs and tables to present the data. Make sure that graphs and tables are clearly labelled so that it is clear to the panellists what data is being presented.
- Decide from the outset whether you will be sending colour copies of your submission to Advance HE or whether you will be asking Advance HE to print the submission in grey scale. If the latter, design your graphs to be visually striking in grey scale. For example, use different patterns for different categories, rather than colours which do not reproduce well in grey scale.
- Where data are used to inform a particular action point, the rationale and the actual action point should be embedded in the narrative and cross-referenced to the full action plan. The panel will look at how effectively data, evaluation and action plans have been linked.
- Consider the size of the graphs and text in tables. They should be easy and clear to read and understand.

- Provide rounded numbers (to the nearest five) as well as percentages, providing this does not leave staff vulnerable to being identified. It is likely that detailed ethnicity data will be possible at the institution level, but you may need to use higher-level aggregation for faculty data; aggregation might be by ethnic group or by combining three years of data together, depending on what you are analysing.

Qualitative data

Statistical evidence is useful for identifying trends and issues, and also for monitoring long-term progress, however it has limitations. For example, statistics can identify that your senior management team is entirely from a White British background, but that does not tell you why, or how you can rectify the issue. To really understand your institution's culture you need to use data from a variety of sources, and wherever possible hear the lived experience of minority ethnic staff and students.

As part of your self-assessment process you should:

- organise interviews and focus groups relating to race equality within the institution (these might be run internally or by independent facilitators).
- scrutinise a variety of qualitative sources, for example, exit interview data, previous staff and student surveys, student evaluations, National Student Survey (NSS) data, anecdotal evidence (which you will want to verify and explore further before taking action).
- Where you refer to these data sources within your application it is useful to provide context or background on how the data has been generated and analysed. While you must ensure individuals cannot be identified, where possible it is useful to state whether the data is from a staff member or student, and if a staff member, whether they are an academic or a member of professional and support staff.

External sources

There is a wealth of research and qualitative data in existence on racial inequalities and advancing race equality. Panels will expect to see you using such resources to assist in unpacking the issues you identify and to help establish appropriate actions.

Presenting qualitative data

It is useful to use quotes and references to qualitative data throughout your application wherever relevant. Quotes are not included in your word count, as long as:

- each one is no longer than 50 words
- you are discerning in the quotes you include. We would not anticipate you using more than four or five per section, depending on their length. Use them to enhance your application but be careful to ensure they are relevant and serve a purpose. If they do not add anything, then leave them out.

Where you have conducted focus groups, interviews and the survey, please ensure you have provided information on:

- how the research and data gathering was undertaken, including who was involved (for example, was an internal or external facilitator used).

- participant demographics including their ethnicity, whether they are UK or non- UK and whether they are a staff member or student.

Benchmarking

Throughout your self-evaluation and subsequent action plan, you will need to benchmark your institution against other comparators, both to measure your own progress and to ascertain where there may be good practice to learn from and strive towards. We are not prescriptive in what or how you benchmark as it will depend upon your own institutional context.

Evaluation panels will expect to see some level of benchmarking to demonstrate your institution's understanding of the scale of the issues you are facing. It will also provide panels with an indicator of your institution's ambitions and awareness of race equality initiatives.

For example, you may decide to benchmark your professional and support staff against your local demographics. If you recruit from both the local city and local region, perhaps choose a benchmark in between the city demographics and regional demographics.

Refer to that benchmark throughout the application, how you will achieve it, and give a realistic timescale.

Purpose of benchmarking

Benchmarking is for your institution's benefit; while panels are interested in the benchmarking data you use, and it can help to inform their decision to award the charter mark, the main focus should be in using the data to drive your institution's aspirations. Be ambitious in what you benchmark against and use the data to challenge your institution to make significant improvements as well as to measure progress and celebrate success.

The first two guiding principles of the Charter acknowledge that racial inequalities affect society and the higher education sector as a whole, which can make it difficult to find inspirational benchmarks. Benchmarking against an organisation which is at the same stage of work and facing the same challenges might lead to establishing who is the 'least bad', rather than who is making the most progress. You should be looking for a benchmark to chase, rather than a benchmark to justify your current position.

Local demographics

The demographics and culture of populations and institutions vary enormously and local context will be important in considering what actions to take and what benchmarks and targets to consider.

Institutions are free to benchmark themselves against any appropriate comparators. For example, it would be inappropriate for an institution in a largely white area to benchmark all of their data against a London institution, regardless of commonalities in size and affiliation. However, there should be an acknowledgment that academic staff and/or staff in more senior positions may be more likely to move for their career, and will not necessarily be recruited from the local population.

Benchmarks do not necessarily have to be higher education-specific, they just need to be relevant to your local context and what you are trying to achieve.

Benchmarking initiatives and actions

Benchmarking can be used not only to compare the demographics of your workforce or student population, but to measure the success of the initiatives you implement. For example, you might choose to introduce a programme of work to improve the rate of promotions for minority ethnic staff. Part of the evaluation of that programme of work could be to compare its success with programmes undertaken in other organisations tackling similar issues. Those organisations might be inside or outside higher education.

Action Plan

The purpose of all the data analysis you will carry out is to identify more specifically where racial inequalities may be manifesting within your institutions so that targeted action to address those inequalities may be devised and implemented and the impact assessed.

