

Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2021: Equality Impact Assessment

University of Bath

Final Report

May 2021

1. Executive Summary

The final REF Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was conducted in April 2021 following the University's REF submission in March 2021. Previous iterations are provided in the Appendices. The EIA focusses on the University's processes and procedures around the identification of staff with a significant responsibility for research, determination of researcher independence and the selection of outputs. The EIA has found no evidence of any systematic equality issues in its analysis.

2. Introduction

The purpose of this EIA is to review the University of Bath's policies and procedures in relation to its submission to the REF 2021. As requested in the Guidance on codes of practice¹, this EIA will focus on processes relating to the identification of staff with a significant responsibility for research, determining researcher independence and the selection of outputs.

This EIA has been conducted by the Department of Policy, Planning and Compliance to ensure an impartial analysis. This Department has not been directly involved in developing any of the policies and procedures under review. The EIA has been approved for submission by the University Executive Board. It has also been reviewed by the University Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee and the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee. In reviewing the report, the University Leadership determined that any underlying issues apparent in the EIA were unrelated to the REF process and would be addressed by measures such as Athena SWAN.

3. Background

As public bodies, in order to show compliance with the requirements of the public sector equality duty in the Equality Act 2010, HEIs in England need to consider and understand the effect of their REF policies on equality. Equalities legislation in England requires HEIs to show due regard to the general duty to conduct EIAs on new and existing policies. Consequently, the funding bodies require all HEIs to conduct EIAs on their policies relating to their REF 2021 submission.

4. Scope

This EIA will analyse the policies and procedures outlined in the University's REF 2021 Code of Practice that relate to:

- The identification of staff with a significant responsibility of research.

¹ https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1086/ref-2019_03-guidance-on-codes-of-practice.pdf

- Determining researcher independence.
- The selection of outputs for submission.

These policies and procedures have the potential to affect all staff at the University whose primary employment activity is to undertake either 'teaching and research' or 'research only' functions.

A data analysis has been conducted on a number of protected characteristics where sufficient data is available. Table 1 provides an overview of data availability by protected characteristic.

Table 1: Protected characteristics and data availability

Protected Characteristic	Data Availability
Age	Full data-set available.
Disability	Data available for over 90 per cent of population; return large enough for meaningful analysis.
Race	The University collects data on Ethnicity as per the guidance from AdvanceHE and HESA. Data available for over 90 per cent of population; return large enough for meaningful analysis.
Sex	The University collects data on Gender as per the guidance from AdvanceHE. Full data-set available.
Gender reassignment	No data available.
Marriage and civil partnership	Data available for less than 10 per cent of population; return too small for meaningful analysis.
Pregnancy and maternity	Full data-set available.
Religion or belief	Data available for less than 65 per cent of population; return too small for meaningful analysis.
Sexual orientation	Data available for less than 65 per cent of population; return too small for meaningful analysis.

There have been two previous iterations of the EIA. The first iteration was considered by the University Executive Board ahead of the submission of the University's REF Code of Practice to the REF Team on 7 June 2019 and is provided in Appendix 1. It covered five areas of the REF preparation as they relate to equality and diversity: the identification of eligible staff; determining which staff are independent researchers; the selection of outputs to be submitted; management structures (including the appeals process); and institutional Equality and Diversity policy. The initial EIA found no indications of negative impact or discrimination but recommended that processes be kept under review.

The second iteration of the EIA took place in summer 2020 as the output selection process was nearing completion and is provided in Appendix 2. This iteration of the EIA was considered by the University Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee, the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee and the University Executive Board. It focused on a data analysis of the processes for selecting outputs and determining researcher independence. The EIA found no evidence of any systematic issues in its analysis, however, there were some specific areas where a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected number of outputs was identified. The EIA recommended that the analysis be discussed with the relevant Unit of Assessment (UoA) leads ahead of the final submission.

This final EIA provides a brief explanation about the University's policies and procedures in relation to the identification of staff with a significant responsibility for research, selection of outputs and determining researcher independence. It also includes an updated analysis of the selected outputs process, following the final selection, and determination of researcher independence by each protected characteristic where sufficient data is available.

5. Code of practice

The University of Bath's policies and procedures regarding REF 2021 have been regularly communicated to staff at important points in the cycle. During the development of our REF 2021 Code of Practice, all staff on 'teaching and research' and 'research only' contracts were emailed a copy of the draft code seeking their input. In addition, the draft code was published on the University's homepage and two open staff meetings were held to answer questions and seek staff views.

The final REF Code of Practice was submitted to the REF Team on 7 June 2019 and was then made available to all staff at:

www.bath.ac.uk/publications/research-excellence-framework-ref-2021-code-of-practice.

Further information on the processes in relation to the identification of staff with a significant responsibility for research, selection of outputs and determining researcher independence is provided below.

5.1 Identification of staff with significant responsibility for research

The University submitted 100 per cent of staff who are Category A eligible. In determining which staff are Category A eligible, the University followed the definition in REF 2019/01:

'Category A eligible' staff will be defined as academic staff with a contract of employment of 0.2 full-time equivalent (FTE) or greater, on the payroll of the submitting institution on the census date, whose primary employment function is to undertake either 'research only' or 'teaching and research'. Staff should have a substantive connection with the submitting institution (see paragraphs 123 to 127). Staff on 'research only' contracts should meet the definition of an independent researcher (see paragraphs 128 to 134).²

As the University submitted all staff who are category A eligible, there are no equality implications and therefore no analysis in this area is required.

Where it was necessary to interpret the definition of category A eligible staff, for example when determining researcher independence, this work was undertaken by the Research Independence Panels. For information on how this process was administered and communicated, please see section 5.3 below.

The University was granted an exemption for UoA 25 (Area Studies), meaning that 4 FTE of staff were not included in the REF population who otherwise would have met the criteria.

5.2 Selection of outputs

As outlined in the University's REF 2021 Code of Practice, the University recognises that there may be many reasons why individuals publish at different rates and does not expect every member of eligible staff to contribute equally to the volume of outputs submitted. Having satisfied the minimum requirement that every member of REF-eligible staff should be submitted with one output, the remaining outputs required were selected with quality as the primary criterion.

² https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1092/ref-2019_01-guidance-on-submissions.pdf

Each output has been reviewed in line with the REF Panel criteria and working methods³ assessment criteria of originality, significance and rigour by a minimum of two senior members of the UoA, with each reader grading the output independently. In order to determine the pool of outputs for each UoA the following assignment process was followed:

- Select the highest scored output per member of staff; this will form the one output per individual requirement for REF 2021.
- Where this is a co-authored output and neither author has another output rated as highly, the assignment of outputs will be determined by the UoA Lead who should select the combination of outputs that give the strongest REF performance of the UoA.
- The remaining outputs required by the UoA will be selected using the next highest scored outputs and assigning these to individuals, up to a maximum of five outputs per member of staff. The assignment of outputs will be determined by the UoA Lead who should select the combination of outputs that gives the strongest REF performance of the UoA.