For each section of data specifically state:

- issues highlighted by the data (if any),
- ensure that where a trend or anomaly in the data is not being followed-up there is an evidence-based reason for it
- deduce what problem is being evidenced by the data – there may be qualitative data that can also shed light on the issue
- specify action(s) that can address the problem (and summarise the actions within the narrative)

Actions need to be written in such a way that they are:

- Specific
- Measurable
- Achievable
- Relevant
- Time-bound

Note: include monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the actions

Devising actions

Actions may be devised from a number of sources. These sources can be seen as falling into three categories: developing something completely new; adapting something based on the experience of other institutions and organisations; learning, adapting and improving something your institution currently does or has done in the past.

Innovating actions

Both academic research and research from other relevant organisations can be a source of evidence from which to devise completely new actions.

In order to devise actions arising from complex areas your SAT may want to set up smaller working groups that can examine a topic in more depth. SATs may also want to involve academics from their own institutions who have an interest or expertise in a particular area. Although careful understanding of research findings is an important basis for sound innovation, the expectation is that analysis would result in new initiatives rather than further research.

Innovative initiatives will be acknowledged and rewarded, regardless of the outcome, as long as they are based on evidence and a sound rationale.

Adapting initiatives used by others

Numerous institutions within and outside the higher education sector have implemented various initiatives to advance race equality. While any initiative will need to be considered for, and adapted to, the culture and context of your institution, it makes sense to build on the work of others.

It is useful to see any evaluation that has been undertaken on existing initiatives. Some initiatives may have been adopted by many different organisations because they have a positive impact, but equally, it is possible that they have been implemented simply because everyone else is doing it, rather than because they have been shown to work.

Adapting and improving your own initiatives

Many institutions have been working on issues of race equality for some time. There may also be initiatives developed under other programmes such as widening participation or Athena SWAN that may overlap with the race equality agenda.

Demonstrating (and celebrating) the impact of past and current initiatives will be an important source of actions, but always ensure they are considered specifically in relation to race equality.

Positive action

It is likely that as part of your self-evaluation and development of your action plan your institution will consider positive action measures.

Methods of utilising positive action have been possible through equality legislation for some years. Positive action falls into two main areas.

- Being able to target initiatives and actions at particular groups of people because of a known underrepresentation or differences in outcome, for example, specific training and development opportunities for specific groups of staff or students to address a particular underrepresentation.
- Being able to consider a particular identity in a recruitment situation where two candidates are equally qualified and able to do the job. In this situation where you cannot choose between them, you are able to offer the job to someone from a known underrepresented group. There are very specific legal requirements around the use of positive action which your institution will want to consider.

Positive action is not the same as positive discrimination, although the two are often confused. Positive discrimination allows organisations to recruit people for positions based on a particular characteristic, regardless of whether there is someone more qualified, and it is illegal in the UK.

The confusion between positive action and positive discrimination can lead to misunderstandings which might cause tension and upset if communicated incorrectly. Race is a particularly sensitive area and positive action initiatives related to race may be perceived

differently to positive action in other areas, for example gender. This does not mean that your institution should not consider introducing them, but that you will need to consider how they are introduced and ensure:

- minority ethnic staff and students are involved in the development of any positive action initiatives
- your institution considers the communication and implementation of positive action initiatives, as well as the initiative itself

Prioritise your actions

It is likely that you will have identified a long list of issues and actions. While we want to see your institution's ambition in your action plan, we recognise that resources are not bottomless, and furthermore, sometimes actions take time to implement. Consider this in your action plan, prioritise your actions and consider how to utilise the full three years of the plan.

Your SAT will need to discuss and agree any prioritisation, with strong involvement and consultation with minority ethnic staff and students.

Roll-out strategy

Implementing your action plan will represent a major focus of cultural change within the institution covering both staff and students. As such it will represent a major programme of work and will need to be effectively project managed. As part of your action plan you need to include actions that will detail how the plan is to be rolled out. Specify how progress on the plan will be driven, managed and monitored within the institution's core business reporting processes.

Completing the application form

It is unlikely that any one individual will be responsible for the whole application. Your final submission should be the result of intensive group work and collaboration across the SAT and the institution.

Advance staff cannot read submissions prior to the deadline and cannot provide feedback on specific content.

Style

There is no prescribed style for completing the various sections of the application form. However, making it easier for panellists to follow and understand your application will make it easier for them to be reassured by your understanding and self-assessment.

For presentation:

- use an accessible font style and size
- use page numbers

- consider how the data looks, and use graphs where a visual representation may be more helpful than tables
- consider whether you are going to provide colour hard copies of your application or whether the panellists will be reading the application in black and white. If it will be in black and white, how will your graphs look?

Structure

If panellists are presented with a mass of data with no context, analysis or commentary, they are unlikely to be convinced that your institution understands the data and is able to act on it.

If panellists are presented with lots of commentary but no evidence, it will be difficult for them to assess whether the analyses and actions are evidence-based.

It is worth ensuring that each section clearly answers the following:

What does the quantitative and qualitative data say?

What trends exist, what gaps have been identified, and what issues exist for the representation, progression and success of minority ethnic staff and students within your institution? Awards panels want to be convinced that your institution has the data it needs to complete a self-evaluation, and understands what the data is saying

What is your institution's reaction to the data?

Is your institution surprised at what has been uncovered or are they issues that have previously been identified? What are the priority areas for the institution and what will success look like? What is the institution going to try and achieve/improve over the next three years?

How will your institution address the issues identified?

Having established what the data says, and what the institution wants to change, how will you achieve the identified priorities and aims? What specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound actions are going to be undertaken over the next three years?

The self-assessment process is a journey and the application should be a reflection of that.

You should also consider that successful applications must be published, so it is worth spending time ensuring the application is accessible and easy to follow to maximise its impact on your website.

You may find it helpful to review successful submissions published by current award holders. These should be made available online when the application is successful.