The final selected outputs for inclusion in the University's REF submission have been analysed by each protected characteristic for which the University has sufficient data. In each case, the distribution of a particular characteristic in the population of eligible staff has been compared to the distribution of the same characteristic in the selected outputs data. The analysis is provided in section 6 below.

As noted above, the University recognises that there may be many reasons why individuals publish at different rates and does not expect all members of staff to contribute equally to the volume of outputs selected. All REF eligible staff were invited to disclose individual circumstances that may have impacted the volume of research produced. Information about staff circumstances was used by the University to:

- Remove the requirement for the minimum of one output where an individual is entitled to this reduction.
- Recognise the effect that equality-related circumstances can have on an individual's ability to research productively, and to adjust expectations in terms of expected workload / production of research outputs.
- Understand where the cumulative effect of individual circumstances has disproportionately affected a UoA's list of potential outputs.

This process was managed centrally through the Staff Circumstances Panels. Information on individual staff circumstances was collected via a staff survey, further details of which are provided in section 5.3 below. An analysis of the declaration of staff circumstances has been conducted and is provided as requested in the separate Staff Circumstances template.

5.3 Research independence procedure

As per the University's REF 2021 Code of Practice, the Secretary to the Research Independence Panels for each Faculty contacted members of staff asking them to complete the REF staff survey online form which was designed to capture details of:

- research independency;
- early career status;
- voluntarily disclosed individual staff circumstances.

³ https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1084/ref-2019_02-panel-criteria-and-working-methods.pdf

Staff absent from work (due to, for example, maternity leave, sickness etc) and unlikely to be checking emails were contacted by post sent to their registered home address. Hard copies of the online survey were made available to those who requested them and posted to those unlikely to be looking at e-mail.

All staff lists, for electronic and postal contact, were obtained from HR. Data was obtained at regular set periods of time to ensure that all staff were captured, new starters were contacted and people who were recruited into different job families were included in the overall staff list. Staff who did not respond to the first invitation received further reminders of the opportunity to disclose special circumstances. The first wave of the survey was sent to 1,110 members of staff and had 561 responses (50.5%).

In line with the principles of consistency and inclusivity, the anonymised information on individuals was presented to the relevant Research Independence Panel. For staff in the Research only job family on a Grade 7-9, the job family, grade, job title and research income was presented to the panel so that a judgement on research independence, as defined in the REF Guidance on Submissions document (see paragraphs 128 to 134⁴), could be made. For those staff considered to fulfil the definition of research independence, the date of their appointment was made available to the Panel so that a decision on early career status could be made. For Teaching and Research staff, dates of appointments were also included so that a judgement on early career status could be made.

Staff on Research only contracts, on a Grade 7-9, who did not respond to the survey were also considered by the Panel in an anonymised format. The Panel was provided with details of job family, grade, job title and research income so that a judgement on research independence could be made. For those staff considered to fulfil the definition of research independence, the date of their appointments was made available to the Panel so that a decision on early career status could also be made.

Once decisions were made at the Panel level, they were mapped back to the individual using their unique reference code and letters with the outcome of the Panel were sent to all who responded to the survey. All staff on Research only contracts who did not respond to the survey were also contacted by letter informing them whether or not they were going to be submitted to REF. As detailed in the University's REF Code of Practice, staff who were not deemed to be independent researchers may appeal the decision. Staff on Research only contracts who did not respond to the survey and were informed that they were not eligible for REF submission were also given the opportunity to appeal the Panel's decision.

An analysis of staff determined to be independent through the Research Independence Panels is provided in section 6.

⁴ https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1092/ref-2019_01-guidance-on-submissions.pdf

6. Data analysis

6.1 Output selection analysis

The selected outputs for inclusion in the University's REF submission have been analysed by the following protected characteristics:

- Sex (using Gender data)
- Pregnancy and Maternity
- Age
- Disability
- Race (using Ethnicity data)

As discussed above, there is insufficient data to analyse gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, religion or belief and sexual orientation. In each case, the distribution of a particular characteristic in the population of eligible staff has been compared to the distribution of the same characteristic in the selected outputs data. A Chi-Squared statistical test has been applied to determine if there is a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between the observed number of outputs and the expected number of outputs for each characteristic based on the proportion in the population of eligible staff. Sex has been analysed by UoA, and, due to the smaller numbers involved, all other characteristics have been analysed by Main Panel.

The following rounding rules have been applied to the presentation of the data in the tables below, as per guidance from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA):

- Counts of people are rounded to the nearest multiple of 5.
- Percentages are not published if they are fractions of a small group of people (fewer than 22.5)
- Following advice from the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Unit, figures of less than 10 are recorded as <10.

Sex (using Gender data)

The highlighted rows record where there is a statistically significance difference between the expected and observed number of outputs at the 95% confidence interval (p < 0.05).

Main Panel	UoA Name	Female headcount		Male headcount		Female selected outputs		Male selected outputs	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	3: Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	15	37.8%	25	62.2%	30	38.2%	45	61.8%
	4: Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	40	59.1%	25	40.9%	80	52.0%	75	48.0%
	5: Biological Sciences	15	29.2%	35	70.8%	25	25.0%	70	75.0%
	A Total	65	44.4%	85	55.6%	130	40.7%	190	59.3%
B	8: Chemistry	10	23.3%	35	76.7%	20	20.8%	75	79.2%
	9: Physics	<10	22.5%	30	77.5%	20	22.6%	65	77.4%
	10: Mathematical Sciences	10	15.7%	60	84.3%	20	13.2%	130	86.8%
	11: Computer Science and Informatics	<10	10.3%	25	89.7%	<10	5.7%	65	94.3%
	12: Engineering	40	23.8%	120	76.3%	80	21.5%	295	78.5%
B Total		70	20.8%	270	79.2%	145	18.5%	635	81.5%
C	16: Economics and Econometrics	<10	22.0%	30	78.0%	15	16.7%	80	83.3%
	17: Business and Management Studies	40	38.0%	60	62.0%	70	35.8%	120	64.2%
	19: Politics and International Studies	15	36.1%	25	63.9%	40	47.0%	45	53.0%
	20: Social Work and Social Policy	30	57.7%	20	42.3%	55	55.9%	45	44.1%
	23: Education	20	50.0%	20	50.0%	40	52.0%	35	48.0%
	24: Sport and Exercise Sciences, Leisure and Tourism	15	35.0%	25	65.0%	25	30.0%	55	70.0%
C Total		120	40.0%	185	60.0%	245	38.8%	385	61.2%
University		260	32.6%	540	67.4%	520	30.0%	1210	70.0%

There is a statistically significant difference between the expected and observed number of outputs in the Politics and International Studies UoA with more selected outputs from females than expected based on the proportion in the population. There is also a statistically significant difference for the University overall with more selected outputs from males than expected.