Embedding actions within the application

Panellists will be looking to see that appropriate actions have been put in place to address the issues and challenges identified throughout the application.

There is no need for the narrative to describe each action in full. However, it is very helpful for a brief description of each action to be provided in the relevant part of the application. These descriptions should be cross-referenced to the full action plan which will then form a comprehensive summary of all actions at the end of the application.

It is important that actions are evidence-based and that the action plan reflects the rest of the application. Embedding your actions within the application can help to ensure this happens.

Keep it race-specific

It sounds obvious, but always keep in mind that your application is for a race equality charter. It is likely that some initiatives and actions to which you refer will be general and open to all staff and students, but your analyses and commentary need to be race-specific. For example, how does the policy impact on race equality, what is the take-up/outcome/impact of the policy when analysed by ethnicity?

If your commentary is not connecting the policy or initiative to ethnicity and race, you should consider whether it is relevant to your application.

Impact

Throughout your application, the emphasis should be on impact and instigating change. When describing actions that have already been taken, it will be important to stress how they were delivered and what happened as a consequence. For example, stating that training has been rolled out in a particular area is not enough, you need to illustrate whether the training was mandatory, who and how many people attended it, what the feedback was from the training and what impact it has had. It might be that an initiative had limited impact because of how it was implemented or supported by senior managers, rather than because of the idea itself, and it will be important to identify that.

Also consider how long something has been in place; as mentioned previously, some initiatives will take time to embed and gain momentum. Also consider how to future-proof actions to ensure they can be evaluated and their impact measured. In three years your renewal application will need to demonstrate the impact of your previous three years of actions so consider in advance how this will be ascertained.

Internet links and extra information

Panellists will make a decision about the award based purely on your application. They will not follow links, review your website or consider any appended information.

If you do not include information on actions or initiatives within the application they will not be included in their decision.

Word limits and appendices

Word limits help ensure that submissions are of a readable length for evaluation panels.

The total word limit for Bronze institutional applications is **14,000 words**, and for Silver applications it is **16,000 words**. We do not stipulate how the words should be spread over each section, it is for you to decide.

The word count **includes**:

- all aspects of the application: the letter of endorsement, institutional description, local context, and all subsequent sections; it also includes any footnotes or other types of reference
- any standalone prose included in tables; any standalone prose will be added to the total word count

The word count **excludes:**

- Details of the members of your SAT where they are presented as a table using a maximum of 30 words for each team member.
- Tables and graphs with data, providing they do not include standalone text or prose. Any text included within the table should only make sense within the context of the table or graph (for example, titles and data labels).
- The full action plan. Your actions should be embedded throughout the application form (see **Action plan**). The action plan provides a summary of all actions, complete with information on ownership and timings and should be provided as an annex.
- Qualitative quotes used throughout your application. However, individual quotes must not exceed 50 words, and institutions should be discerning in the number of quotes used. It is not anticipated that institutions will use more than four or five quotes in relevant sections.

At the end of every section, please state how many words you have used in that section

Requests for extended word limits

Requests for additional word allowances to account for exceptional circumstances are considered on a case-by-case basis. Examples of where such awards may be made include where a restructure has recently taken place, or where the submitting institution has a unique or unusual structure, or is subject to particular constraints.

If granted, additional words should only be used to explain how the special circumstances have impacted or been taken into account with respect to REC activities and the progression of race equality.

Applicants who wish to extend their word limit in this way should contact Advance HE's Race Equality Charters team (racecharter@advance-he.ac.uk) for approval at least two months in advance of the submission deadline. Where additional words are granted, the increased allowance will be at the discretion of Advance HE.

Guidance on the application questions

Section 1: Letter of endorsement

The letter of endorsement from the head of the institution sets the tone for the submission. It is vital that it demonstrates support, commitment and investment as well as an acknowledgment of the challenges to overcome.

This is an opportunity for the head of your institution to articulate the institutional drivers for tackling racial inequalities and how the application contributes to, and sits within, the overall institutional strategy and mission.

The letter should include:

- why the head of the institution supports the application;
- details of the issues senior management believe exist for minority ethnic staff and students within the institution;
- details of how race equality is being advanced by the senior management team, council and senate (or equivalent) and regularity with which it is discussed;
- how the senior management team, council and senate ensure race equality is embedded within the decisions they take;
- details of any allocated additional and ring-fenced resources for this work.

It is important that race equality work does not redirect any existing resources away from current work, particularly work in relation to age, disability, religion and belief, and sexual orientation.

Letters should be addressed to:
Advance HE,
First floor, Napier House,
24 High Holburn, London WC1V

Section 2: The Self-Assessment Process

Provide enough information to enable the panel to assess whether your SAT is fit for purpose. In order to have the ability to influence effectively your SAT will need to have the right people in the right roles at the right levels of the organisation. Is the membership of your SAT appropriately representative of different roles and ethnicities? Has the group met adequately and has it carried out the appropriate consultations to be effective?

Your rollout strategy is also part of this assessment. How will the SAT fit into the decision-making structures of the institution to ensure the implementation of your action plan over the three or five years of the award?

Section 2a: Description of the self-assessment team

The description of the SAT should include:

- team members, their role within the institution and the SAT, faculty/ department, grade and ethnicity; if individual members do not wish for this information to be disclosed then please provide a summary of the ethnic composition of the SAT.

Note: When this information is contained in a table (maximum 30 words about each team member), it will not be included in the word count.

- how people were nominated or volunteered for the role and how any time involved in being a member of the team is included in any workload allocation or equivalent;
- how each faculty and relevant central departments are involved and included.

Section 2b: The self-assessment process

Outline the process the SAT has gone through preparing for the application. This section should include:

- how the team met and communicated;
- how often they met and communicated. For face-to-face meetings please provide the dates of the meetings, attendees and a brief description of the outcomes of the meeting.

Note: the SAT is expected to meet in full at least three times.

- how the team fits in with other existing committees and structures, for example, the senior management team, existing equality and diversity committees and departmental decision-making committees.

Section 2c: Involvement, consultation and communication

Outline how the team has consulted with staff and students throughout the institution, with particular reference to minority ethnic staff and students. This should include:

- how the staff and student survey was conducted, disseminated and analysed and how many staff and students responded (with specific reference to the ethnicity and nationality of respondents);
- how minority ethnic staff and students were further involved and consulted in the self-assessment and development of actions;
- how relevant staff and student networks were involved (this may include a statement from any relevant networks);
- how you involved external interest groups, for example local race equality groups;
- communications to all staff and students, including any faculty-level communications with staff.

Section 2d: Future of the self-assessment team

Outline:

- whether the team and/or specific team members will continue to be involved;
- who will have overall responsibility for the action plan;
- how the action plan will be monitored within other existing committees and structures, for example, the senior management team;
- who will be responsible for the next application in three years; for example, will a different SAT be convened, how will the current team provide handover to that team.

Section 3: Institution and local context

Local context is crucial throughout the application in both analysing trends and issues, and identifying solutions; what works for one institution can provide inspiration and ideas, but may not be entirely appropriate for another institution.

This is your opportunity to help panellists understand your institution. If they are aware of the structures within which you are working, and the local communities within which you are based, it will help them to understand your current position and future plans. This may be especially important for specialist institutions, and those based in rural and/or less diverse parts of the UK.

You may wish to include information in this section on local community engagement activities and how local communities are encouraged to engage with the institution. If you do describe this, it must be with specific consideration of ethnicity and race, rather than in general terms.

Reflect on the ethnic mix (or lack thereof) of the local area and the institution and the impact that may have on attracting/retaining/progressing minority ethnic staff and students. This may also impact on the ease with which conversations about race and ethnicity take place and how actions are implemented without creating internal tensions.

The information in this section also provides a context for benchmarking considerations. Local demographics can provide the relevant benchmark for comparing the minority ethnic representation of professional and support staff, students, and possibly early career academics employed by the institution.

Section 3a: Overview of your institution, including:

- size;
- structure;
- specialisms;
- any other historical and/or background information that you think is relevant to your application.

Section 3b: Overview of the local population and context with reference to:

- population demographics;
- known racial tensions either specifically within local communities or linked to the institution's staff and students;

- how the institution engages with specific minority ethnic communities and how those communities engage with the institution;
- where the institution recruits its professional and support staff, students and academics;
- any other information your institution feels to be relevant

Section 4: Staff profile

This section should illustrate the staffing profile of your institution. The purpose of this section is to enable you to identify whether minority ethnic staff are disproportionately over or underrepresented in any specific roles, grades, faculties or contract types.

When you look at the career pipeline across the whole university you might identify a point where there is a disproportionate fall in the number of minority ethnic individuals between one job level and another, a so-called 'leaky pipeline'. Once the 'leak' has been identified, analyse why the problem has occurred using the other qualitative and quantitative data at your disposal. Information from your staff survey and focus groups may be enough for you to understand the factors behind the disproportionate fall in numbers.

You may want to carry out additional investigations, or use research and information available from other institutions and sectors on the common career barriers and issues experienced by minority ethnic individuals. For example, Advanc e HE research suggests that there may be a pipeline issue for early career minority ethnic academics obtaining their first open ended/permanent academic position (in contrast to gaining fixed-term academic opportunities), and a glass ceiling at senior lecturer positions.

Once you have identified possible causes of the problems you will need to develop actions to address them. Specify how they are to be implemented, who will be responsible for driving their implementation and how their impact is to be monitored.

State whether data on staff is presented by FTE, FPE or headcount. See **Terminology** for full definitions of these terms.

> **Note: If you are benchmarking against Advance HE data please note that this uses FPE.**

Where possible for sections 4a and 4b below, please provide the data for each academic faculty. Please also provide a brief overview statement on section 4 as a whole from the head of each faculty/central department.

Section 4a: Academic staff

Provide three years' quantitative data, accompanied by analysis, relevant qualitative data/research, commentary and resultant action points to describe any issues and trends in the ethnic profile of your UK and, separately, non-UK academic staff. Provide this information for:

- the institution as a whole
- each academic faculty as a whole
- each academic grade (where numbers are small, cluster relevant grades together)

- contract type (permanent/open-ended or fixed-term)
- full-time/part-time contracts
- staff turnover rates

Please comment specifically on how the institution benchmarks the ethnic composition of its academic staff in the short and longer term, and what it is hoping to achieve.

Section 4b: Professional and support staff

Provide three years' quantitative data, accompanied by analysis, relevant qualitative data/research, commentary and resultant action points to describe any issues and trends in the ethnic profile of your UK and, separately, non-UK professional and support staff.

Provide this information for:

- the institution as a whole
- each central department (and where numbers permit, each academic faculty), accompanied by a brief statement from the head of each central department
- each professional and support staff grade (where numbers are small, cluster relevant grades together)
- contract type (permanent/open-ended or fixed-term)
- full-time/part-time contracts
- staff turnover rates
- At Silver level, it is likely that institutions will have additionally considered role and occupational segregation

Please comment specifically on how the institution benchmarks the ethnic composition of its professional and support staff in the short and longer term, and what it is hoping to achieve.