An analysis by gender has also been conducted on a subset of eligible staff, those in full-time, permanent employment who have not had a period of maternity leave in the REF period. Part-time employment and maternity leave could impact on the number of outputs available for selection for a member of staff, and this is more likely to effect females (15% of female staff are part time, compared to 5% of male staff).

Main Panel	UoA Name	Female headcount		Male headcount		Female selected outputs		Male selected outputs	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	3: Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	<10	25.9%	20	74.1%	15	26.7%	45	73.3%
A	4: Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	20	43.5%	25	56.5%	40	34.9%	70	65.1%
A	5: Biological Sciences	10	23.3%	35	76.7%	20	22.7%	70	77.3%
A Total		35	31.9%	80	68.1%	75	28.8%	185	71.2%
B	8: Chemistry	<10	13.8%	25	86.2%	<10	13.8%	55	86.2%
B	9: Physics	<10	17.6%	30	82.4%	10	17.1%	60	82.9%
B	10: Mathematical Sciences	<10	12.7%	55	87.3%	10	8.9%	125	91.1%
B	11: Computer Science and Informatics	<10	3.8%	25	96.2%	<10	1.5%	65	98.5%
B	12: Engineering	25	17.1%	115	82.9%	55	16.6%	285	83.4%
B Total		45	14.7%	250	85.3%	90	13.4%	585	86.6%
C	16: Economics and Econometrics	<10	16.2%	30	83.8%	15	14.3%	80	85.7%
C	17: Business and Management Studies	30	34.1%	55	65.9%	55	37.6%	95	62.4%
C	19: Politics and International Studies	10	31.3%	20	68.8%	30	42.6%	40	57.4%
C	20: Social Work and Social Policy	20	52.8%	15	47.2%	40	53.9%	35	46.1%
C	23: Education	15	51.7%	15	48.3%	35	53.1%	30	46.9%
C	24: Sport and Exercise Sciences, Leisure and Tourism	<10	22.6%	25	77.4%	15	24.6%	45	75.4%
C Total		85	34.4%	160	65.6%	190	36.9%	320	63.1%
University		165	25.2%	490	74.8%	355	24.4%	1090	75.6%

In this analysis, there remains a statistically significant difference between the expected and observed number of outputs in the Politics and International Studies UoA, with more selected outputs from females than expected based on the proportion in the population, but there is no statistically significant difference at the University level. A statistically significant difference in one UoA does not suggest a systematic issue between the selection of outputs and sex.

Pregnancy and Maternity

The highlighted rows record where there is a statistically significance difference between the expected and observed number of outputs at the 95% confidence interval ($p < 0.05$).

Main Panel	No maternity leave headcount		At least one period of maternity leave headcount		No maternity leave selected outputs		At least one period of maternity leave selected outputs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	135	89.4%	15	10.6%	295	91.4%	30	8.6%
B	325	95.0%	15	5.0%	750	96.7%	25	3.3%
C	280	92.5%	25	7.5%	595	94.9%	30	5.1%
University	740	93.0%	55	7.0%	1640	95.0%	85	5.0%

There is a statistically significant difference between the expected and observed number of outputs in the following Main Panels:

- Main Panel B (less selected outputs from members of staff with at least one period of maternity leave than expected)
- Main Panel C (less selected outputs from members of staff with at least one period of maternity leave than expected)

There is also a statistically significant difference for the University overall (less selected outputs from members of staff with at least one period of maternity leave than expected). Periods of maternity leave could impact on the number of outputs available for selection for a member of staff.

Age

Main Panel	25 - 35 headcount		36 - 45 headcount		46 - 55 headcount		56 - 65 headcount		Over 65 headcount		25 - 35 selected outputs		36 - 45 selected outputs		46 - 55 selected outputs		56 - 65 selected outputs		Over 65 selected outputs	
	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	15	9.9%	60	40.4%	45	30.5%	25	15.2%	<10	4.0%	40	12.3%	135	41.0%	95	29.6%	45	13.6%	10	3.4%
B	70	20.8%	115	33.6%	85	25.1%	65	18.7%	<10	1.8%	160	20.6%	270	35.0%	200	25.7%	135	17.1%	15	1.7%
C	50	16.7%	120	40.0%	75	24.3%	50	15.7%	10	3.3%	90	14.1%	250	40.1%	160	25.9%	95	15.0%	30	5.0%
University	135	17.2%	300	37.3%	205	25.8%	135	16.9%	20	2.8%	290	16.7%	655	38.0%	460	26.5%	270	15.7%	55	3.2%

There are no statistically significant differences between the expected and observed number of outputs at the 95% confidence interval ($p < 0.05$).

Early Career Researcher Status

Although not a protected characteristic, an analysis has also been conducted on Early Careers Researcher (ECR) status.

The highlighted rows record where there is a statistically significance difference between the expected and observed number of outputs at the 95% confidence interval ($p < 0.05$).

Main Panel	ECR headcount		Not an ECR headcount		ECR selected outputs		Not and ECR selected outputs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	30	18.5%	125	81.5%	75	23.8%	245	76.2%
B	80	24.0%	260	76.0%	165	21.0%	615	79.0%
C	65	21.3%	240	78.7%	120	19.0%	505	81.0%
University	175	21.9%	625	78.1%	360	20.8%	1370	79.2%

There is a statistically significant difference between the expected and observed number of outputs in the following Main Panels:

- Main Panel A (more selected outputs from ECRs than expected)
- Main Panel B (less selected outputs from ECRs than expected)

There is no consistent pattern in the data that suggests there is an issue between ECR status and the selection of outputs.

Race (using Ethnicity data)

Main Panel	BAME headcount		White British headcount		BAME selected outputs		White British selected outputs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	10	8.0%	125	92.0%	30	9.8%	260	90.2%
B	60	18.4%	260	81.6%	125	16.9%	610	83.1%
C	40	13.3%	255	86.7%	85	13.8%	525	86.2%
University	110	14.5%	645	85.5%	235	14.5%	1395	85.5%

Headcount: 20 Not Known, 25 Information Refused

There are no statistically significant differences between the expected and observed number of outputs at the 95% confidence interval ($p < 0.05$).

Disability

Main Panel	Declared Disability Headcount		No Known Disability Headcount		Declared Disability Selected Outputs		No Known Disability Selected Outputs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	<10	2.0%	145	98.0%	<10	1.2%	320	98.8%
B	<10	2.4%	330	97.6%	15	2.2%	755	97.8%
C	<10	2.3%	295	97.7%	<10	1.5%	610	98.5%
University	20	2.3%	770	97.7%	30	1.7%	1685	98.3%

Headcount: 8 Information Refused

There are no statistically significant differences between the expected and observed number of outputs at the 95% confidence interval ($p < 0.05$).