Section 4c. Grievances and disciplinary processes

This information is requested because research suggests that some minority ethnic staff feel under greater scrutiny than their White British peers. Additionally, there is evidence to suggest that some minority ethnic staff do not believe that reporting a race-related incident will result in appropriate action being taken by their institution.

This section requests three years on:

- the ethnic profile of individuals involved in grievance procedures
- the ethnic profile of individuals involved in disciplinary procedures
- whether the nature of any grievances and disciplinary proceedings are race-related

These numbers are likely to be small, so collate all three years together

Section 4d: Decision-making boards and committees

We know that minority ethnic staff are less likely to be in senior positions and therefore are less likely to be on decision-making boards. It is important that institutions ensure equality and diversity are considered by boards and committees in their decision-making, as well as working towards diversifying their composition. For example:

- how are decision-making boards and committees encouraged to consider equality and diversity, for example, through training, or briefings on pertinent issues
- how do you ensure those boards have diverse representation in the short and longer term

Please provide details of the ethnic profile, and related analysis, commentary and actions, of your decision-making boards and committees, including:

- senior management team
- board of governors/council
- research and academic committees
- key departmental decision-making bodies
- any other key decision-making committees

Section 4e: Ethnicity pay

Provide details of equal pay audits conducted over the past three years by ethnicity (by specific ethnic group as far as possible) and actions taken to address any issues identified.

It is important to identify any significant ethnicity pay gaps. Comment on the findings from the most recent equal pay audit and identify the institution's top three priorities to address any disparities and to enable equality in pay.

As a general guide, any differences in pay of five per cent or more, or patterns of three per cent or more, will require exploration and explanation. Significant differences do not prove that there is pay discrimination, but they may indicate features of the pay system that are indirectly discriminatory and will need to be resolved.

Section 5: Academic staff: recruitment, progression and development

This section provides information on the outcomes of your institution's recruitment rounds, staff progression and development opportunities.

This section should illustrate the effectiveness of the institution's recruitment and selection procedures as well as highlighting any issues within career development and promotion opportunities. This section should be informed by extensive analysis of the institution's quantitative data, as well as the results from the mandatory race equality survey, and any other appropriate quantitative and qualitative sources. It also provides an opportunity to assess and reflect on the policies and practices already in place and to identify any areas for improvement. Full commentary should be included with the data, along with any relevant work already undertaken to address any issues identified, and actions you plan to take.

When providing information about academic staff please remember that this should include information about postdoctoral and early career researchers.

Where possible, for each of the sections below, please provide the data for each academic faculty. Please also provide a brief overview statement on section 5 as a whole from the head of each faculty.

Section 5a. Academic recruitment

Information on the institution's recruitment processes should be provided, with particular emphasis on how minority ethnic individuals, where underrepresented, are encouraged to apply and succeed. For example, are there policies in place to ensure ethnic representation on recruitment panels? Is there any training provided for those on interview panels and what is done to try to address biases within the processes?

Where policies and processes are referred to within the commentary, please ensure the focus is on their impact and outcome.

Please provide details of the ethnic profile (by specific ethnic group where possible) of UK, and separately, non-UK academics:

- applying for academic posts
- being shortlisted/invited to interview for academic posts
- being offered academic posts
- Where possible, please provide the data for each academic faculty. Please provide information on the institution's recruitment processes
- How are minority ethnic individuals, where underrepresented, encouraged to apply and accept offers?
- What is done to try to identify and address biases within the process?

Section 5b: Training

Outline the training available to academic staff at all levels of the institution. In particular, the application should present information on management, leadership, and/or other opportunities linked to career progression.

Provide information on the uptake of these courses, and break down the information by ethnicity if possible. Also explain how staff are kept informed of training opportunities.

This is an opportunity to provide information about the support needed to assist minority ethnic staff in their career progression. For example, are mentoring, coaching schemes or shadowing opportunities offered? What is the uptake of these schemes by ethnic group?

Section 5c. Appraisal/development review

Describe the outcomes of the appraisal/development review process for academic staff at all levels across the institution, with specific reference to outcomes by ethnicity.

Provide information about any training the institution offers to prepare for the appraisal. This could be training for those conducting the review and/or for those being appraised.

Provide information on the uptake of these training opportunities, including any differences by ethnicity. Include a narrative detailing any feedback that staff have provided about this training.

Section 5d: Academic promotion

Please provide details of the ethnic profile (by specific ethnic group where possible) of UK, and separately, non-UK academic staff promotions. Please provide collated data by each academic grade (i.e. promotions from each grade to the next).

Where possible, please provide the data for each academic faculty. This section should also include:

- details of the promotions process, including how candidates are identified, and how the process and criteria are communicated to staff
- commentary on the criteria for promotion; comment on how the full range of work-related activities (including administrative, pastoral and outreach work) are taken into consideration
- provide details of any training or mentoring offered around promotion
- promotion opportunities including temporary promotions/interim positions
- comment on staff perceptions of the promotions process, including whether it is transparent and fair

Section 5e: Research Excellence Framework (REF)

Data on the number of staff submitted to REF should be presented as a proportion of the eligible pool, broken down by ethnicity. Please differentiate between UK and non-UK staff.

Section 5f: Support given to early career researchers

Please provide details of how your institution supports minority ethnic individuals who are at the beginning of their academic careers in higher education, with specific comment on open-ended/permanent opportunities. Comment and reflect on whether any issues of concern are highlighted in the data and what actions the institution needs to undertake to respond to these issues.

Section 5g: Profile-raising opportunities

Please describe how your institution ensures the following are conducted transparently and without racial bias:

- profile-raising opportunities including conferences, seminars, guest lectures, exhibitions and media opportunities.
- nominations to public bodies, professional bodies and for external prizes

Section 6: Professional and support staff: recruitment, progression and development

Career pathways for professional and support staff in academic institutions are often very different to those for academic staff. Professional and support staff do not always have access to formalised promotion routes and promotions are accessed via applying for internal vacancies.

This section provides you with an opportunity to consider these pathways. You should review the outcomes of career progression and development and consider what the data highlight.

This section should be informed by extensive analysis of the institution's quantitative data, as well as the results from the mandatory survey, and any other appropriate quantitative and qualitative sources. It also provides an opportunity to assess and reflect on policies and practices already in place and to identify any areas for improvement. Full commentary should

be included with the data, along with any relevant work already undertaken to address any issues identified, and actions you plan to take.

Where possible, for each of the sections below, please provide the data for each central department. Please also provide a brief overview statement on section 6 as a whole from the head of each central department.

Section 6a: Professional and support staff recruitment

Please provide details of the ethnic profile (by specific ethnic group where possible) of UK, and separately, non-UK applicants:

- applying for professional and support posts
- being shortlisted/invited to interview for professional and support posts
- being offered professional and support posts

Where possible, please provide this information for each central department (and where relevant each academic faculty).

Comment on whether the institution's recruitment processes for professional and support staff are the same as those used for academic staff. Consider whether this is appropriate or not. Consider where the institution advertises vacancies, and how minority ethnic applicants are progressing through the process.

Section 6b: Training

Outline the take-up and outcome of training available to professional and support staff, analysed by ethnicity. In particular, the application should present information on training that is related to management, leadership, and/or other opportunities linked to career progression.

Describe how the institution monitors the effectiveness of training, and provide details of how training is developed in response to levels of uptake and evaluation.

Section 6c: Appraisal/development review

Describe the outcomes of the appraisal/development review process for professional and support staff at all levels across the institution, with specific reference to outcomes by ethnicity.

Provide information about any training the institution offers to prepare for the appraisal. This could be training for those conducting the review, and/or for those being appraised.

Provide information on the uptake of these training opportunities, including any differences by ethnicity. Also include narrative detailing any feedback that staff have provided about this training.

Section 6d: Professional and support staff promotions

This section provides an opportunity for you to reflect and comment on the processes for professional and support staff to progress. This might be through applying for internal

vacancies or having their roles regraded. However the process operates, is the outcome impacted by ethnicity? For example, if managers nominate people for role regrading, how would you assess whether minority ethnic staff have had an equal opportunity to be put forward? What does the qualitative data suggest, are there comments in your staff survey or from the focus groups that shed light on this issue? If your analysis suggests that there is room for concern, you would need to develop actions to address this.

Please provide details of the ethnic profile (by specific ethnic group where possible) of UK, and separately, non-UK professional and support staff promoted. Please consider:

- provide details of any training or mentoring offered around promotion and progression
- comment on staff perceptions of the promotions process, including whether it is transparent and fair

Where possible, please provide this information for each central department (and where relevant each academic faculty).

Section 7: Student pipeline

This section should illustrate the progression and success of students at different stages in their academic career. Undergraduate students are the academic professors of the future, and institutions can use this section to reflect on longer-term aims and goals. For example, where your student body is more ethnically diverse than your staff population, could the student demographics represent a 10–15 year staff target? What actions are you putting in place to encourage undergraduates to continue to postgraduate study and beyond?

Where you have significant discipline segregation, where some disciplines have high proportions of minority ethnic students, and others with very low proportions, can you work with widening participation teams to promote underrepresented areas?

The section should be informed by extensive analysis of the institution's quantitative data, as well as the results from the mandatory survey, and any other appropriate quantitative and qualitative sources. At least three years of student data should be presented, as this will help to identify trends

Full commentary should be included with the data, outlining any relevant work already undertaken to address any issues identified, and actions you plan to take.

Where possible, for each of the sections below, please provide the data for each academic faculty, otherwise please provide data for the institution as a whole. Please also provide a brief overview statement on section 7 as a whole from the head of each faculty.

Section 7a: Admissions

Please provide details of undergraduate application success rates by average predicted/actual tariff point by specific ethnic group and disaggregating between UK and international students.

This data should highlight whether ethnicity has an impact on the likelihood of students with the same predicted/actual grades being offered a place at your university. This data is made

available by UCAS at the end of each admissions round, and the head of admissions at your institution should know how to gain access.

At Bronze level, we anticipate institutions to be starting their work in this area. Your analysis may be at the early stages, with gaps being identified but without clear understanding of their cause, or how to reduce them. Your resultant actions might therefore be focused on gaining further information to understand the full impact of ethnicity on student admissions.

At Silver level we anticipate a thorough interrogation of racial biases within your student admissions procedures to have been completed, with appropriate related actions in place. Institutions are expected to have analysed success rates in individual faculties, as well as any differences in average tariff points with which students enter the institution, for example, are minority ethnic students being required to gain higher grades than their white counterpart to access the same course? Are their predicted grades disproportionately low to their actual grades, impacting on the offers made to them?

At Silver level we also expect institutions to have begun analysing the impact of admissions interviews on student success rates.

Section 7b: Undergraduate student body

Please provide details of the ethnic profile, by specific ethnic group, of your institution's UK, and separately, non-UK undergraduate student body.

Where possible, please provide the data for each academic faculty.

Carrying out such an analysis will enable you to assess whether minority ethnic undergraduates (both UK and non-UK) are over- or underrepresented in different faculties and within different disciplines. Comment on trends identified in the data and identify actions to address the issues identified.

Section 7c: Course progression

Please provide details of the ethnic profile by specific ethnic group of UK undergraduate students', and separately non-UK undergraduate students', continuation rates through their course (ie progression rates from one year to the next), and reasons for permanently leaving the university.