6.2 Researcher Independence Analysis

The Research Independence Panel assessed staff members on Grade 7 or Grade 8 from the University's Education and Research (KTP) and Education and Research (Research) job families as set out in the University's Code of Practice. The exceptions were those Research Fellows who were deemed to be independent researchers due to the nature of their Fellowships. This included the University of Bath Prize Fellows and the Royal Society University Research Fellows.

Staff in these two families on Grade 9 or above were deemed to be independent researchers; those on Grade 6 or below were deemed not to be independent researchers.

Out of 293 members of staff considered by the Panels, only 22 were designated as independent. As a result, and following the HESA rounding rules detailed above, no percentages can be published as the population is less than 22.5. The numbers are also too small for any reliable statistical analysis. However, the data has been reviewed and headcount figures (rounded to the nearest 5) for the institution overall are provided below.

Characteristic	Considered by Independent Research Panel	Determined to be Independent Researchers
Sex (using Gender data)	Female: 110 Male: 180	Female: 10 Male: 10
Pregnancy and Maternity	No maternity: 280 At least one period of maternity leave: 15	No maternity: 15 At least one period of maternity leave: <10
Age	24 – 35: 195 36 – 45: 80 46 – 55: 15 56 – 65: <10 Over 65: <10	24 – 35: <10 36 – 45: <10 46 – 55: <10 56 – 65: <10 Over 65: <10
Race (using Ethnicity data)	White – British: 175 BAME: 80	White – British: 15 BAME: <10
Disability	No Known Disability: 285 Declared Disability: <10	No Known Disability: 20 Declared Disability: <10

The University's REF 2021 Code of Practice outlines the process for submitting an appeal against the decision of the Research Independence Panel. Three appeals were submitted, one of which was subsequently withdrawn. Of the two remaining appeals, in one case the decision of the Research Independence Panel was upheld by the Appeals Panel. In the other, the decision was referred back from the Appeals Panel to the Research Independence Panel, which reconfirmed its decision.

7. Conclusion

The University's REF 2021 EIA has not found evidence of any systematic issues in its analysis of the identification of staff with a significant responsibility for research, determining researcher independence and the selection of outputs for submission. The analysis by sex (using Gender data) based on full-time, permanent members of staff without a period of maternity leave found only the Politics and International Studies UoA to have a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected number of outputs, with more selected outputs from females than expected based on the proportion in the population. A statistically significant difference in one UoA does not suggest any systematic issues with the process. The maternity leave analysis highlighted statistically significant differences between the observed and expected number of outputs in Main Panel B, C and the University overall with less selected outputs from members of staff with at least one period of maternity leave than expected based on the population. Periods of maternity leave could impact on the number of outputs available for selection for a member of staff. The ECR analysis highlighted statistically significant differences in Main Panel A and B, but there was no consistent pattern in the data to suggest an issue between the selection of outputs and ECR status. No other statistically significant differences have been identified.

8. Action plan

The University recognises that diversity fuels creativity and innovation and is continuously working to create an inclusive community. The University is committed to action to better reflect the society in which we operate.

As part of this we have committed to take action in the following areas between 2019 and 2021:

- Increase the proportion of women in senior roles and take positive action to address gender imbalances and the gender pay gap.
- Improve the recruitment of staff and students from under-represented groups in order to better reflect the society in which we operate. Where gaps in outcomes or opportunities for progression are identified, the University will seek to address these.
- Create and maintain a living and working environment that supports the health and wellbeing of all staff and students.
- Foster a culture of inclusion and belonging through a programme of raising awareness and training.
- Create a supportive environment for our LGBT+ community.

In addition to these overarching equality objectives, the University has committed to the following vehicles to help achieve the above objectives:

- The University applied for an institutional Silver Athena SWAN award in April 2021.
- Work towards appearing on the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index.
- Explore the benefits of an institutional Bronze Race Equality Charter award.

The University has recently established the role of Executive Chair of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Committee to provide a clearer locus of responsibility for delivery of the University's EDI commitments and for line-management of the EDI Unit. In addition, a Race Equality Taskforce (RET) has been set up and tasked with providing a report and action plan to implement the University's future race equality agenda. Both the EDI Committee and the RET will make proposals for a more formal and longer-term structure within one year.

Appendix 1 – REF 2021 EIA: First Iteration

REF 2021: Equality Impact Assessment

1. Executive Summary

This Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was conducted in spring 2019 as part of on-going preparations for REF 2021. It covers four areas of the REF preparation as they relate to Equality and Diversity: the identification of eligible staff; the selection of outputs to be submitted; management structures (including the appeals process); and institutional Equality and Diversity policy. The EIA found no indications of negative impact or discrimination; nevertheless it is recommended that processes in these four areas be kept under review.

2. Background

As public sector organisations, in order to show compliance with the requirements of the public sector equality duty in the Equality Act 2010, HEIs in England need to consider and understand the effect of their REF policies on equality. Equalities legislation in England requires HEIs to show due regard to the general duty to conduct equality impact assessments (EIAs) on new and existing policies. Consequently, the funding bodies require all HEIs to conduct EIAs on their policies for selecting staff for the REF.

The EIA will be considered by the University Executive Board ahead of the submission of the University's REF Code of Practice to the REF Team on 7 June 2019. The EIA will be reviewed in autumn 2019 following the preliminary identification of independent researchers.

The impact of REF processes at the University of Bath on protected characteristics will be kept under review. This will include data analysis where sufficient data is available at an institution-wide level. Table 1 provides an overview of data availability by protected characteristic.

Protected Characteristic	Data Availability
Age	Full data-set available.
Disability	Data available for over 90 per cent of population; return large enough for meaningful analysis.
Ethnicity (Race)	Ethnicity used for analysis. Data available for over 90 per cent of population; return large enough for meaningful analysis.
Gender (Sex)	Full data-set available.
Gender reassignment	No data available.
Marriage and civil partnership	Data available for less than 10 per cent of population; return too small for meaningful analysis.
Pregnancy and maternity	Full data-set available.

Religion or belief	Data available for less than 65 per cent of population; return too small for meaningful analysis.
Sexual orientation	Data available for less than 65 per cent of population; return too small for meaningful analysis.

In addition to the table above, data has not yet been identified for Additional paternity leave (Sex); Adoption leave (Sex); Breastfeeding (Sex); Nationality (Race); Political opinion; and Shared parental leave (Sex).

3. University of Bath's REF Processes

a. Identification of Research Active Staff

The University will submit 100 per cent of staff who are Category A eligible. In determining which staff are Category A eligible, the University will follow the definition in REF 2019/01:

'Category A eligible' staff will be defined as academic staff with a contract of employment of 0.2 full-time equivalent (FTE) or greater, on the payroll of the submitting institution on the census date, whose primary employment function is to undertake either 'research only' or 'teaching and research'. Staff should have a substantive connection with the submitting institution (see paragraphs 123 to 127). Staff on 'research only' contracts should meet the definition of an independent researcher (see paragraphs 128 to 134).⁵

The OPP will liaise with the secretary to the Independent Research Panels during the determination of research independence, and will analyse the protected characteristics of those determined as independent researchers against an appropriate comparator pool.

Where it is necessary to interpret this definition when identifying staff (for example in relation to 'independent researchers') this work will be undertaken by the Independent Research Panel. For information on how this process will be administered and communicated, please see sections 3.3 and 3.4.

b. Selection of Outputs

The University conducted a REF Readiness exercise (RRE3) starting in October 2018 and concluding in June 2019. A provisional list of UoAs was established for the purposes of the RRE3. The census date for the purposes of the RRE3 was 31st October 2018. Units of Assessment carried out internal assessments of research outputs using the REF 2021 Panel criteria and working methods. Within each UOA a list of 2.5 outputs times the FTE on the census date was produced.

⁵ https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1092/ref-2019_01-guidance-on-submissions.pdf

In selecting outputs, each academic was allocated their highest scoring paper, and the remaining outputs were chosen based on their internal assessment scores (up to a maximum of five outputs per academic). The results of this exercise were analysed at an institutional level by OPP in May 2019. No significant divergence was found between proportion of population and proportion of outputs for the protected characteristics where data was available: Age, Disability, Ethnicity category (Race); Gender (Sex); and Pregnancy and maternity. For results by protected characteristic, please see Appendix 1.

c. Policy and Procedure (including Appeals)

The University of Bath's policies and procedures regarding REF 2021 are being regularly communicated to staff at important points in the cycle. During the development of our REF 2021 Code of Practice, all staff on 'Teaching & Research' and 'Research only' contracts were emailed a copy of the draft code seeking their input. In addition the draft code was published on the University's homepage and two open staff meetings were held to answer questions and seek staff views. Once approved the REF 2021 Code of Practice will be published online.

4. Institutional Equality and Diversity

The University recognises that diversity fuels creativity and innovation. We are continuously working to create an inclusive community. The University is committed to action to better reflect the society in which we operate; this will in turn address the imbalances in protected characteristics identified in this EIA.

5. Recommendations

This iteration of the University of Bath's REF 2021 EIA has not found evidence of negative impact or discrimination in its analysis of the selected outputs in RRE3 against the protected characteristics for which data was available. It has identified a number of protected characteristics for which reliable quantitative data is not currently available.

The recommendations from this iteration of the EIA are therefore that:

- i. The selection of outputs is kept under review, and further analysis benchmarking outputs against protected characteristics is undertaken if there are significant changes.
- ii. Once an initial population of independent researchers has been identified in autumn 2019, the protected characteristics of this population are analysed against a meaningful benchmarking group.
- iii. Input is sought from staff and their representative groups on REF policy and procedures at the University of Bath; most especially from staff with protected characteristics for which meaningful quantitative data is not available.

Annex 1: Comparison of Outputs and Protected Characteristics

These tables measure, for RRE3, the proportion of the outputs selected by the Internal Assessment Panels by the protected characteristics of the authors against the proportion of staff identified as Category A eligible for: Age; Disability; Ethnic Category (Race); Gender (Sex); and Pregnancy and maternity. Counts and proportions have been calculated at an Institution level due to small populations at UoA level acting as a severe limitation on meaningful analysis.

Age

Age Band	Headcount	Headcount as % of Total Headcount	Output Count	Output Count as % of Total Output Count
20-30	16	2.0	28	1.6
30-40	269	33.2	580	32.9
40-50	246	30.4	563	31.9
50-60	196	24.2	427	24.2
60-70	77	9.5	154	8.7
70 or above	6	0.7	12	0.7
Total	810	100.0	1764	100.0

Disability

Disability	Headcount	Headcount as % of Total Headcount	Output Count	Output Count as % of Total Output Count
Declined to specify	10	1.2	24	1.4
Disabled	23	2.8	43	2.4
Not Disabled	682	84.2	1508	85.5
Not known	95	11.7	189	10.7
Total	810	100.0	1764	100.0

Ethnicity Category (Race)

Ethnicity Category	Headcount	Headcount as % of Total Headcount	Output Count	Output Count as % of Total Output Count
Information refused	23	2.8	48	2.7
Not known	26	3.2	55	3.1
Other	97	12.0	203	11.5
White - British	664	82.0	1458	82.7
Total	810	100.0	1764	100.0

Gender (Sex)

Gender	Headcount	Headcount as % of Total Headcount	Output Count	Output Count as % of Total Output Count
Female	254	31.4	511	29.0
Male	556	68.6	1253	71.0
Total	810	100.0	1764	100.0

Pregnancy and maternity

Maternity Leave since 1 January 2014	Headcount	Headcount as % of Total Headcount	Output Count	Output Count as % of Total Output Count
No	768	94.8	1699	96.3
Yes	42	5.2	65	3.7
Total	810	100.0	1764	100.0

Appendix 2 – REF 2021 EIA: Second Iteration

REF 2021: Equality Impact Assessment

Second Iteration

September 2020

1. Executive Summary

This second iteration of the REF Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was conducted in Summer 2020 following the final determination of the University's REF eligible population and selection of outputs. This EIA focuses on analysing the University's processes and procedures around the selection of outputs and the determination of independent researcher status. A further iteration of the EIA will be conducted to review the disclosure of individual staff circumstances once all the panels have taken place. This iteration of the EIA found no evidence of any systematic issues in its analysis of selected outputs and determination of researcher independence.

2. Background

As public sector organisations, in order to show compliance with the requirements of the public sector equality duty in the Equality Act 2010, HEIs in England need to consider and understand the effect of their REF policies on equality. Equalities legislation in England requires HEIs to show due regard to the general duty to conduct EIAs on new and existing policies. Consequently, the funding bodies require all HEIs to conduct EIAs on their policies for selecting staff for the REF.

The first iteration of the EIA was considered by the University Executive Board ahead of the submission of the University's REF Code of Practice to the REF Team on 7 June 2019 and is provided in Annex 1. It covered five areas of the REF preparation as they relate to Equality and Diversity: the identification of eligible staff; determining which staff are independent researchers; the selection of outputs to be submitted; management structures (including the appeals process); and institutional Equality and Diversity policy. The initial EIA found no indications of negative impact or discrimination but recommended that processes be kept under review.

This second iteration of the EIA focuses on the processes and procedures around the selection of outputs and determination of independent researcher status. Data analysis has been conducted on a number of protected characteristics where sufficient data is available. Table 1 provides an overview of data availability by protected characteristic.