Where possible, please provide the data for each academic faculty.

Explore whether there are any trends in continuation rates and what the reasons for this may be. Insight into these issues may be gained from some of the additional qualitative data you have collected from the student survey and focus groups. Explore whether minority ethnic students that permanently leave do so for the same reasons as White British students.

Section 7: Attainment

Please provide details of the ethnic profile, by specific ethnic group, of your institution's degree attainment gap for UK, and separately, non-UK students. Please focus specifically on differences, by ethnicity, of students being awarded a first/2:1 (a 'good degree').

Where possible, please provide the data for each academic faculty.

In this section you have the opportunity to assess whether your minority ethnic students are being awarded a good (first or 2:1) degree in the same proportions as White British students. Analyse the data and comment and reflect on any initiatives your institution has to address any attainment gaps (with reference to section 8 of your application).

Where you have initiated work in this area, what has been the impact of these initiatives?

Section 7e: Postgraduate pipeline

Please provide details of the ethnic profile, by specific ethnic group, of your institution's UK postgraduate student body, and separately non-UK postgraduate student body.

Please make specific reference to taught master's programmes, research master's programmes and PhD programmes.

Where possible, please provide the data for each academic faculty.

Comment and reflect on the support offered to minority ethnic students to assist in their academic career progression. For example, are mentoring, coaching schemes or shadowing opportunities offered? How are students wishing to stay on for a PhD and those finishing a PhD supported?

Where you refer to generic initiatives, please comment specifically on take-up by ethnicity, and their impact on race equality.

Section 7f: Postgraduate employment

Please provide details of the ethnic profile, by specific ethnic group, of your graduates in employment six months after graduating and in graduate-level employment six months after graduating.

This is an opportunity to consider your institution's employability strategy from a race equality perspective and consider whether this strategy addresses the needs of minority ethnic students.

What are the employment outcomes of your minority ethnic graduates? Are they proportionate? What is the uptake and impact of any schemes currently in place? Do actions need to be devised to put in new or additional initiatives?

Where students are employed on campus, is there any occupational segregation? Some opportunities may enhance employability more than others (for example, working as a library assistant or student ambassador may be perceived differently to working in the students' union bar).

At Bronze level, we anticipate institutions to be starting their work in this area. Your analysis may be at the early stages, with actions beginning to be identified. At Silver level we anticipate a thorough interrogation of your employment support mechanisms to have been completed, with appropriate related actions already in place.

Section 8: Teaching and learning

We know that there has been a degree attainment gap between minority ethnic and White British students for too long, and this section is an opportunity for your institution to consider the impact of academic practices.

This section focuses on the curriculum in its widest sense, and your commentary should be race-specific, considering the impact of institutional practices.

Section 8a: Course content/syllabus

Please outline how you consider race equality within course content. This should include reference to new and existing courses. You may want to consider:

- overall subject matter of courses
- research and researchers cited within courses
- case studies and other resources used

Section 8b: Teaching and assessment methods

Please outline how you consider race equality within different teaching and assessment methods. This should include reference to new and existing courses. You may want to consider:

- the outcome of different assessment methods, for example, anonymised marking, anonymized examinations compared with assessments directly by academics
- how students respond to different teaching styles and methods, for example, lectures, seminars, group work, group discussions, and one-to-one tutorials
- the learning environment and how this impacts specifically on minority ethnic students
- how students participate and are encouraged to participate in group discussions
- how students are encouraged to work in groups with those with whom they do not normally work

Section 8c: Academic confidence

Please outline how academics are supported and developed to ensure they have the knowledge, skills and confidence to consider race equality in their teaching and course development:

- How are academics incentivised and encouraged to consider race equality within their teaching and course design?
- What training is provided to academics in considering racial inequalities within their teaching and course design?
- How is good practice shared across faculties and the institution?

Full commentary should be included with the data, along with any relevant work already undertaken to address any issues identified, and actions you plan to take.

Section 9: Any other information

This section is an opportunity to provide details of any other actions or learning which are relevant to race equality, but which have not been included in previous sections. This is an optional section, you are not obligated to include anything; you will not be disadvantaged for not including anything here, but anything you do include will be considered by the awards panels.

Section 10: Action Plan

The action plan is a crucial part of a submission. Actions need to convince an assessment panel that their completion will advance race equality over the next three years. While there may be some need for evidence-gathering actions or areas which need to be researched/monitored, there should be a significant proportion focused on action, and advancing race equality.

You are welcome to use any action plan template which suits your institution. A sample template is provided below, but there is no obligation to use it. However, please ensure that your action plan clearly indicates what the action is, who is undertaking the action, the timeline for completion and what the action will achieve, ie how it will progress race equality.

Please also consider:

- actions identified in the submission document should be clearly highlighted and cross-referenced so that when a panellist reads the action plan the rationale for the action is clear.
- actions should be scheduled across the three-year duration of the award.
- actions (and action plans) should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Agreed, Realistic, Time-bound).
- it is useful to have overarching objectives with actions underpinning their completion
- action plans should be ordered logically with progression from the actions that need to come first in order start an initiative, followed by actions that build on the initiative and sustain progress over the course of the award.
- responsibility for completing actions should be distributed across a range of staff. Action plans where human resources and equality and diversity practitioners are responsible for the majority will not be well received by panels.
- when progress is measured against the actions, this should also be localised, with the performance of individual faculties being considered individually, as well as measuring the institution's progress as a whole; awards will only be renewed where progress can be shown across the board.
- descriptions of measures already in place should not be included in the action plan without details of their monitoring or development.
- it is important to indicate how the success of an action will be measured.
- there is no right or wrong number of actions, however, it is important to balance ambition with realism.
- action plans should be aspirational and innovative, particularly at higher levels of award.
- action plans should be organic documents, constantly reviewed and updated (not just prepared as part of an award submission).