Protected Characteristic	Data Availability
Age	Full data-set available.
Disability	Data available for over 90 per cent of population; return large enough for meaningful analysis.
Ethnicity (Race)	Ethnicity used for analysis. Data available for over 90 per cent of population; return large enough for meaningful analysis.
Gender (Sex)	Full data-set available.
Gender reassignment	No data available.
Marriage and civil partnership	Data available for less than 10 per cent of population; return too small for meaningful analysis.
Pregnancy and maternity	Full data-set available.
Religion or belief	Data available for less than 65 per cent of population; return too small for meaningful analysis.
Sexual orientation	Data available for less than 65 per cent of population; return too small for meaningful analysis.

3. University of Bath's REF Processes

The University of Bath's policies and procedures regarding REF 2021 have been regularly communicated to staff at important points in the cycle. During the development of our REF 2021 Code of Practice, all staff on 'Teaching & Research' and 'Research only' contracts were emailed a copy of the draft code seeking their input. In addition, the draft code was published on the University's homepage and two open staff meetings were held to answer questions and seek staff views.

The final REF Code of Practice was submitted to the REF Team on 7 June 2019 and was then made available to all staff at:

www.bath.ac.uk/publications/research-excellence-framework-ref-2021-code-of-practice.

Further information on the processes in relation to the identification of research active staff, selection of outputs and determining researcher independence is provided below.

3.1 Identification of Research Active Staff

The University will submit 100 per cent of staff who are Category A eligible. In determining which staff are Category A eligible, the University followed the definition in REF 2019/01:

'Category A eligible' staff will be defined as academic staff with a contract of employment of 0.2 full-time equivalent (FTE) or greater, on the payroll of the submitting institution on the census date, whose primary employment function is to undertake

either 'research only' or 'teaching and research'. Staff should have a substantive connection with the submitting institution (see paragraphs 123 to 127). Staff on 'research only' contracts should meet the definition of an independent researcher (see paragraphs 128 to 134).⁶

Where it is necessary to interpret this definition when identifying staff (for example in relation to 'independent researchers') this work will be undertaken by the Research Independence Panels. For information on how this process was administered and communicated, please see section 3.3.

The University was granted an exemption for UoA 25 (Area Studies), meaning that 4 FTE of staff were not included in the REF population who otherwise would have met the criteria.

3.2 Selection of Outputs

As outlined in the University's REF 2021 Code of Practice, the University recognises that there may be many reasons why individuals publish at different rates and does not expect every member of eligible staff to contribute equally to the volume of outputs submitted. Having satisfied the minimum requirement that every member of REF-eligible staff should be submitted with one output, the remaining outputs required will be selected with quality as the primary criterion.

Each output has been reviewed in line with the REF Panel criteria and working methods⁷ assessment criteria of originality, significance and rigour by a minimum of two senior members of the UoA, with each reader grading the output independently. In order to determine the pool of outputs for each UoA the following assignment process has been followed:

- a) Select the highest scored output per member of staff; this will form the one output per individual requirement for REF 2021.
- b) Where this is a co-authored output and neither author has another output rated as highly, the assignment of outputs will be determined by the UoA Lead who should select the combination of outputs that give the strongest REF performance of the UoA.
- c) The remaining outputs required by the UoA will be selected using the next highest scored outputs and assigning these to individuals, up to a maximum of five outputs per member of staff. The assignment of outputs will be determined by the UoA Lead who should select the combination of outputs that gives the strongest REF performance of the UoA.

⁶ https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1092/ref-2019_01-guidance-on-submissions.pdf

⁷ https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1084/ref-2019_02-panel-criteria-and-working-methods.pdf

The final selected outputs for inclusion in the University's REF submission have been analysed by each protected characteristic for which the University has sufficient data. In each case, the distribution of a particular characteristic in the population of eligible staff has been compared to the distribution of the same characteristic in the selected outputs data. The analysis is provided in section 4.1 below.

As noted above, the University recognises that there may be many reasons why individuals publish at different rates and does not expect all members of staff to contribute equally to the volume of outputs selected. All REF eligible staff were invited to disclose individual circumstances that may have impacted the volume of research produced. Information about staff circumstances was used by the University to:

- a) Remove the requirement for the minimum of one output where an individual is entitled to this reduction.
- b) Recognise the effect that equality-related circumstances can have on an individual's ability to research productively, and to adjust expectations in terms of expected workload / production of research outputs.
- c) Understand where the cumulative effect of individual circumstances has disproportionately affected a UoA's list of potential outputs.

This process was managed centrally through the Staff Circumstances Panels. Information on staff circumstances was collected via a staff survey, further details of which are provided in section 3.3 below. An analysis of the staff circumstances process will be conducted once all the Panels have concluded.

3.3 Research Independence procedure

As per the University's REF 2021 Code of Practice, the Secretary to the Research Independence Panels for each Faculty contacted members of staff asking them to complete the REF staff survey online form which was designed to capture details of research independency, early career status and to provide a platform to voluntarily disclosed individual circumstances. Staff absent from work (due to, for example, maternity leave, sickness etc) and unlikely to be checking emails were contacted by post sent to their registered home address. Hard copies of the online survey were made available to those who requested them and posted to those unlikely to be looking at e-mail.

All staff lists, for electronic and postal contact, were obtained from HR. Data was obtained at regular set periods of time to ensure that all staff were captured, new starters were contacted and people who were recruited into different job families were included in the overall staff list. Staff who did not respond to the first invitation received further reminders of the opportunity to

disclose special circumstances. The first wave of the survey was sent to 1,110 members of staff and had 561 responses (50.5%).

In line with the principles of consistency and inclusivity, the anonymised information on individuals was presented to the relevant Research Independence Panel. For staff in the Research only job family on a Grade 7-9, the job family, grade, job title and research income was presented to the panel so that a judgement on research independence, as defined in the REF Guidance on Submissions document (see paragraphs 128 to 134⁸), could be made. For those staff considered to fulfil the definition of research independence, the date of their appointment was made available to the Panel so that a decision on early career status could be made. For Teaching and Research staff, dates of appointments were also included so that a judgement on early career status could be made.

Staff on Research only contracts, on a Grade 7-9, who did not respond to the survey were also considered by the Panel in an anonymised format. The Panel was provided with details of job family, grade, job title and research income so that a judgement on research independence could be made. For those staff considered to fulfil the definition of research independence, the date of their appointments was made available to the Panel so that a decision on early career status could also be made.