An example action plan template is available below which you may choose to use, or you are welcome to present your actions in your own template.

Section/Aim/Target								
Action Reference	Section reference	Issue identified and rationale	Objectives/aims and actions	Actions to address issues	Success criteria (what and how the action will contribute to achieving this objective?)	Timeframe (Be sure to consider filling the 3 or 5 year award length)		Person responsible (include title)
						Start	End	

Section/Aim/Target (worked example)								
Action Reference	Section Reference	Issue identified and rationale	Objectives/aims and actions	Actions to address issues	Success criteria (what and how the action will contribute to achieving this objective?)	Timeframe (Be sure to consider filling the 3 or 5 year award length)		Person responsible (include title)
						Start	End	
1.2.	3a	Senior leaders need to be more engaged with advancing race equality on campus	Formalising senior leadership engagement through strategies, policies and processes an increasing engagement with Black staff and students	Make senior leader accountability formal through as a performance objective for leadership staff.	Developing KPIs for increasing engagement with race equality initiatives and staff/student engagement	Aug 2021	Aug 2022	Dr. XYZ (Pro-vice Chancellor)

55

Terminology

Within individual institutions terminology may be applied in different ways. The definitions below are for the purposes of clarification in the REC application.

Academic staff: Academic staff includes postdoctoral researchers, teaching-only, research-only or teaching and research staff including lecturers, fellows and professors.

Black, Asian and ethnic minority: Black, Asian and ethnic minority is widely recognised and used to identify patterns of marginalisation and segregation caused by an individual's ethnicity. Advance HE recognises the limitations of this definition, particularly the assumption that minority ethnic individuals are a homogeneous group.

Curriculum: Advance HE refers to curriculum in its widest sense, encompassing course content, delivery, assessment and those involved in teaching and learning.

Degree attainment: Degree attainment refers to the degree classification awarded to undergraduate students. This would usually be first, 2:1, 2:2, 3rd/ pass. The degree attainment gap is measured as the difference between groups of students being awarded a first or 2:1, which is considered to be a 'good' degree.

Ethnicity: Ethnicity refers to groups of people with a shared history of which the group is conscious as distinguishing it from other groups and the memory of which it keeps alive. This can include:

- a cultural tradition of its own including family and social manners, often but not necessarily associated with religious observance
- a common, however distant, geographical origin
- a common language and literature

Faculty: A faculty is a group of sub-units or departments that come together under an overarching decision-making body, for example, a medical school, which is likely to contain sub-units, or departments such as a department of nursing or institute of neuroscience. An additional example could be a faculty of science, under which there are separate departments of mathematics, physics, biology and chemistry.

Fixed-term contract: A contract of employment that ends on a particular date, or on completion of a specific task, for example a specific research project or covering a period of maternity leave. This includes staff on rolling fixed-term contracts.

Full-person equivalent (FPE): Looks at how much of the (whole) person's time is engaged in a particular activity. FPE is measured on 1 December. All of Advance HE's staff data in the statistical reports and benchmarking data are calculated in FPE. For data on students, it is in student instance (different from headcount) unless the data is broken down by subject area in which case it is apportioned by FPE.

Full-time equivalent (FTE): A unit which indicates a person's intensity of study/work comparable to a standard full-time, full-year contract. FTE describes the reporting year 1 August – 31 July.

Headcount: Looks at the number of people.

Institution: An institution of higher education and research which grants academic degrees in a variety of subjects. An institution may consist of a mixture of colleges, faculties, schools and departments.

Open-ended (permanent) contract: A contract without a fixed term. Open-ended/permanent staff are those who are employed on a contract of employment that states the member of staff as permanent or on an open-ended contract. This includes term-time-only staff who are employed on an open-ended contract.

Postdoctoral researcher: Postdoctoral researchers are staff that undertake independent research, leading or acting as principal investigator or equivalent on a research grant or significant piece of research work.

Professional and support staff: For institution applications this includes any staff not included in the above definition of academic staff who are employed by the institution. Staff who are contracted out/outsourced should not be included. This may include administrators and technical support staff.

Race: Advance HE refers to race as a social construct without biological basis or merit. Societal constructs and categorisation has led to inequalities on the basis of perceived racial differences, and it is those inequalities and perceptions that the REC is tackling.

Religion or belief: Religion or belief refers to the full diversity of religions and belief affiliations, including non-religious and philosophical beliefs such as atheism, agnosticism and humanism.

Research-only staff: Those staff whose contracts of employment state that the primary academic employment function is research only, even though the contract may include a limited number of hours teaching (up to six hours per week or pro-rata for part-time staff).

Teaching and research staff: Those staff whose contracts of employment state that they are employed to undertake both teaching and research.

Teaching-only staff: Those staff whose contracts of employment state that they are employed only to undertake teaching.

UK/non-UK: Advance HE refers to individuals who are UK domiciled as 'UK', and to international staff and students as 'non-UK'. The differentiation is sometimes unclear, especially where individuals have lived in the UK for a considerable length of time.

However, the purpose of the differentiation is to understand the different experiences of different groups.

Zero-hours contract: There is no legal definition of a zero-hours contract in UK domestic law. In general terms, a zero-hours contract is an employment contract in which the employer does not guarantee the individual any work, and the individual is not obliged to accept any work offered. Staff on these contracts are entitled at minimum to national minimum