Once decisions were made at the Panel level, they were mapped back to the individual using their unique reference code and letters with the outcome of the Panel were sent to all who responded to the survey. All Staff on Research only contracts who did not respond to the survey were also contacted by letter informing them whether or not they were going to be submitted to REF. As detailed in the University's REF Code of Practice, staff who are not deemed to be independent researchers may appeal decisions. Staff on Research only contracts who did not respond to the survey and were informed that they were not eligible for REF submission will also be given the opportunity to appeal the Panel's decision.

An analysis of staff determined to be independent through the Research Independence Panels is provided in section 4.2 below.

⁸ https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1092/ref-2019_01-guidance-on-submissions.pdf

4. Data analysis

4.1 Output selection analysis

The selected outputs for inclusion in the University's REF submission have been analysed by the following protected characteristics:

- Sex
- Pregnancy and Maternity
- Age
- Disability
- Ethnicity

As discussed above, there is insufficient data to analyse gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, religion or belief and sexual orientation.

In each case, the distribution of a particular characteristic in the population of eligible staff has been compared to the distribution of the same characteristic in the selected outputs data. A Chi-Squared statistical test has been applied to determine if there is a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between the observed number of outputs and the expected number of outputs for each characteristic based on the proportion in the population of eligible staff. Gender has been analysed by UoA, and, due to the smaller numbers involved, all other characteristics have been analysed by Main Panel.

The following rounding rules have been applied to the presentation of the data in the tables below, as per guidance from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA):

- Counts of people are rounded to the nearest multiple of 5.
- Percentages are not published if they are fractions of a small group of people (fewer than 22.5)

Following advice from the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Unit, figures of less than 10 are recorded as <10.

Gender

The highlighted rows record where there is a statistically significance difference between the expected and observed number of outputs at the 95% confidence interval ($p < 0.05$).

Main Panel	UoA Name	Female headcount		Male headcount		Female selected outputs		Male selected outputs	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	10	36.4%	20	63.6%	25	34.8%	45	65.2%
A	Biological Sciences	15	28.0%	35	72.0%	25	25.5%	80	74.5%
A	Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	35	60.7%	25	39.3%	70	53.0%	65	47.0%
A Total	A Total	65	43.8%	80	56.3%	120	39.5%	185	60.5%
B	Chemistry	10	23.3%	35	76.7%	20	23.2%	75	76.8%
B	Computer Science and Informatics	<10	11.1%	25	88.9%	<10	4.8%	60	95.2%
B	Engineering	40	23.6%	125	76.4%	75	19.2%	315	80.8%
B	Mathematical Sciences	10	16.2%	60	83.8%	20	13.5%	135	86.5%
B	Physics	<10	22.0%	30	78.0%	20	22.0%	70	78.0%
B Total	B Total	75	20.9%	275	79.1%	140	17.8%	655	82.2%
C	Business and Management Studies	40	39.0%	60	61.0%	75	37.9%	125	62.1%
C	Economics and Econometrics	<10	22.2%	30	77.8%	15	20.5%	65	79.5%
C	Education	20	50.0%	20	50.0%	45	52.4%	40	47.6%
C	Politics and International Studies	15	35.1%	25	64.9%	40	47.1%	45	52.9%
C	Social Work and Social Policy	30	58.5%	20	41.5%	55	49.1%	60	50.9%
C	Sport and Exercise Sciences, Leisure and Tourism	15	35.0%	25	65.0%	25	30.6%	60	69.4%
C Total	C Total	125	40.8%	180	59.2%	260	39.8%	390	60.2%
Institution	Institution	260	32.6%	540	67.4%	520	29.7%	1230	70.3%

There is a statistically significant difference between the expected and observed number of outputs in the following UoAs:

- Engineering (more selected outputs from males than expected)
- Politics and International Studies (more selected outputs from females than expected)
- Social Work and Social Policy (more selected outputs from males than expected)

There is also a statistically significant difference for Main Panel B and the Institution overall (both more selected outputs from males than expected).

An analysis by sex has also been conducted on a subset of eligible staff, those in full-time, permanent employment who have not had a period of maternity leave in the REF period. Part-time employment and maternity leave could impact on the number of outputs available for selection for a member of staff, and this is more likely to effect females (100% of those that took maternity leave in the REF period were female and 15% of female staff are part time, compared to 4% of male staff).

Main Panel	UoA Name	Female headcount		Male headcount		Female selected outputs		Male selected outputs	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	<10	23.1%	20	76.9%	15	25.0%	40	75.0%
A	Biological Sciences	10	22.2%	35	77.8%	20	21.6%	75	78.4%
A	Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	20	46.5%	25	53.5%	40	40.0%	60	60.0%
A Total	A Total	35	31.6%	80	68.4%	75	29.6%	180	70.4%
B	Chemistry	<10	13.8%	25	86.2%	10	15.9%	55	84.1%
B	Computer Science and Informatics	<10	4.0%	25	96.0%	<10	1.7%	60	98.3%
B	Engineering	25	16.7%	120	83.3%	55	14.8%	305	85.2%
B	Mathematical Sciences	<10	13.8%	55	86.2%	15	10.1%	125	89.9%
B	Physics	<10	17.1%	30	82.9%	15	17.1%	65	82.9%
B Total	B Total	45	14.8%	255	85.2%	90	13.1%	605	86.9%
C	Business and Management Studies	30	35.7%	55	64.3%	65	39.8%	100	60.2%
C	Economics and Econometrics	<10	15.6%	25	84.4%	15	16.9%	65	83.1%
C	Education	15	51.7%	15	48.3%	35	53.6%	30	46.4%
C	Politics and International Studies	10	31.3%	20	68.8%	30	44.3%	40	55.7%
C	Social Work and Social Policy	20	54.1%	15	45.9%	40	45.9%	45	54.1%
C	Sport and Exercise Sciences, Leisure and Tourism	<10	25.0%	25	75.0%	20	27.9%	50	72.1%

C Total	C Total	90	35.8%	160	64.2%	205	38.3%	330	61.7%
Institution	Institution	170	25.5%	490	74.5%	370	25.0%	1115	75.0%

In this analysis, there is only one UoA with a statistically significant difference between the expected and observed number of outputs; Politics and International Studies, with more selected outputs from females than expected based on the proportion in the population. A statistically significant difference in one UoA does not suggest a systematic issue between the selection of outputs and sex.

Pregnancy and Maternity

The highlighted rows record where there is a statistically significance difference between the expected and observed number of outputs at the 95% confidence interval ($p < 0.05$).

Main Panel	No maternity leave headcount	At least one period of maternity leave headcount	No maternity leave selected outputs	At least one period of maternity leave selected outputs				
	n	%	n	%	n	%		
A	130	90.3%	15	9.7%	285	92.8%	20	7.2%
B	335	95.4%	15	4.6%	775	97.4%	20	2.6%
C	285	93.1%	20	6.9%	620	95.8%	25	4.2%
Institution	745	93.6%	50	6.4%	1680	96.0%	70	4.0%

There is a statistically significant difference between the expected and observed number of outputs in the following Main Panels:

- Main Panel B (less selected outputs from members of staff with at least one period of maternity leave than expected)

- Main Panel C (less selected outputs from members of staff with at least one period of maternity leave than expected)

There is also a statistically significant difference for the Institution overall (less selected outputs from members of staff with at least one period of maternity leave than expected). Periods of maternity leave could impact on the number of outputs available for selection for a member of staff.

Age

The highlighted rows record where there is a statistically significance difference between the expected and observed number of outputs at the 95% confidence interval ($p < 0.05$).

Main Panel	25 - 35 headcount		36 - 45 headcount		46 - 55 headcount		56 - 65 headcount		Over 65 headcount		25 - 35 selected outputs		36 - 45 selected outputs		46 - 55 selected outputs		56 - 65 selected outputs		Over 65 selected outputs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	15	9.0%	55	38.9%	50	35.4%	20	13.9%	<10	2.8%	35	11.1%	115	37.6%	110	35.9%	40	13.7%	<10	1.6%
B	75	21.7%	115	33.1%	85	24.3%	60	17.7%	10	3.1%	160	20.3%	285	35.9%	215	27.1%	115	14.6%	15	2.1%
C	60	20.1%	115	37.8%	75	24.0%	45	14.8%	10	3.3%	105	16.5%	265	41.1%	155	24.0%	90	14.0%	30	4.3%
Institution	150	18.8%	285	36.0%	210	26.2%	125	15.9%	25	3.1%	300	17.3%	665	38.1%	480	27.5%	250	14.2%	50	2.9%

There is a statistically significant difference between the expected and observed number of outputs in Main Panel B. There are more selected outputs than expected for the age groups 36 – 45 and 46 – 55, and less than expected for the age groups 25 – 35, 56 – 65 and Over 65. A statistically significant difference in one Main panel does not suggest a systematic issue between the selection of outputs and age.

Ethnicity

Main Panel	BAME headcount		White British headcount		BAME selected outputs		White British selected outputs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	10	9.0%	120	91.0%	30	11.4%	250	88.6%
B	55	17.4%	270	82.6%	120	16.2%	630	83.8%
C	35	12.6%	255	87.4%	80	12.6%	550	87.4%
Institution	105	14.0%	650	86.0%	235	14.0%	1430	86.0%

Headcount: 18 Not Known, 25 Information Refused

There are no statistically significant differences between the expected and observed number of outputs at the 95% confidence interval (p < 0.05).

Disability

Main Panel	Declared Disability Headcount		No Known Disability Headcount		Declared Disability Selected Outputs		No Known Disability Selected Outputs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	<10	2.1%	140	97.9%	<10	1.3%	300	98.7%
B	<10	2.0%	340	98.0%	10	1.3%	780	98.7%
C	<10	2.3%	295	97.7%	15	2.2%	630	97.8%
Institution	15	2.2%	775	97.8%	30	1.6%	1710	98.4%

Headcount: 8 Information Refused

There are no statistically significant differences between the expected and observed number of outputs at the 95% confidence interval (p < 0.05).

4.2 Researcher Independence Analysis

The Research Independence Panel assessed the large majority of staff members on Grade 7 or Grade 8 from the University's Education and Research (KTP) and Education and Research (Research) job families as set out in the University's Code of Practice. The exceptions were those Research Fellows who were deemed to be independent researchers due to the nature of their Fellowships. This included the University of Bath Prize Fellows and the Royal Society University Research Fellows.

Staff in these two families on Grade 9 or above were deemed to be independent researchers; those on Grade 6 or below were deemed not to be independent researchers.

Out of 293 members of staff considered by the Panels, only 22 were designated as independent. As a result, and following the HESA rounding rules detailed above, no percentages can be published as the population is less than 22.5. The numbers are also too small for any reliable statistical analysis.

However, the data has been reviewed and headcount figures (rounded to the nearest 5) for the institution overall are provided below.

Characteristic	Considered by Independent Research Panel	Determined to be Independent Researchers
Sex	Female: 110 Male: 180	Female: 10 Male: 10
Pregnancy and Maternity	No maternity: 280 At least one period of maternity leave: 15	No maternity: 15 At least one period of maternity leave: <10
Age	24 – 35: 195 36 – 45: 80 46 – 55: 15 56 – 65: <10 Over 65: <10	24 – 35: 10 36 – 45: 10 46 – 55: <10 56 – 65: <10 Over 65: <10
Ethnicity	White – British: 175 BAME: 80	White – British: 15 BAME: <10
Disability	No Known Disability: 285 Declared Disability: <10	No Known Disability: 20 Declared Disability: <10

The University's REF 2021 Code of Practice outlines the process for submitting an appeal against a decision of a Research Independence Panel. One appeal was submitted. The decision of the Research Independence Panel was upheld by the Appeals Panel.

5. Institutional Equality and Diversity

The University recognises that diversity fuels creativity and innovation and is continuously working to create an inclusive community. The University is committed to action to better reflect the society in which we operate.

As part of this we have committed to take action in the following areas between 2019 and 2021:

- a) Increase the proportion of women in senior roles and take positive action to address gender imbalances and the gender pay gap.
- b) Improve the recruitment of staff and students from under-represented groups in order to better reflect the society in which we operate. Where gaps in outcomes or opportunities for progression are identified, the University will seek to address these.
- c) Create and maintain a living and working environment that supports the health and wellbeing of all staff and students.
- d) Foster a culture of inclusion and belonging through a programme of raising awareness and training.
- e) Create a supportive environment for our LGBT+ community.

In addition to these overarching equality objectives, the University has committed to the following vehicles to help achieve the above objectives:

- f) Apply for an institutional Silver Athena SWAN award in 2021.
- g) Work towards appearing on the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index.
- h) Explore the benefits of an institutional Bronze Race Equality Charter award.

6. Recommendations

This iteration of the University's REF 2021 EIA has not found evidence of any systematic issues in its analysis of the selected outputs processes and determination of researcher independence. However, there are some specific areas where a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected number of outputs has been identified for some protected characteristics.

The recommendations from this iteration of the EIA are:

- a) That the results of the outputs selection analysis should be shared with the UoA Leads ahead of the final submission. In particular, the gender analysis should be discussed with the UoA leads in Engineering, Politics and International Studies and Social Work

and Social Policy. The Age analysis should be discussed with the UoA Leads in Main Panel B.

- b) A further analysis on the disclosure of staff circumstances should be conducted following the conclusion of the Staff Circumstances Panels.
- c) University Research Committee should be asked to review the data analysis presented above and provide any additional commentary to be included in the final REF EIA.
- d) A final REF EIA will be produced ahead of the University's REF 2021 submission in March 2021.

Office of Policy, Planning and Compliance

September 2020